

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on
FFY18**

New Hampshire



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

New Hampshire has a responsibility, under federal law, to have a system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by school districts. The general supervision system is accountable for identifying and correcting noncompliance with IDEA, the New Hampshire Education Laws and the New Hampshire Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities, as well as for promoting continuous improvement.

There are eight components that comprise NH's general supervision system. It is important to note that although the components are presented separately here, they each connect, interact and articulate requirements to form a comprehensive system. The general supervision system for NH has the following components (The SPP is described in the Executive Summary. The remainder of components are described in the General Supervision and Technical Assistance sections).

- 1) State Performance Plan (SPP)
- 2) Integrated Monitoring Activities: A) District Selection Process, B) Compliance and Improvement Monitoring Process
- 3) Fiscal Management
- 4) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- 5) Data on Processes and Results
- 6) Effective Dispute Resolution
- 7) Improvement, correction, incentives and sanctions
- 8) Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development

1) State Performance Plan: The State Performance Plan (SPP) is a blueprint for system change for special education in New Hampshire. It incorporates a variety of methods including the use of desk audits, on-site monitoring and data collection to determine performance and compliance. Throughout the plan, please note the change in the name of the Bureau. New Hampshire's Bureau is now called the Bureau of Student Support (Bureau). The new name is the result of our new Commissioner working with the NH legislature to reorganize the NH Department of Education. Throughout the State Performance Plan, the Bureau seeks to align across the NH Department of Education and across other agencies and organizations to maximize results. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), is part of OSEP's Results Driven Accountability (RDA). All the components of the general supervision system are woven together in the SPP. For example, Targeted Technical Assistance is provided to districts when the review of Data on Processes and Results indicates that there are concerns with local Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation. This can result in Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and as laid out in IDEA and New Hampshire laws.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

175

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

2) Integrated Monitoring Activities: New Hampshire integrates monitoring activities across several key components of the New Hampshire general supervision system through its Compliance & Improvement Monitoring Review process. The Program Administrator (Director) is in charge of subrecipient (LEA) monitoring in relation to the compliance review of subrecipient audit reports. The Director has a compliance & improvement monitoring team of education consultants and program specialists and administrative assistants who coordinate, lead and maintain data collection and reporting for the special education monitoring of New Hampshire public schools.

A) District Selection Process: The Bureau followed a standard process to select districts to participate in the special education compliance & improvement monitoring review. This process was described in FY' 15 Memo #18 (which may be accessed here:

https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/memos/documents/fy15_memo_18_district_selection_sped_compliance_improvement_monitoring.pdf.

The district selection rubric may be found here:

https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/documents/cim_district_selection_rubric_no_dates.pdf

B) Compliance & Improvement Monitoring (CIM) Process- The CIM process is a comprehensive review of student files, personnel credentials, district special education forms, district special education programs and district special education procedures. Districts are offered technical assistance to support school district personnel in their understanding of the special education process and the CIM process approximately 10 month prior to the onsite monitoring. Districts have access to technical assistance before, during and after the monitoring process. Student files and special education programs are monitored onsite and the review of credentials, forms and procedures are reviewed through desk audit. Findings and corrective actions are provided to districts in a report which is presented in a meeting with district administration which occurs about 45 days after the onsite date. The report is posted here: https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/compliance_monitoring_reports.htm

A follow up visit from the Bureau to verifies corrective actions of noncompliance, beginning 2 to 3 months from the report. Monthly follow up visits are scheduled as necessary to verify evidence of correction of outstanding findings of noncompliance. About 6 months after the report date, the district selects new student files in accordance with the number of files and student selection criteria that is provided to the district, by the Bureau, approximately 3 weeks prior to a previously scheduled, subsequent Bureau on-site visit. The scheduled on-site visit is to verify implementation of the regulations that were identified as non compliant in the original report using the new files. Additional monthly visits scheduled as necessary verify evidence of correction for any outstanding findings of noncompliance. Once a district has shown corrective action regarding the implementation of regulations a close out letter is sent to the district and no further action is needed. The district will remain out of the district selection list for the next five years. An overview of the district selection process and CIM process, forms used for the CIM process since 2015, and district reports back to 2013 and may be found here: https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/whats.htm.

3) Fiscal Management: The annual request for federal funds allows a local education agency (LEA) to apply for IDEA Part B Section 611 & Preschool Section 619 funds in one application. The application is a web-based online process, which requires activities, assurances and when appropriate, a consolidated application option. Funds are distributed based on a reimbursement process after an extensive review by the Bureau to ensure activities are allowable costs under IDEA. This application process walks districts through a process to ensure that required proportional share of funds are spent on children with disabilities who are enrolled by their parents in private schools. Districts also specify if they are using IDEA funds for CEIS, which allows

the Bureau to monitor the appropriate use of CEIS dollars. As a "pass-through" entity for Federal funds, the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Federal Compliance (BFC) completes annual fiscal compliance monitoring and single-audit reviews of its subrecipients in accordance with 2 CFR 200.331. More information about the Bureau of federal compliance process may be found here:

<https://www.education.nh.gov/program/federal-compliance/index.htm>

4) Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation: In addition to monitoring policies, procedures and effective implementation through the SPP and the Compliance Monitoring Review, the Bureau has authority under RSA 186-C:5 III as follows: (d) On-site monitoring to further evaluate noncompliance, verify accuracy of data, assess the adequacy of the corrective action plans and their implementation, or other purposes as the Department may determine.

5) Data on Processes and Results: Data on processes and results are intricately woven into all areas of general supervision. The Bureau coordinates with the EDFacts stewards and other Bureaus in the Department to ensure fidelity of data and results. As part of the SPP process, the Bureau annually reports to the public on district performance compared to the State and established targets which may be accessed here:

https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/spp.htm

As required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 34 CFR §300.600, the Bureau makes determinations annually on the performance of each public school district regarding the implementation of IDEA: https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/districtdeterminations.htm Districts that are in need of intervention or substantial intervention are provided with a contact person within the Bureau who works with the district to examine data with the intention of identifying a root cause. A plan to address the root cause is created by the district in consultation with Bureau staff to include universal, targeted or intensive TA (see the description of TA system below).

6) Effective Dispute Resolution: Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) may take the form of a neutral conference as described in RSA 186-C:23-b and Ed 215.02, and mediation as described in RSA 186-C:24 and Ed 215.03.

Due Process Hearing Complaints: Either a parent, a child, or the school district may file a due process hearing complaint on any matter relating to a proposal or a refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of a child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to the child. For more information on Special Education Due Process Hearings and Alternative Dispute Resolutions, go to:

http://www.education.nh.gov/legislation/special_ed_due_process.htm

Special Education Complaint Procedures: The complaints process is one method parents or others have to resolve an issue if they believe a public agency (LEA or SEA) has not complied with a special education law. Because most differences are successfully resolved at the local level, parents may wish to notify their school district to give them the opportunity to resolve the issue at the local level before filing a complaint. For more information about the NH Special Education Complaint process, go to: https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/complaint.htm

7) Improvement, correction, incentives and sanctions: The Bureau applied enforcement procedures subsequent to the issuance of corrective actions specified in the orders resulting from a complaint investigated, a due process hearing, or a monitoring activity (see RSA 186-C:5)

<http://gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/xv/186-c/186-c-mrg.htm>

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Technical Assistance (TA) and Professional Development

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support provided a tiered approach to technical assistance (TA) to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to districts. The TA was closely paired with professional development (PD) to ensure that service providers had the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities. In alignment with OSEP's TA & PD Conceptual Framework, New Hampshire defines TA activities and the levels as follows:

Technical Assistance Activities

TA activities provided expertise in response to a client's defined problem or need in order to increase their capacity. Clients typically include local school district personnel and parents of children with disabilities but may also include other people interested in special education. New Hampshire has specified three categories of technical assistance: Universal, General TA; Targeted, Specialized TA and Intensive Sustained TA. Each category was important and employed strategically to achieve the desired outcomes. The description below references New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Student Support (Bureau) staff, however this model also applies to key initiatives funded with IDEA funds. Each of the levels of technical assistance included a variety of professional development activities. These were designed to promote evidence-based practices, utilize the Participatory Adult Learning Strategies (PALS) model and take into consideration implementation science for scale-up and sustainability

Universal, General TA

Passive technical assistance (TA) and information provided to independent users through their own initiative resulting in minimal interaction with NHDOE, Bureau of Student Support. This includes one-time, invited or offered professional development presentations by Bureau staff such as trainings regarding: NHSEIS; application for reimbursement under the high school fund (State Special Aid); IDEA Federal Funds Application; and presentations at the various associations. This category of TA also included information or products, such as numbered memorandums, guidebooks and manuals, and other resources downloaded from the Bureau's website by independent users. Brief communications by Bureau staff with recipients, either by telephone or e-mail were considered Universal, General TA.

In addition, dissemination activities were considered Universal, General TA. This included the distribution of information and resources to specific audiences with or without a direct request for this information. The intent was to collect, package and spread knowledge and the associated evidence-base in a way that could be accessed by audiences on their own schedules and without the direct intervention of the Bureau staff.

Targeted, Specialized TA

Targeted or specialized technical assistance (TA) were services developed based on needs common to multiple recipients and not extensively individualized. In this TA, a relationship was established between the TA recipient and one or more Bureau staff or the Bureau's designee. This category of TA could be one-time, labor-intensive events, such as on-site training to selected districts regarding the completion of the self-assessment data collection form prior to the compliance monitoring review. They could also be episodic, less labor-intensive events that extend over a period of time, such as facilitating a series of meetings with new Special Education Administrators or Special Education Coordinators or the Measurable Annual Goals trainings with a coaching component. Facilitating communities of practice can also be considered Targeted, Specialized TA.

Targeted TA was also provided to districts with findings of noncompliance relative to indicators in the State Performance Plan. Bureau staff offered TA and PD to district administrators and practitioners, as appropriate. This could include a review of data, identification of root causes of noncompliance and support for district personnel with understanding the intricacies of the area being addressed. This TA might have been mandated as part of the correction of noncompliance.

Intensive, Sustained TA

The Intensive or Sustained technical assistance (TA) services were often provided on-site and required a stable, ongoing relationship between the Bureau staff and the TA recipient. This category of TA is intended to have resulted in changes to policy, program, practice, or operations that supported increased recipient capacity and/or improved outcomes at one or more systems levels. Frequently these TA services were defined as negotiated series of activities designed to reach a valued outcome. Many of the Bureau's initiatives provided intensive TA to districts that demonstrate readiness and a desire to engage in significant work. A non-exhaustive list of current intensive TA included the UDL Academy, iSocial and Parent Center for Authentic Family Voice. These generally had an application process or some other selection criteria. Recipients' of these types of intensive TA commit to a multi-year process that included data collection and evaluation of implementation.

Mandatory intensive TA may be provided to districts that are determined to need substantial intervention with the implementation of IDEA. Bureau staff and district leadership worked closely to identify root causes that impact the determination and to develop and implement a long-term plan to remedy areas of concern.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The NH Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support General Supervision System (described above) includes the description of the mechanisms the State has in place to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

The NH Department of Education reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each LEA (district) located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). These reports are available on the NH Department of Education website at:<https://ireport.education.nh.gov/>

A complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available at:

https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/spp.htm

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2010	71.56%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	85.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	71.03%	71.54%	72.67%	72.73%	74.26%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets

- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,776
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	2,407
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	73.78%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,776	2,407	74.26%	95.00%	73.78%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Explanation of Calculation

Consistent with the OSEP instructions, the NHDOE has described the results of the examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2018 APR, used data from 2017-2018), and compared the results to the target reported in the FFY 2018 State Performance Plan that aligns with the graduation rate target under Title I of the ESEA.

When reporting graduation rates for the SPP/APR, OSEP permits States to use the same data as used for reporting to the US Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). These data are reported in the CSPR for all students. In order to calculate this for students with IEPs, the Bureau of Data Management identified youth with IEPs in the overall data and performed the same calculation for this subgroup as the calculation used for all youth. Beginning with 2009-2010, the Department reports the NH Annual Graduate Rate based on a cohort model using US Department of Education established parameters. This report identifies the number of students who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma or an adult high school diploma and the graduation rate by school and district.

For the FFY 2018 APR, NH calculated a five-year cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities in addition to the four-year cohort graduation rate. Students from the original incoming freshman class who were counted in the FFY 2018 four-year cohort group, but who needed a fifth year to complete graduation requirements and who did so successfully are captured in the five-year cohort graduation rate that was calculated for FFY 2018. The FFY 2018 APR five-year cohort graduation rate was 1,929 of 2,463 or 78.32%.

Definition and Requirements for Graduation with a Regular Diploma

RSA 186-C:9 Education Required states that an educationally disabled child "shall be entitled to attend an approved program which can implement the child's individualized education program. Such child shall be entitled to continue in an approved program until such time as the child has acquired a regular high school diploma or has attained the age of 21, whichever occurs first, or until the child's individualized education program team determines that the child no longer requires special education in accordance with the provisions of this chapter." New Hampshire does not recognize alternative diplomas, IEP diplomas, the GED, certificates of attendance or any other form but a regular high school diploma for the purposes of counting a child as fulfilling the diploma exiting requirement of RSA 186-C:9. To earn a regular high school diploma, a child must, as specified in the Minimum Standards for Public School Approval effective 7/1/05, Section Ed 306.27, earn "a minimum of 20 credits for a regular high school diploma, unless the local school board has set a requirement of more than 20 credits for a regular high school diploma, in which case the local credit requirement shall apply." In NH, a regular high school diploma is conferred by the local school board.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2008	4.53%
-----------------	-------------	--------------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.76%	0.76%	0.76%	0.76%	0.76%
Data	0.76%	0.53%	0.74%	0.87%	1.05%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.65%	0.65%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,440
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	126
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	31
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	160
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	5

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

As permitted by OSEP, the NHDOE used the same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012. The NHDOE exercised Option 2 from the Instructions: "Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data." Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2018 APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
51	8,607	1.05%	0.65%	0.59%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Consistent with the OSEP Part B Indicator Measurement Table, the NHDOE has described the results of the examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2016 APR, use data from 2015-2016). The results are compared to the target set for FFY 2017 in the State Performance Plan. Dropout numbers and rates for all students, including students with IEPs, are reported by districts operating high schools and for the two public academies. Beginning with 2009-2010, the Department has reported the NH Annual Dropout rate using the cohort rate defined by the New England Secondary School Consortium (NESSC) in parallel with national definitions. The cohort model includes all students during the past four years who were expected to graduate at the end of the reported school year. This analysis results in a more accurate picture of students who were in NH schools during the past four years. The calculation for the dropout rate for students with IEPs was the same calculation that the NHDOE Bureau of Data Management used to determine rates for all students.

New Hampshire defines a student as having dropped out of public education based on a specific formula. This formula identifies students enrolled in public school in grades 9 – 12 who:

have completed the prior school year,

did not return after the summer or dropped out during the current school year, and did not return by October 1st of the subsequent school year.

For example: a 2017-18 dropout is a public school student in grades 9-12 who completed the 2016-17 school year, did not return after the summer of 2017 or dropped out during the 2017-18 school year, and did not return by October 1, 2018.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	97.65%	91.10%	91.10%	91.10%	91.10%
A	Overall	91.10%	Actual	97.65%	91.10%	92.32%	91.78%	92.10%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	97.54%	91.14%	91.14%	91.14%	91.14%
A	Overall	91.14%	Actual	97.54%	91.14%	92.35%	91.85%	92.85%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	17,224	15,488	92.10%	95.00%	89.92%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	During the 2018 NH Legislative session NH RSA 193-C:6 was amended to allow a parent to exempt his or her child from participating in the statewide assessments. While there is no requirement for districts to provide the NHDOE with the data relative to the numbers of children whose parents have exempted them, the NHDOE believes that this provision continues to be a contributing factor to the decline in participation rates.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	17,224	15,528	92.85%	95.00%	90.15%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	During the 2018 NH Legislative session NH RSA 193-C:6 was amended to allow a parent to exempt his or her child from participating in the statewide assessments. While there is no requirement for districts to provide the NHDOE with the data relative to the numbers of children whose parents have exempted them, the NHDOE believes that this provision continues to be a contributing factor to the decline in participation rates.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

To access the link to 2018-19 New Hampshire Statewide Assessment (NHSAS), NH Alternate Assessment (DLM) & Grade 11 (SAT) Reporting Results for ELA/Mathematics, please click on the following link <https://www.education.nh.gov/iportal/index.htm>

- 1) Then click on iReport
 - 2) Once on the landing page, search for the school or district you desire
 - 3) When your school or district opens on the new page, select the IDEA Report tab
 - 4) After the IDEA Report tab opens, scroll down to Indicator 3b and 3c to review the participation and proficiency data
- This link <https://www.education.nh.gov/iportal/index.htm> also includes, at the bottom of the page, link to the longitudinal comparison of results for grades 3-8 and 11 for Reading and Mathematics for both the State of New Hampshire and for individual schools and school districts <http://my.doe.nh.gov/profiles/> There are options to view results by subgroups, including students with disabilities as well. Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) data is reported in combination with SAT, and PACE assessments.

To access these reports:

- 1) Under Search Options, select by District
- 2) Select a district to view
- 3) Click on the green Test Results tab at the top of the screen and select School Year 201-18 in the upper right corner of the screen
- 4) Scroll to the bottom of the screen under Longitudinal Reports and Subgroup Reporting and select a content area (e.g. Math or Reading)
- 5) Using the filters at the top of the screen, select IEP/SWD – IEP from the Subgroup dropdown

To access 2018-19 data regarding the number of those children with disabilities who were provided accommodations in order to participate in SAT and the New Hampshire Statewide Assessment System assessments and the number of those children with disabilities who participated in alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards, visit <https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/index.htm> Scroll down to the middle of the screen. Under 2018 Final Assessment Results for DLM, SAT and select 2018 Participation with Accommodations: Counts for Students with Disabilities and 2018 DLM Participation Counts.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	35.70%	19.31%	19.31%	19.31%	19.31%
A	Overall	19.31%	Actual	35.70%	19.31%	20.06%	18.99%	18.81%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	25.94%	13.29%	13.29%	13.29%	13.29%
A	Overall	13.29%	Actual	25.94%	13.29%	14.25%	14.17%	14.52%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	58.00%	58.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	46.00%	46.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The

Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	15,488	2,604	18.81%	58.00%	16.81%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	The NHDOE compliance and improvement monitoring team has identified a statewide weakness in the development of IEPs with respect to specially designed instruction. While there has been significant improvement in the development of measurable annual goals and an increase in the quality of prior written notice, there continues to be concerns with the implementation of specially designed instruction. The NHDOE believes that this may be impacting student performance across the board, including with assessment results. In order to address this, in the past year, the NHDOE has developed and provided more comprehensive training and technical assistance on specially designed instruction. Moving forward, this will be enhanced by the provision of training around evidenced based practices.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	15,528	2,196	14.52%	46.00%	14.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

To access the link to 2018-19 New Hampshire Statewide Assessment (NHSAS), NH Alternate Assessment (DLM) & Grade 11 (SAT) Reporting Results for ELA/Mathematics, please click on the following link <https://www.education.nh.gov/iportal/index.htm>

Then click on iReport

Once on the landing page, search for the school or district you desire

When your school or district opens on the new page, select the IDEA Report tab

After the IDEA Report tab opens, scroll down to Indicator 3b and 3c to review the participation and proficiency data

This link <https://www.education.nh.gov/iportal/index.htm> also includes, at the bottom of the page, link to the longitudinal comparison of results for grades 3-8 and 11 for Reading and Mathematics for both the State of New Hampshire and for individual schools and school districts

<http://my.doe.nh.gov/profiles/> There are options to view results by subgroups, including students with disabilities as well. Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) data is reported in combination with SAT, and PACE assessments.

To access these reports:

- 1) Under Search Options, select by District
- 2) Select a district to view
- 3) Click on the green Test Results tab at the top of the screen and select School Year 2018-19 in the upper right corner of the screen
- 4) Scroll to the bottom of the screen under Longitudinal Reports and Subgroup Reporting and select a content area (e.g. Math or Reading)
- 5) Using the filters at the top of the screen, select IEP/SWD – IEP from the Subgroup dropdown

To access 2018-19 data regarding the number of those children with disabilities who were provided accommodations in order to participate in SAT and the New Hampshire Statewide Assessments System and the number of those children with disabilities who participated in alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards, visit <https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/index.htm> Scroll down to the middle of the screen. Under 2018 Final Assessment Results for DLM, SAT and select 2018 Participation with Accommodations: Counts for Students with Disabilities and 2018 DLM Participation Counts.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.57%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%
Data	1.15%	1.71%	0.57%	0.57%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	1.15%	1.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council,

which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

3

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	172	0.00%	1.15%	1.16%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In the previous year, no districts were identified but due to NH's continuous TA to the districts with respect to the accuracy of their data (through for example, webinars and in person training), data accuracy and quality of disciplinary data has improved. Two districts are now identified. In speaking with one of the two districts identified with a significant discrepancy, the NHDOE determined that the district's recent technical assistance in the special education process regarding documenting discipline events in the New Hampshire Special Education Information System (NHSEIS) has lead the district to document events in NHSEIS with more fidelity than in years prior. The NHDOE continues to work statewide with districts to ensure that they are correctly reporting discipline events in the NHSEIS system.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Definition of Significant Discrepancy

The NHDOE defines a "significant discrepancy" as any district with a rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs that is greater than 3% of students with IEPs enrolled in the district.

For any district that had greater than 3% students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year, the State applied a minimum "n" size. Districts that exceeded the threshold and did not meet the following minimum "n" size requirements were removed from the count:

A minimum of 11 children with IEPs in the district, consistent with the State Assessment, NHSAS.

At least 4 students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

Identification of Comparison Methodology

Discrepancies were computed by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State. The results of the NHDOE examination of the data are for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2018 APR, data are from 2017-2018)

, including data disaggregated to determine if significant discrepancies occurred in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs. If the NHDOE determined that there were significant discrepancies in the suspension and expulsion rates, the NHDOE reviewed, and if

appropriate, revised (or required the district to revise) the district's policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards to ensure that the policies, procedures and practices complied with Part B. Minimum "n" size requirements

Report on the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement in the FFY 2018 APR (using the 2017-2018 data).

Step 1: Of the 175 districts, the NHDOE determined that there were 5 districts that had greater than 3% suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs for more than 10 days in a school year.

Step 2: Of the 5 districts identified in Step 1, five (5) had more than 11 students with IEPs and so were considered for the next step. None of the five (5) were removed because they did not meet the minimum "n" size.

Step 3: Of the 5 districts identified in Step 1 & 2, two (2) had four or more students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the school year. Three (3) districts were removed because it did not meet the minimum "n" size.

Therefore, 3 districts were removed because they did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement in the FFY2018 APR.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

In the FFY 2018 APR, using 2017-2018 data, there were 2 districts identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator. The NHDOE reviewed, and, when appropriate, revised (or required the affected district to revise) the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

The NHDOE review included the completion of a self-assessment by each of the identified districts. The district's self-assessment specifically covered a review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The NHDOE then verified the results of the district's self-assessment. Based on this process, it was determined that there were no individual instances of noncompliance and no findings of noncompliance with the implementation for regulations of IDEA relative to this indicator.

If there had been any districts identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator, the NHDOE would have verified, as soon as possible, but in no case greater than one year of the noncompliance being identified that, in the districts with identified noncompliance, the districts were: 1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and 2) would have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

11

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	164	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Definition of Significant Discrepancy

The NHDOE defines a "significant discrepancy" as any district with a rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs that is greater than 3% of students with IEPs enrolled in the district.

For any district that had greater than 3% students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year, the State applied a minimum "n" size. Districts that exceeded the threshold and did not meet the following minimum "n" size requirements were removed from the count:

- A minimum of 11 children with IEPs in the district, consistent with the State Assessment, NHSAS.
- At least 4 students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

For Indicator 4B, these minimum cell sizes are applied to the population of students with IEPs in each race and ethnicity category.

Identification of Comparison Methodology

Discrepancies were computed by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs (districts) within the State. The results of the NHDOE examination of the data are for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2016 APR, data are from 2015-2016), including data disaggregated to determine if significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity occurred in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs. If the NHDOE determined that there were significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity in the suspension and expulsion rates, the NHDOE reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the district to revise) the district's policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards to ensure that the policies, procedures and practices comply with Part B.

Minimum "n" size requirements

Report on the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement in the FFY 2018 APR (using the 2017-2018 data).

Step 1: Of the 175 districts, the NHDOE determined that there were twelve (12) districts that had greater than 3% suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs for more than 10 days in a school year.

Step 2: Of the 12 district identified in step 1:

- 4 districts were excluded because they did not have 11 students with IEPs and
- 7 were excluded because they did not have 4 students that were suspended or expelled for more than 10 days

In total, 11 districts were removed because they did not meet the n size.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

In the FFY 2018 APR, using 2017-2018 data, there was one (1) district identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator. The NHDOE reviewed the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

The NHDOE review included the completion of a self-assessment by the identified district. The district's self-assessment specifically covered a review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The NHDOE then have verified the results of the district's self-assessment. Based on this review, it was determined that there were no individual instances of noncompliance and no findings of noncompliance with the implementation for regulations of IDEA relative to this indicator.

Had there been findings of non-compliance, as part of this review, the NHDOE would have conducted an on-site visit to review the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. Furthermore, file reviews of all students potentially impacted by the noncompliance would have been completed to determine if there were any individual case of noncompliance or if the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the district. Based on the self-assessment and the subsequent on-site review, the NHDOE determined that there were no (0) districts that had noncompliance regarding this indicator.

If there had been any districts identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator, the NHDOE would have verified within one year of the noncompliance being identified that, in the districts with identified noncompliance, the districts were: 1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and 2) would have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2013	Target >=	72.85%	72.85%	72.85%	72.85%	72.85%
A	72.85%	Data	72.85%	72.34%	72.44%	71.71%	70.81%
B	2013	Target <=	7.97%	7.97%	7.97%	7.97%	7.97%
B	7.97%	Data	7.97%	8.47%	8.44%	8.79%	9.05%
C	2013	Target <=	2.61%	2.61%	2.61%	2.61%	2.61%
C	2.61%	Data	2.61%	2.67%	2.73%	2.88%	2.84%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	74.00%	74.00%
Target B <=	7.00%	7.00%
Target C <=	2.05%	2.05%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for

both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	26,243
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	18,779
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,419
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	614
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	111
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	8

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	18,779	26,243	70.81%	74.00%	71.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,419	26,243	9.05%	7.00%	9.22%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	733	26,243	2.84%	2.05%	2.79%	Did Not Meet	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]						Target	

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	<p>The NHDOE reviewed the aggregate data with respect to Identifications and Child Count. The data shows an increase of students with the identifications of Developmental Delay (225 more students than last year) and Autism (159 more students than last year) which is a total of 384 more students, representing 19.79% of the overall population compared to last year of 17.83% The NHDOE believes that the number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day has increased due to the number of preschool children, whose needs were identified by early intervention in these two disability categories, entering the 6-21 child count. NHDOE notes that students in these categories tend to have more significant needs than children in some other disability categories and are therefore often served in somewhat more restrictive environments.</p> <p>The NHDOE also noted that there has been a rise in approved special education programs over the past few years which have been created to meet the needs of children with more significant needs such as those identified with Autism and/or Developmental Delay. The NHDOE believes that the number of students placed in the self-contained (setting B) programs at the early elementary level may be an attempt to avoid seeking a more restrictive placement (such as separate schools) to meet the students' more significant needs,</p> <p>Additionally, through monitoring, the NHDOE has determined that school districts are often not entering the special education and related services properly into the NHSEIS database and inadvertently skewing the data relative to educational environments. For example, the NHDOE is aware of a practice of districts capturing the supports for personnel (such as BCBA consultation) in the section of the IEP (from which the data for tables 1 and 3 are derived) which capture special education and related services to the student, rather than in the section of the IEP indicated for supports for personnel (which does not contribute to educational environment calculation). Therefore, services to assist the student where the student is not being removed from the regular education environment are erroneously being reported as removals.</p> <p>The NHDOE recently increased professional development efforts for LEAs around data fidelity to include online trainings and presentations addressing very specifically how district personnel may review district-level child count and educational environment data as well as increased training and professional development on how the NHSEIS data base generates child count and educational environment data. The NHDOE is also updating the NHSEIS guidebook (which serves as a resource for school district personnel in utilizing the database) by creating 3 separate manuals which will be tailored to administrative assistants, special education teachers/related service providers, and special education district-level administrators. Additionally, available training in how to navigate the NHSEIS database, including data entry, is increasing and now available in an online format.</p>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2013	Target >=	50.36%	50.36%	51.00%	53.00%	56.00%
A	50.36%	Data	50.36%	56.48%	58.08%	58.70%	58.43%
B	2013	Target <=	18.22%	18.22%	17.50%	16.00%	14.50%
B	18.22%	Data	18.22%	15.64%	14.00%	13.11%	12.86%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	60.00%	60.00%
Target B <=	12.00%	12.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for

both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,677
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,206
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	427
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	3
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,206	3,677	58.43%	60.00%	59.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	432	3,677	12.86%	12.00%	11.75%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2012	Target >=	79.50%	79.50%	79.50%	79.50%	80.00%

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	79.50%	Data	80.94%	82.40%	79.71%	82.88%	79.92%
A2	2012	Target >=	61.60%	61.60%	61.60%	61.60%	62.00%
A2	61.60%	Data	61.82%	62.13%	59.98%	58.35%	61.68%
B1	2012	Target >=	78.90%	78.90%	79.00%	79.00%	80.00%
B1	78.90%	Data	79.96%	81.52%	79.98%	80.67%	79.82%
B2	2012	Target >=	60.90%	60.90%	61.00%	61.00%	61.50%
B2	60.90%	Data	61.74%	60.68%	58.78%	57.04%	61.59%
C1	2012	Target >=	76.80%	76.80%	77.00%	77.00%	77.50%
C1	76.80%	Data	77.85%	80.91%	76.95%	84.65%	90.45%
C2	2012	Target >=	63.20%	63.20%	63.20%	63.20%	63.50%
C2	63.20%	Data	66.03%	66.21%	63.11%	72.59%	83.24%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	80.00%	80.00%
Target A2 >=	62.00%	62.00%
Target B1 >=	80.00%	80.00%
Target B2 >=	61.50%	61.50%
Target C1 >=	77.50%	77.50%
Target C2 >=	63.50%	63.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After

soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	53	4.33%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	166	13.55%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	294	24.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	463	37.80%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	249	20.33%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	757	976	79.92%	80.00%	77.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	712	1,225	61.68%	62.00%	58.12%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	53	4.33%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	164	13.39%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	309	25.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	506	41.31%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	193	15.76%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	815	1,032	79.82%	80.00%	78.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
<i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	699	1,225	61.59%	61.50%	57.06%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	41	3.35%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	295	24.08%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	197	16.08%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	342	27.92%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	350	28.57%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	539	875	90.45%	77.50%	61.60%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	692	1,225	83.24%	63.50%	56.49%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>The NHDOE conducted an analysis of the data by tools (AEPsi vs MTS Gold/My Teaching Strategies. Based on this analysis, it was determined that the data from Teaching Strategies was having a negative impact on the results. The changes to Teaching Strategies data are described below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In August 2017, Teaching Strategies GOLD expanded the progressions from a Birth to Age 5 assessment to a Birth to Grade 3 assessment. For the past two years' districts have been experiencing anomalies in their data. Data for the FFY2017 reporting period yielded an abnormally high score for Outcome C (Using Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs). States contacted MTS GOLD regarding this concern and those scores were re-calculated by the company, confirming the issue with the data. The FFY 18 data still reflects this data issue. Data for FFY 2018 yielded a decline in scores for one, two or all outcome areas. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> New Hampshire is a participant in a cohort of states that use MTS GOLD for Outcomes reporting and they are working with MTS GOLD to rectify the scoring abnormalities. MTS GOLD has indicated they are looking into the scoring algorithm. In addition, states were concerned that the data in the system for three and four year olds previously (FFY2017 and FFY2018) was based on scoring from the previous Birth to Age 5 assessment. If there were any errors in that data (such as: not completed or not finalized), it was unable to be corrected as that became "Read Only" data. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most three and four year old children will have exited the system prior to the FFY2019 reporting period so previous data from the Birth to Age 5 assessment should not be impacting the FFY2019 reporting period. During the FFY2017 and FFY2018, any errors made on the Child Profile page area of "The child has an IEP" could not be corrected. If "Yes" was not checked properly the Social Emotional questions C1, C2, C3, and C4 were not generated by the assessment. Without those questions, the assessment was not complete and districts were unable to retrieve and report the data for the children involved. This resulted in a loss of data for 42 children in FFY2017 and 38 children in FFY2018. My Teaching Strategies GOLD has explained to us that this is not something that can be corrected, so moving forward districts must take care in completing the profile page correctly. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The NHDOE has put in place a system where the district administrator can view a grid of identified children from their district in the MTS

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>GOLD system and are able to see if IEP has been checked "Yes" as needed.</p> <p>b. A reminder also goes out from the POMS Technical Assistance Consultant 3 times a year to review this grid.</p>
A2	<p>The NHDOE conducted an analysis of the data by tools (AEPsi vs MTS Gold/My Teaching Strategies. Based on this analysis, it was determined that the data from Teaching Strategies was having a negative impact on the results. The changes to Teaching Strategies data are described below:</p> <p>1. In August 2017, Teaching Strategies GOLD expanded the progressions from a Birth to Age 5 assessment to a Birth to Grade 3 assessment. For the past two years' districts have been experiencing anomalies in their data. Data for the FFY2017 reporting period yielded an abnormally high score for Outcome C (Using Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs). States contacted MTS GOLD regarding this concern and those scores were re-calculated by the company, confirming the issue with the data. The FFY 18 data still reflects this data issue. Data for FFY 2018 yielded a decline in scores for one, two or all outcome areas.</p> <p>a. New Hampshire is a participant in a cohort of states that use MTS GOLD for Outcomes reporting and they are working with MTS GOLD to rectify the scoring abnormalities. MTS GOLD has indicated they are looking into the scoring algorithm.</p> <p>2. In addition, states were concerned that the data in the system for three and four year olds previously (FFY2017 and FFY2018) was based on scoring from the previous Birth to Age 5 assessment. If there were any errors in that data (such as: not completed or not finalized), it was unable to be corrected as that became "Read Only" data.</p> <p>a. Most three and four year old children will have exited the system prior to the FFY2019 reporting period so previous data from the Birth to Age 5 assessment should not be impacting the FFY2019 reporting period.</p> <p>3. During the FFY2017 and FFY2018, any errors made on the Child Profile page area of "The child has an IEP" could not be corrected. If "Yes" was not checked properly the Social Emotional questions C1, C2, C3, and C4 were not generated by the assessment. Without those questions, the assessment was not complete and districts were unable to retrieve and report the data for the children involved. This resulted in a loss of data for 42 children in FFY2017 and 38 children in FFY2018. My Teaching Strategies GOLD has explained to us that this is not something that can be corrected, so moving forward districts must take care in completing the profile page correctly.</p> <p>a. The NHDOE has put in place a system where the district administrator can view a grid of identified children from their district in the MTS GOLD system and are able to see if IEP has been checked "Yes" as needed.</p> <p>b. A reminder also goes out from the POMS Technical Assistance Consultant 3 times a year to review this grid.</p>
B2	<p>The NHDOE conducted an analysis of the data by tools (AEPsi vs MTS Gold/My Teaching Strategies. Based on this analysis, it was determined that the data from Teaching Strategies was having a negative impact on the results. The changes to Teaching Strategies data are described below:</p> <p>1. In August 2017, Teaching Strategies GOLD expanded the progressions from a Birth to Age 5 assessment to a Birth to Grade 3 assessment. For the past two years' districts have been experiencing anomalies in their data. Data for the FFY2017 reporting period yielded an abnormally high score for Outcome C (Using Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs). States contacted MTS GOLD regarding this concern and those scores were re-calculated by the company, confirming the issue with the data. The FFY 18 data still reflects this data issue. Data for FFY 2018 yielded a decline in scores for one, two or all outcome areas.</p> <p>a. New Hampshire is a participant in a cohort of states that use MTS GOLD for Outcomes reporting and they are working with MTS GOLD to rectify the scoring abnormalities. MTS GOLD has indicated they are looking into the scoring algorithm.</p> <p>2. In addition, states were concerned that the data in the system for three and four year olds previously (FFY2017 and FFY2018) was based on scoring from the previous Birth to Age 5 assessment. If there were any errors in that data (such as: not completed or not finalized), it was unable to be corrected as that became "Read Only" data.</p> <p>a. Most three and four year old children will have exited the system prior to the FFY2019 reporting period so previous data from the Birth to Age 5 assessment should not be impacting the FFY2019 reporting period.</p> <p>3. During the FFY2017 and FFY2018, any errors made on the Child Profile page area of "The child has an IEP" could not be corrected. If "Yes" was not checked properly the Social Emotional questions C1, C2, C3, and C4 were not generated by the assessment. Without those questions, the assessment was not complete and districts were unable to retrieve and report the data for the children involved. This resulted in a loss of data for 42 children in FFY2017 and 38 children in FFY2018. My Teaching Strategies GOLD has explained to us that this is not something that can be corrected, so moving forward districts must take care in completing the profile page correctly.</p> <p>a. The NHDOE has put in place a system where the district administrator can view a grid of identified children from their district in the MTS GOLD system and are able to see if IEP has been checked "Yes" as needed.</p> <p>b. A reminder also goes out from the POMS Technical Assistance Consultant 3 times a year to review this grid.</p>
C1	<p>The NHDOE conducted an analysis of the data by tools (AEPsi vs MTS Gold/My Teaching Strategies. Based on this analysis, it was determined that the data from Teaching Strategies was having a negative impact on the results. The changes to Teaching Strategies data are described below:</p> <p>1. In August 2017, Teaching Strategies GOLD expanded the progressions from a Birth to Age 5 assessment to a Birth to Grade 3 assessment. For the past two years' districts have been experiencing anomalies in their data. Data for the FFY2017 reporting period yielded an abnormally high score for Outcome C (Using Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs). States contacted MTS GOLD regarding this concern and those scores were re-calculated by the company, confirming the issue with the data. The FFY 18 data still reflects this data issue. Data for FFY 2018 yielded a decline in scores for one, two or all outcome areas.</p> <p>a. New Hampshire is a participant in a cohort of states that use MTS GOLD for Outcomes reporting and they are working with MTS GOLD to rectify the scoring abnormalities. MTS GOLD has indicated they are looking into the scoring algorithm.</p> <p>2. In addition, states were concerned that the data in the system for three and four year olds previously (FFY2017 and FFY2018) was based on scoring from the previous Birth to Age 5 assessment. If there were any errors in that data (such as: not completed or not finalized), it was unable to be corrected as that became "Read Only" data.</p> <p>a. Most three and four year old children will have exited the system prior to the FFY2019 reporting period so previous data from the Birth to Age 5 assessment should not be impacting the FFY2019 reporting period.</p> <p>3. During the FFY2017 and FFY2018, any errors made on the Child Profile page area of "The child has an IEP" could not be corrected. If "Yes" was not checked properly the Social Emotional questions C1, C2, C3, and C4 were not generated by the assessment. Without those questions, the assessment was not complete and districts were unable to retrieve and report the data for the children involved. This resulted in a loss of data for 42 children in FFY2017 and 38 children in FFY2018. My Teaching Strategies GOLD has explained to us that this is not something that can be corrected, so moving forward districts must take care in completing the profile page correctly.</p> <p>a. The NHDOE has put in place a system where the district administrator can view a grid of identified children from their district in the MTS GOLD system and are able to see if IEP has been checked "Yes" as needed.</p> <p>b. A reminder also goes out from the POMS Technical Assistance Consultant 3 times a year to review this grid.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C2	<p>The NHDOE conducted an analysis of the data by tools (AEPSi vs MTS Gold/My Teaching Strategies. Based on this analysis, it was determined that the data from Teaching Strategies was having a negative impact on the results. The changes to Teaching Strategies data are described below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In August 2017, Teaching Strategies GOLD expanded the progressions from a Birth to Age 5 assessment to a Birth to Grade 3 assessment. For the past two years' districts have been experiencing anomalies in their data. Data for the FFY2017 reporting period yielded an abnormally high score for Outcome C (Using Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs). States contacted MTS GOLD regarding this concern and those scores were re-calculated by the company, confirming the issue with the data. The FFY 18 data still reflects this data issue. Data for FFY 2018 yielded a decline in scores for one, two or all outcome areas. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. New Hampshire is a participant in a cohort of states that use MTS GOLD for Outcomes reporting and they are working with MTS GOLD to rectify the scoring abnormalities. MTS GOLD has indicated they are looking into the scoring algorithm. 2. In addition, states were concerned that the data in the system for three and four year olds previously (FFY2017 and FFY2018) was based on scoring from the previous Birth to Age 5 assessment. If there were any errors in that data (such as: not completed or not finalized), it was unable to be corrected as that became "Read Only" data. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Most three and four year old children will have exited the system prior to the FFY2019 reporting period so previous data from the Birth to Age 5 assessment should not be impacting the FFY2019 reporting period. 3. During the FFY2017 and FFY2018, any errors made on the Child Profile page area of "The child has an IEP" could not be corrected. If "Yes" was not checked properly the Social Emotional questions C1, C2, C3, and C4 were not generated by the assessment. Without those questions, the assessment was not complete and districts were unable to retrieve and report the data for the children involved. This resulted in a loss of data for 42 children in FFY2017 and 38 children in FFY2018. My Teaching Strategies GOLD has explained to us that this is not something that can be corrected, so moving forward districts must take care in completing the profile page correctly. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The NHDOE has put in place a system where the district administrator can view a grid of identified children from their district in the MTS GOLD system and are able to see if IEP has been checked "Yes" as needed. b. A reminder also goes out from the POMS Technical Assistance Consultant 3 times a year to review this grid.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

List the instruments used: The two instruments used to gather the data are the online systems for My Teaching Strategies by Teaching Strategies and AEPSi by Brookes Publishing.

Procedures used to gather data for this indicator: § Who is included in the measurement, I.E. What population of children?

Effective November 1, 2006, all NH districts were required to begin assessing the entry level and exit data on each of the three outcomes for all preschool children who began receiving special education from that date on. Only children who are receiving preschool special education in NH for at least 6 months are included in the measure.

Who conducted the assessments?

District personnel are responsible for ensuring the assessments are conducted with fidelity. They are encouraged to work closely with the child's family members, Child Care/Head Start provider(s), and others who may have knowledge of a child when conducting an assessment. Some districts have hired/contracted with additional individuals to oversee the assessment process while others have designated this responsibility to specific personnel already on staff.

When did measurement occur?

The child's status at entry is measured within 6 weeks of the child beginning to receive special education or related services. Assessments on child status on the outcomes are measured at least annually. The child's status on exit is measured near exit.

What data was reported to the state, and how was that data transmitted?

Districts subscribe to the web-based data management systems with the publisher of the tool(s) they opt to use. The district enters assessment data into the web-based data management system as assessments are completed. The NHDOE runs aggregate reports directly from the publisher's web-based data systems. This data can be disaggregated at both a state and district level for monitoring of implementation of the system and for federal reporting.

What data analysis methods were used to determine the progress categories?

The publisher, with direction from the NHDOE and ECO, have created systems to analyze data at a state and district level based on the federal reporting requirements. This analysis converts the raw data from the assessment items to the ECO COS scores and calculates progress as required by OSEP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
---	----

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the

meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NH Department of Education utilized the Indicator 8 Input Group (which meets at least three times per year) to provide multi-stakeholder input into the development of targets for Indicator 8. The Input Group includes Special Education Directors from urban, rural and cooperative school districts and parent leaders from local family-school partnership groups (parents of children with disabilities). The group consisted of a representative from each of the following: NH Superintendent's and Special Education Administrator's Associations, the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), and the NH State Advisory Committee (SAC), as well as staff from Gibson Consulting Group (the survey vendor) and the NH Connections project (TA Project funded by the NHDOE to support the development and improvement of family-school partnerships in special education) and the national consultant Dr. Batya Elbaum (formerly from federally-funded Data Accountability Center). The Input Group reviewed the 2013-2014 statewide Parent Survey in Special Education results, State historical and trend data, previous target setting information, and information on national trends presented by Dr. Elbaum to provide recommendations for FFY 2013-2018 targets for Indicator 8.

The Indicator 8 Input Group recommended that, because starting next year the Parent Involvement Survey would be administered as a census survey over a two year period, the target should remain the same for the first three years of the State Performance Plan so as to afford each block named Block A and Block B an equal opportunity to reach the target. The premise being that the 2013 gave us a "new baseline" to understand where we were as a State. The fourth year of the SPP the target would increase by one percent, the same target would be applied to fifth year to allow both blocks equal opportunity to reach the target. The 6th year of the SPP would increase by one percentage point over the target set for year four.

Beginning in January 2019, the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Student Support, contracted with Panorama Education to conduct the NH Parent Involvement Survey in Special Education. The goal of the contract is to provide data for reporting requirements for the US Department of Education's Special Education State Performance Plan. Panorama Education worked with the representatives from the Block A School Districts involved in the 2019 Parent Involvement Survey Administration to provide technical assistance regarding improving response rates and public information about the survey process.

In addition, the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) Commissioner of Education requested Panorama, Incorporated work with school and family representatives from Block A districts to provide feedback to the NHDOE concerning the current survey administration and analysis. The results of the feedback concluded that the entire survey administration process be revised in order to reflect more contemporary and relevant questions on the survey. Families and school representatives suggested that the NHDOE design a survey for all families in partnerships with families and schools that includes the requirements in the State Performance Plan regarding the Indicator 8 Special Education Parent Involvement. Family Organizations and School representatives recommended that overall the survey should incorporate and support the great work of the NH Scholastic Center for Authentic Family Voice designed to incorporate the Karen Mapp Dual Capacity Framework to improve family and school partnerships.

Based on this feedback Commissioner Edelblut met with US ED Deputy Secretary Dr. Mitchell M. Zais to request permission for New Hampshire to review and change the entire process of the Indicator 8 Parent Survey for the anticipated FFY20 SPP/APR. Dr. Mitchell M. Zais approved Commissioner Edelblut's request to begin revision to the Indicator 8 Parent Survey. In addition the Bureau of Student Support at the New Hampshire reached out to the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to work with a National Indicator 8 Stakeholder Group to begin revising the NH Special Education Parent Involvement Survey. The IDC has agreed to support New Hampshire in the entire process of revising regarding the New Hampshire Special Education Family Engagement Survey process.

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	36.93%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	37.00%	37.00%
Data	36.93%	35.40%	41.55%	39.62%	41.50%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	38.00%	38.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
525	1,380	41.50%	38.00%	38.04%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

15,022

Percentage of respondent parents

9.19%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The NHDOE and Panorama followed procedures used to combine data from both the school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable .

The items on the preschool and school age surveys are weighted equally on a nationally validated scale. An item's position on the scale is referred to as its item location. Items with lower values (item locations) are easier to agree with; items with higher values are more difficult to agree with. In prior years, Gibson Consulting Group calculated a scale score for each returned survey in 2017-2018 and this scale was used again for 2018-19. A scale score of 600 on the Parent Involvement Survey was recommended by NCSEAM as the threshold for determining whether a parent with a child receiving special education services reports that his/her school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving special education services and results. This threshold was used to calculate the results reported in FFY 2018.

Beginning in January 2019, the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Student Support, partnered with Panorama Education to conduct the NH Parent Involvement Survey in Special Education. The goal of the contract is to provide data for reporting requirements for the US Department of Education's Special Education State Performance Plan.

Upon closure of the window to complete the survey, all paper survey responses were scanned and all online survey responses were exported from the online survey platform. All responses were then merged into one analytic dataset. The analytic team then conducted substantial data diagnostics on the combined dataset. Responses to two demographic items were checked for validity: if the students' reported age at referral was greater than their reported current age, the age at referral variable was recoded to "missing". Similarly, on the school age survey, if a respondent reported that their student was in elementary school, but answered the last question about transition planning meetings, their response to the question about transition planning meetings was changed to "missing" as these meetings are targeted to students at the high school level.

Extreme response patterns (answering "very strongly disagree" or "very strongly agree" to all survey items) were also examined. Extreme disagreement was less common (less than 1 % of completed surveys) than extreme agreement (approximately 10% of completed surveys). Given the overall low incidence of extreme values, no submissions were dropped from the analytic dataset for this reason.

Additional validation processes were possible using data collected online. First, time to survey completion was examined, with start and end times demonstrating that, on average, online surveys were completed in just under six minutes (with a median response rate of nearly five minutes). Responses of two minutes or less comprised roughly 5% of the survey respondent group. Again, because this value was not unreasonable, and because time to completion could not be examined on data resulting from paper surveys, no submissions were dropped from the analytic dataset for this reason.

The final analytic data set was comprised of 160 preschool responses and 1220 school age responses, for a total of 1380 responses. In 2019, 13,392 Surveys for K-12 and 1,711 Surveys for Preschool were sent to families in New Hampshire.

Rasch Scaling: Once the analytic data files were finalized, the Rasch scaling model was applied. Responses to both the preschool and school age Parent Involvement Surveys were scaled separately using a Polychromous Rasch model, where the rating scale was collapsed into three categories: Very Strongly Disagree, Strongly Disagree and Disagree comprise Category 1, Agree represents Category 2, and Strongly Agree and Very Strongly Agree are in Category 3. The specific scaling method used was the Andrich Rating Scale model, which was the method used for the initial validation and calibration of the Parent Involvement measure (Elbaum, personal communication, September 2014). Anchor values for some items, where available, were taken from those used in Florida, which represent the most recently re-scaled values.

The scaling method places each individual, conditional on their responses to the 25 items comprising the rating scale for the respective instrument, on a continuous scale, or ruler, ranging from 0 to 1,000. The standard for agreeing that their child's school facilitated parental involvement was set at 600 (this threshold was defined by NCSEAM as part of the Parent Involvement Survey development process): respondents whose scaled score was below this threshold were identified as having not agreed that their child's school facilitated parental involvement, while scaled scores at or above this level agreed.

Was sampling used?	NO
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Prior to 2014-15, New Hampshire surveyed parents of all students receiving special education services in the state every year. In 2014-15, New Hampshire migrated to a "census over two years" method, such that parents of students receiving special education services in a representative half of the state were surveyed in 2014-15 (Block A), and the other half in 2015-16 (Block B). This strategy allows districts time to consider and implement improvement strategies, and to reduce the experience of survey fatigue for district staff and parents. In 2018-19, the two-year cycle started over and Block A was surveyed.

The 2019 NHDOE Special Education Parent survey was administered from May 13 - June 28, 2019 with the survey available in both English and in Spanish. Districts in Block A were asked to identify a point of contact and this person then communicated the number of K-12 and Preschool Age Family surveys needed for their districts. Surveys were produced and mailed to districts with instructions for distribution to families. Following the initial mailing, districts were asked to confirm that they had mailed their family surveys and 88% of districts confirmed that they had mailed theirs with 12% of districts not responding. In support of the survey program, Panorama communicated with district contacts in advance of the window, hosted a district coordinator webinar to review survey distribution and process, created communication materials to be hosted at www.NHparent.com, and responded to inquiries received at their support desk within 24 hours. Additionally, Panorama did a second round of survey printing for districts that had misidentified the correct number of forms needed. Parents whose children attended school in the Block A Districts received the surveys and a letter describing the process to either complete the survey on line or return the paper survey by US Mail. Parents answered questions about their students' ethnicity, gender, and primary exceptionality/disability type. Analysis of these responses shed light on the extent to which the group of students for whom respondents answered questions is similar to the population of students in the state who receive

special education services. The more comparable the characteristics of the respondent group are to the population of students, the more generalizable the results are to the population of students in the state who receive special education services.

Statistics on the population of the state's students receiving special education services were extracted from the state's 2018 Statewide Census by Disability report, which is based on students enrolled as of October 1, 2018. Statistics were then compared for gender, ethnicity, and primary exceptionality/disability between the state's population and the respondents in Block A for 2018-19.

The group of students whose parents responded to the survey in 2018-19 mirrored the state population of students receiving special education services as defined by gender. Two-thirds (66%) of the state's population of students receiving special education services were male and 63% of respondents replied reflecting on experiences regarding their male child.

In FFY 2018, respondents described their children with ethnicity categories that mostly matched those of the state's population of students receiving special education services, with some notable exceptions. The greatest difference was the percent of respondents who self-reported their student as Hispanic on the survey (1.1%) compared with the state average (6.0%). This may be due to differences in how a student's race/ethnicity data was collected for the state versus how it was posed on the survey (with the option to "mark all that apply"). For more detail on this, please refer to the statewide results report on the New Hampshire Department of Education website:

https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/documents/parent_involvement_survey_2018_2019_executive_summary.pdf

The survey respondent group varied in three primary ways from the state population as defined by the student's primary exceptionality/disability. These comparisons were conducted by comparing survey response data with the most recent census data available our child count in New Hampshire at the time of reporting (October 2018). Please see the tables below for full comparisons. Note that the census data does not explicitly break data out by Pre-K and K-12.

- First, about 15% of respondents did not identify a primary exceptionality/disability whereas the state's entire population is accounted. This may be due to privacy concerns, even though the survey was completely anonymous.
- Secondly, respondents who identified their child as a child with Autism made up 15% of the survey respondent group whereas the state proportion is closer to 11%.
- Finally, respondents who identified their child as a child with Other Health Impairment made up only 9% of the respondent group but makes up approximately 18% of the state population.

Reference the tables in the state report .

Students with Specific Learning Disabilities made up the greatest number of special education student primary exceptionalities in the respondent group in the population (approximately one-quarter to one-third). The next most frequently represented disability in the survey respondent group was parents of students with Autism. At the state level, the second most frequent disability was Other Health Impairment followed by Speech or Language Impairment and then Developmental Delay. Thirty-nine percent of preschool respondents identified their student as having a Speech or Language Impairment, 21% as Developmental Delay, and 11% as Autism.

The responding group of parents or guardians was distributed across children's grades. Almost all ages were represented by between 5% and 8% of the total responding group. In short, parents or guardians of students across all age ranges were equally likely to respond to the survey.

Overall, the percentage of respondents who were at/above the 600 threshold in 2018-19 is slightly lower to the percentage seen in the same districts in 2016-17 (39.6% compared with 38% in 2018-19). Parents of preschool-aged children provided higher, more positive reports compared with those of school age children (resulting in higher percentages at or above the 600 threshold). Approximately 46.0% of parents or guardians of preschool students in 2018-19 scored at or above 600, roughly 9 percentage points higher than those of school age children (36.9%). A higher proportion of preschool age respondents in 2018-19 met or exceeded a scale score of 600 compared to two years ago (46% compared to 41.9% in 2016-17), while a lower proportion of school-age respondents met or exceeded the threshold this year (36.9% in 2018-19 compared to 39.3% in 2016-17).

The Bureau recognizes the need to improve the state's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services as part of the Indicator 8 Special Education . .

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

148

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	27	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Definition of "Disproportionate Representation" and Methodology
 Definition of Disproportionate Representation

The NHDOE has defined disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a weighted risk ratio above 3.00 for the reporting year.

Methodology

All racial/ethnic groups were included in the analysis, as required by OSEP. A weighted risk ratio was used in analyzing the district data. In order to calculate the weighted risk ratio, there had to be at least two racial/ethnic subgroups in the district that met the minimum cell and "n" sizes. The minimum "n" size was defined as at least 40 students enrolled in the district in two or more racial/ethnic subgroups and within those subgroups, at least the minimum cell size was defined as at least 10 students identified as receiving special education and related services. The cell size was selected to protect individually identifiable student information and to ensure that there were sufficient students in the subgroups to allow for appropriate identification of disproportionate representation. The OSEP/Westat technical guide: Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide, July 2007 was used in developing this methodology. The NHDOE used the electronic spreadsheet developed by Westat that calculates both weighted and un-weighted risk ratios to determine state and district level data.

Using the criteria established above, the NHDOE determined that, out of 175 school districts, 27 school districts met the cell size requirement for data analysis. Of those 27 school districts, 0 were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation of over representation.

In FFY 2009 the NHDOE, with support from NERRC and DAC, conducted an intensive review of our procedure for identification of LEAs with disproportionate representation. Based on this examination, the NHDOE determined that the process as explained in the SPP was sound. The small number of districts that met the cell size was a direct result of the homogeneous nature of New Hampshire's population.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Through the process used for this indicator (described above), if any districts identified in Step One had been determined to have overrepresentation in the identification of students with disabilities, the NHDOE would have utilized the following monitoring process to determine whether the disproportionate representation (see above definition) was the result of inappropriate identification. The NHDOE would examine the districts' child find, evaluation, eligibility and other related policies, procedures and practices to ensure an equitable consideration for special education and related services for all racial and ethnic groups and that those eligibility determinations were conducted appropriately. For each district that met the criteria in Step One, the State would have consulted with the local Director of Special Education regarding the data and reviewed local policies, procedures and practices related to this indicator. In addition, the NHDOE would have reviewed the data for complaints and due process hearings for any issues regarding inappropriate identification that may have been found in either of these dispute resolution mechanisms

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

164

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	11	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Definition of "Disproportionate Representation" and Methodology

Definition of Disproportionate Representation

The NHDOE has defined disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification as a weighted risk ratio above 3.00 for the reporting year.

Methodology

All racial/ethnic groups were included in the analysis, as required by OSEP. A weighted risk ratio was used in analyzing the district data. In order to calculate the weighted risk ratio, there had to be at least two racial/ethnic subgroups in the district that met the minimum "n" size. The minimum "n" size was defined as at least 40 students enrolled in the district in two or more racial/ethnic subgroups and within those subgroups, at least 10 students identified in the specific disability category (specific learning disability, intellectual disability, autism, other health impaired, speech language impaired, and emotional disturbance) for the racial/ethnic subgroup being compared. The cell size was selected to protect individually identifiable student information and to ensure that there were sufficient students in the subgroups to allow for appropriate identification of disproportionate representation. The OSEP/Westat technical guide: Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide, July 2007 was used in developing this methodology. The NHDOE used the electronic spreadsheet developed by Westat that calculates both weighted and un-weighted risk ratios to determine state and district level data.

Using the criteria established above, the NHDOE determined that, out of 175 school districts, 11 school districts met the cell size requirement for data analysis. Of the 11 school districts that met the cell size requirements, one (1) was identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate overrepresentation.

In FFY 2009 the NHDOE, with support from NERRC and DAC, conducted an intensive review of our procedure for identification of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Based on this examination, the NHDOE determined that the process as explained in the SPP was sound. The small number of districts that met the cell size was a direct result of the homogeneous nature of New Hampshire's population.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Through the process used for this indicator (described above), the NHDOE utilized the following monitoring process to determine whether the disproportionate representation (see above definition) was the result of inappropriate identification. The NHDOE examined the districts' child find, evaluation, eligibility and other related policies, procedures and practices to ensure an equitable consideration for specific disability categories for all racial and ethnic groups and that those eligibility determinations were conducted appropriately.

For the one district that met the criteria in Step One, the NHDOE completed a review of local policies, procedures and practices related to identification. The NHDOE consulted with the local Director of Special Education regarding the data. The local Director of Special Education completed a root cause analysis to further assess whether disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification. In addition, the NHDOE reviewed the data for complaints and due process hearings for any issues regarding inappropriate identification that may have been found in either of these dispute resolution mechanisms. Based on this review, the NHDOE determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	81.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.61%	96.11%	95.92%	94.96%	97.30%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,442	1,417	97.30%	100%	98.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

25

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Of the 1442 children for whom parental consent for initial evaluation was received, 25 children did not have evaluations completed within the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be completed. The 25 children were from 17 districts. Pursuant to the OSEP FAQ dated 9/3/08, NHDOE groups individual instances of noncompliance in a district related to this Indicator as one finding of noncompliance. The review of FFY 18 data resulted in 17 new findings of noncompliance, one per district. The findings were made in FFY 18 and NHDOE will report on correction of those findings in the FFY 19 APR.

In analyzing the data, the majority of delays occurred between 1 and 15 days past the timeline. The reasons for delay include lack of understanding of the evaluation process and timelines, data entry errors and scheduling issues. The NHDOE has offered technical assistance for those districts who continue to struggle meeting the timelines.

1 - 15 Days = 18

16 - 30 Days = 4

31 - 45 Days = 2

46 - 60 Days = 0

60+ Days = 1

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The NHDOE monitored each district in the State for compliance with this indicator. The data for this indicator were only partially available through the State database, the New Hampshire Special Education Information System (NHSEIS). NHSEIS does not collect data on allowable exceptions. Those additional data points for this indicator were collected through a desk audit monitoring process soliciting additional documentation from the districts to demonstrate compliance.

Monitoring data for FFY 2018 were collected on all children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received for the time period of August 15 - November 15, 2018.

The desk audit allowed districts to present evidence of allowable exceptions to the timeline when the timeframe set for initial evaluation did not apply to a public agency because: 1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for evaluation, or 2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the relevant timeframe [for initial evaluations] has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability,” as allowed by 34 CFR §300.301(d). As permitted by OSEP in the Measurement Table, the NHDOE did not report these exceptions in either the numerator or denominator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	0	17	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The NHDOE has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator has corrected the identified noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, as follows: The NHDOE verified that each district was correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301(c), (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of data subsequently collected through a desk audit monitoring process. During the correction period, the NHDOE reviewed local policies and procedures and provided on-site technical assistance to districts to support the timely evaluation process, including accurate data collection and entry in order to ensure districts were providing timely evaluations.

These findings reflect all noncompliance identified with this indicator through monitoring and data collections. Written findings were made consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 that identified LEA’s where noncompliance occurred and their levels of noncompliance are included the regulatory citations. All noncompliant practices were addressed through root cause analysis and improvement activities. Policies and procedures were revised as necessary.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The NHDOE conducted a, through a thorough data review to verify timeliness of initial evaluations. If additional information was needed, the NHDOE contacted the school district to submit evidence of timeliness of initial evaluation for individual cases. The NHDOE conducted a desk audit of the documentation to verify timeliness of evaluations, and if untimely, the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA prior to identification of findings. For each district that had findings of noncompliance, a desk audit occurred after submission of evidence for each individual case for verification that all required corrective actions were completed. Therefore, the NHDOE verified that, for each of these individual cases, the district had completed the required action, although late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, prior to the identification of findings, as reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2012	97.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.48%	96.86%	97.67%	97.13%	97.88%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	354
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	34
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	298
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	14
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	298	303	97.88%	100%	98.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
5

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Of these five children, 2 children were found not eligible for special education after the third birthday and 3 children were found eligible and had their IEPs fully developed and implemented after their third birthdays. These 5 children were in 3 districts (1 from one district and 2 from each of the other 2 districts). Reasons for delay included a lack of understanding regarding the timelines and the district's responsibility regarding the transition process. Range of days beyond the third birthday 0-15 days: 3 and 16-30 days: 2

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data were collected for this indicator through a monitoring process, as the data required for this indicator were only partially available through the State database known as NHSEIS. This was the fifth year that NH Part C data transferred automatically into the Part B data system and the State was able to create a report of all children who were referred from Part C to Part B. Once the preliminary report was generated, the NHDOE, in conjunction with RACE2K (the NHDOE funded TA center), verified with districts additional data elements that were required to determine compliance. The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Supports collected data from each district in the State to determine compliance with this indicator. Data were collected on all children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination from the time period of July 1 – October 31, 2018. The data were collected from all geographic areas and accurately represent data for the full reporting period. In order to ensure data quality, the NHDOE verified available data points in NHSEIS. In addition, RACE2K and NHDOE staff conducted on-site reviews of files, policies and procedures as needed. This is the same process that was used to report in the FFY 2017 APR.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The NHDOE has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator has corrected the identified noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, as follows:

The NHDOE verified that each district identified in FFY 2017 with noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (34 CFR §300.124(b) i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of data subsequently collected through a desk audit monitoring process. The desk audit included a review of data in the State data system followed by a review of evidence documenting valid reasons for delays (parents did not make the child

available) or late referrals to Part C. During the correction period, RACE2K, an initiative funded by the NHDOE, Bureau of Student Supports through the NH Parent Information Center (PIC) provided technical assistance and reviewed local policies and procedures to support districts with timely and quality transitions in compliance with the regulations. Through this desk audit process, the NHDOE verified that each of the districts identified in FFY 2017 with noncompliance for Indicator 12 was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements as soon as possible but in no case greater than 1 year from notification.

Findings of non-compliance for Indicator 12 identified in FFY 17 included data from two years. This was because the Bureau capacity to review data in a more timely manner was expedited. Moving forward it is anticipated that findings made in a fiscal year will represent one year of data.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The NHDOE has verified that the identified districts had developed and implemented the IEP for each individual case, though late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. This verification occurred through a review of each affected child's data which demonstrated that each district had developed and implemented the IEP for these children, although late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	60.48%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	60.48%	54.67%	56.76%	56.90%	71.88%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
20	60	71.88%	100%	33.33%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Historically, the NHDOE utilized the NTACTION checklist as a reference for monitoring Indicator 13. The NHDOE had a change in personnel for the FFY 2018 monitoring of Indicator 13. Compliance rates decreased. Once the NHDOE realized there was slippage, we reached out to NTACTION and IDC for support to analyze the changes and provide training for our personnel to ensure effective monitoring. Root cause analysis of the monitoring revealed the measurability of the goals for transition (number six on the checklist) were not monitored in the same manner as previously or as intended by the checklist. After the review and the training of staff, monitoring for FFY2019 has been revised.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Between FFY 2005–FFY 2010, all NH school districts had been monitored for Indicator 13, as mandated by OSEP. The NHDOE, with input and guidance from Data Accountability Center (DAC) and Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), began a new process for Indicator 13 compliance review monitoring for FFY 2011 marking the beginning of a new five-year monitoring cycle for Indicator 13, in order to complete monitoring of all districts during the FFY 2005 SPP. For the SPP beginning in FFY 2013, the NHDOE began a new 6 year monitoring cycle. This six-year monitoring cycle will allow the NHDOE to monitor every public high school in NH, in the 6 year time frame, for this Indicator. The NHDOE randomly selects high schools to participate in Indicator 13 monitoring to ensure that all high schools will be monitored during the six-year cycle. In FFY18 there were 11 high schools monitored. Reporting for this Indicator is done only at the high school level, just as is done for Indicator 1 (graduation) and Indicator 2 (dropout), and no longer will be done at the district level. Once a NH high school is randomly selected, monitored, and meets 100% compliance for Indicator 13, they are removed from the selection process until the cycle is complete.

The New Hampshire Process: Once a high school was selected for monitoring, the NHDOE used an on-site file review process for monitoring for Indicator 13. NHDOE staff and/or qualified reviewers trained by the NHDOE conduct the file reviews.

Randomly selected high schools are notified three years prior to the start of the school year in which they are monitored. Professional development opportunities were made available at no cost to the schools by the NHDOE in the areas of understanding the components of compliance, secondary transition, & writing measurable post-secondary goals. High schools were encouraged to take advantage of trainings offered by the NHDOE.

In preparation to meet the requirements for Indicator 13, it was recommended that high school special education staff: (1) review the I-13 checklist found in the Indicator 13 Guidance Document (see below); (2) complete the Best Practices in Planning for Transition on line module available free at <https://www.transitioncoalition.org>, (3) schedule professional coaching on Indicator 13 either in-person or electronically. High schools were responsible for ensuring that evidence of compliance with I-13 is in students’ IEPs and/or their IEP files.

The New Hampshire Special Education System (NHSEIS) was used to generate student level information regarding this Indicator. The data was used to select student files to be reviewed that was a representative sample considering gender, age, ethnicity, and disability. For the 2018-19 school year, the number of files reviewed was based on district special education enrollment of students age 16 and up and is as follows:

District enrollment of 46 or more students age 16 and up – 8 files District enrollment 31 to 45 students age 16 and up – 6 files District enrollment of 30 or fewer students age 16 and up – 4 files

The NHDOE generated a list that had twice as many files for review, keeping in mind that unexpected changes may occur to a student’s status, such as transferring to another school district. The NHDOE notified high schools approximately 6 - 8 weeks prior to the date they are scheduled to be monitored of the list of randomly selected student files. In the fall of the year of the on-site visit, the NHDOE scheduled the I-13 on-site compliance monitoring visit with the high school to take place in the winter or spring of that school year.

The NHDOE then conducted on-site visits to review student IEP files in the winter or spring. The NHDOE reviewers who completed the monitoring consisted of two team members (see I-13 Guidance Document

https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/documents/indicator_13_guidance_2017.pdf). From the sample list of students provided by the NHDOE, the high school selected the files to be reviewed. NHDOE reviewers used the NH Indicator 13 Compliance Checklist to review the files at the on-site visit. In order to meet the compliance requirements, all 8 elements of the checklist must have had (yes) in order to be in full compliance or in some cases, (N/A) to be in compliance. The checklist may be accessed at:

https://transitionta.org/system/files/resourcetrees/NSTTAC_ChecklistFormA.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=1754&force

The NHDOE entered data from completed Indicator 13 compliance checklist forms into the Indicator 13 Compliance database which collects the following information: District name, School Name, Student ID #, NHDOE team reviewer’s names, date of finding(s), items of noncompliance, date of written notification to district of noncompliance, date of correction and date of closure letter noting the correction. The NHDOE calculated compliance percentage by dividing the total number of compliant files reviewed by the total number of reviewed files. (Example: Seven (7) files out of eight (8) files meet compliance = $7/8 \times 100 = 87.5\%$ compliance). The NHDOE calculated the State compliance percentage by dividing the total number of NH compliant files reviewed by the total number of files reviewed. High schools were notified in writing as soon as possible, but no later than 90 days from the date of the on-site file review visit of the findings of compliance or noncompliance.

Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
---	----

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Ed 1109.01 (a) (10) of NH’s Standards for the Education of Students with Disabilities states that “Each IEP shall include a statement of transition services that meets the requirements of 34 CFR 300.43 and 34 CFR 300.320(b) with the exception that a plan for each student with a disability beginning at age 14 or younger, if determined appropriate by the IEP team, shall include a statement of the transition service needs of the student under the applicable components of the student’s IEP that focuses on the student’s courses of study such as participation in advanced- placement courses, vocational education or career and technical education.

The students’ files monitored for Indicator 13 are all students who are age 16 or older. Monitoring of students’ files under general supervision includes monitoring the student’s courses of study for students who are age 14 and 15.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

Pursuant to the OSEP FAQ dated 9/3/08, the NHDOE groups individual instances of noncompliance in a district related to this Indicator as one finding of noncompliance. In FFY 2017, there were 4 written findings of noncompliance relative to this indicator from 4 districts. After the written finding of noncompliance was made, the NHDOE and the district determined what, if any, additional technical assistance and/or coaching needed to be provided to the district by the NHDOE. Once the agreed upon technical assistance and/or coaching occurred, the NHDOE conducted a verification visit in each of the districts at a mutually agreed upon date. At the verification visit, the NHDOE reviewed files for newly selected students to verify evidence the district was subsequently correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, as identified through the component check list. The NHDOE verified that 4 of the 4 LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for this indicator within one year of the written finding of noncompliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Each of the 4 districts with a finding of noncompliance were required to correct each individual instance of noncompliance within 60 days of the written finding of noncompliance. After the written finding of noncompliance was made, the NHDOE and the district determined what, if any, additional technical assistance and coaching needed to be provided to the district by the NHDOE. Once the agreed upon technical assistance and/or coaching occurred, the NHDOE conducted a verification visit in each of the 4 districts at a mutually agreed upon date. The NHDOE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance through an on-site review of the updated file. If the NHDOE determined that the area of noncompliance was not corrected within the initial timeline, additional support was provided and another verification visit was scheduled. For each of the 4 FFY 2017 findings of noncompliance, 3 individual cases of noncompliance were verified as corrected within 90 days of the written finding of noncompliance. The last District requiring student-specific corrections provided evidence to the SEA Indicator 13 Coordinator 120 days after the district received the notification of findings demonstrating that all student-specific findings of noncompliance had been corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2013	Target >=	39.56%	39.56%	39.56%	39.56%	39.56%
A	39.56%	Data	39.56%	38.52%	38.89%	29.48%	36.36%
B	2013	Target >=	63.11%	63.11%	63.11%	63.11%	63.11%
B	63.11%	Data	63.11%	67.14%	66.67%	62.31%	66.23%
C	2013	Target >=	77.78%	77.78%	77.78%	77.78%	77.78%
C	77.78%	Data	77.78%	80.57%	81.48%	80.22%	75.97%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	40.40%	40.40%
Target B >=	64.00%	64.00%
Target C >=	78.20%	78.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in

each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	110
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	53
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	34
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	4
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	2

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	53	110	36.36%	40.40%	48.18%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	87	110	66.23%	64.00%	79.09%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	93	110	75.97%	78.20%	84.55%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

NH completed an extensive review of the demographic characteristics of respondents to determine their representativeness of the target population. Using a 3% allowance, it was determined that the data evidenced the following variances in representation:

- A 5.4% overrepresentation of students who graduated among respondents.
- A 6.1% underrepresentation of students who dropped out of high school among respondents
- A 7.4% overrepresentation of students identified with a label of autism among respondents
- An 8.3% underrepresentation of students who identified as having "Other Health Impairments" among respondents

However, due to a small number of completed surveys, these differences of 5% - 9% represent very few actual students. If more students completed and returned surveys, the NH Post School Outcome survey respondent results could possibly reflect the demographic characteristics of respondents to determine the representativeness of the population. The NHDOE wants to improve the overall response rate to address these variances regarding the representativeness among respondents of the target population. The NHDOE requests technical assistance from the IDC to consider methods to increase the response rate and its impact in relation to over and underrepresentation of specific subgroups to improve overall responsiveness of the post-school outcome survey.

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES
--	-----

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The discrepancy between responses of students who graduated versus dropped out was likely a result of disengagement or disenfranchisement with the school because of the circumstances surrounding the decision to drop out. The discrepancies amongst the various disability subgroups required more information to determine a root cause. In reviewing historical data, variation amongst the disability subgroups consistently ranges between and 5% and 9% of the targeted responses. One explanation might be the theory that a few students with a low number of respondents for the current reporting year might be reflected in the 5 - 9% of over representation or underrepresentation among respondents, due to the low number of respondents overall. This suggests that the data for FFY2018 may be an anomaly. However, to ensure that this is the case, New Hampshire has reached out to districts to explore particular outreach strategies each district might pursue to improve response rates.

New Hampshire has also been partnering with Scholastic and Panorama to educate families about the parent survey (B-8) and the post-school outcomes survey (B-14). New Hampshire has requested technical assistance with IDC to revise the parent survey process. These efforts in conjunction with the work around improving the results for Indicator 14 theoretically, may increase response rates in subsequent data collection for the post school outcome survey .

The NHDOE requests that the technical assistance from IDC focus on increasing the response rate to the PSO Survey, including an examination of the relationship to response rate and over and underrepresentation of specific subgroups.

The NHDOE may also seek assistance of the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition, in concert with IDC, on the following goal areas:

- Work with the Indicator 13 program staff to insert Indicator 14 Post School Outcome basic requirements for districts participating in Indicator 13 Training.
- Explore what in-school experiences influence their students post –school outcomes.
- Collaborate with The National Center on Post- School Outcomes and Panorama Education to build The NH Indicator 14 Statewide Technical Assistance Training including the survey and process to increase overall respondents rates for students with IEPs who transition to improve post-secondary outcomes based on survey results.
- Connect the Cohort Districts participating in the FY 20 Indicator 13 Training to receive technical assistance regarding Indicator 14 including resources provided by the National Center on Secondary Transition.
- Outreach to all districts and organizations working on post- secondary outcomes for students with IEPs.
- Create and implement an evaluation system that looks at each aspect involved in Indicator 13 and 14 of the State Performance Plan to improve the post-secondary outcomes survey results and transition service to students with IEPs.

The NHDOE anticipates the following results based on the plans to work with the IDC and the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition for Indicator 14 Targeted Technical Assistance :

- Districts, families, organizations and communities in New Hampshire will have access to Information and resources about the Post- School Outcome Survey;
- Districts will have received trainings in accessing information and strategies on how contact hard to find youth, increase response rates and engaging families and students as stakeholders;
- Families , organizations and districts will be able to work together to improve post-secondary outcomes for students, and ,
- Indicator 14 Post- school Outcomes Survey results will reflect an improvement in outcomes for students with IEPs due to the indicator 14 Targeted Technical Assistance work.

The NHDOE anticipates that the following results based on the plans to work with IDC and the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition for Indicator 8 and Indicator 14 Targeted Technical Assistance:

- Districts, families, organizations and communities in New Hampshire will have access to Information and resources about the Special Education Parent Survey Parent Post- School Outcome Survey;
- Districts will have received trainings in accessing information and strategies on how contact hard to find families and youth , increase response rates and engaging families and students as stakeholders;
- Families , organizations and districts will be able to work together to improve the special education and parent and post-secondary outcomes for students, and ,
- Indicators 8 Special Education Parent Survey and Indicator 14 14 Post- school Outcomes Survey results will reflect an improvement in outcomes for students with IEPs due to the indicators 8 and 14 Targeted Technical Assistance work.
- The NHDOE will see an increase in the statewide response rate and representativeness of the results of both surveys in comparison to the child count.

The Parent Survey may be accessed here: https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/parent_involv.htm

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

In the section of this report named "State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and the section named " the state reported on the required action with respect to the representativeness of the demographics.

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	7
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Based on guidance provided by OSEP, when a State meets the threshold of at least 10 resolution sessions in a report period at any point in time, the baseline is established and targets are to be set for each succeeding year. Furthermore, OSEP has stated that states are only held to the targets in a year when the threshold has been met. Given this guidance, the NHDOE, after consulting with stakeholders, has established the baseline year for FFY 2010 and set targets from FFY 2013-FFY 2018. NH did not meet the threshold in FFY 2013, FFY 2014, FFY 2015, FFY 2016, FFY 2017 or FFY 2018 therefore the State is not held to the targets for these years.

Historical Data

Baseline	2010	71.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	62.00% - 72.00%	62.00% - 72.00%	62.00% - 72.00%	62.00% - 72.00%	63.00% - 73.00%
Data	80.00%	40.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	63.00%	73.00%	63.00%	73.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3	7	100.00%	63.00%	73.00%	42.86%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NH has not reached the threshold of at least 10 resolution sessions therefore the State is not held to the target for this year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	27
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	14
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the Committee directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Student Support Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also served as the past Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Student Support. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the State; including RACE2K which focuses on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the State in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attended the NH Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA) meetings. When invited, she attended regional meetings of local administrators. She was also appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the State special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinator. The bureau also provides mentorship opportunities for new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specific stakeholder involvement in target setting for the SPP indicators are described in each indicator.

On December 9, 2019 the bureau held a webinar to engage stakeholders in conversation around setting targets for each of the indicators for the FFY 19 SPP/APR. The Bureau solicited 17 individuals to include members of the Parent Information Center (PIC), State Advisory Council (SAC), the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators (NHASEA), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NSAA) and other

administrators of special education from the various geographic regions within the state. The Bureau presentation addressed the following content:

- 1) The extension of the FFY18 SPP/APR and the requirement to set targets
- 2) The difference between results and compliance indicators
- 3) Longitudinal data for results indicators going back to the year baseline was established for each
- 4) Rationale for the proposal to maintain the targets as they were previously set until the time when stakeholders reconvene to set targets for the new SPP/APR that will be released for FFY2020

All participants were encouraged to provide their feedback verbally or in writing and were emailed a copy of the power point at the conclusion of the meeting for further consideration. The Bureau received one emailed question from an individual with respect to data relative to Indicator 3c. After soliciting input stakeholders for target setting in the SPP/APR, there was general agreement that the NHDOE would extend the targets for one year. Stakeholders expressed enthusiasm with reviewing data and SPP/APR requirements for target setting moving forward with the new SPP.

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	68.97%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	65.00% - 75.00%	65.00% - 75.00%	65.00% - 75.00%	65.00% - 75.00%	65.00% - 75.00%
Data	68.97%	83.33%	60.61%	58.82%	72.73%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	70.00%	80.00%	70.00%	80.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
14	6	27	72.73%	70.00%	80.00%	74.07%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

The State did not submit 508 compliant attachments. Non-compliant attachments to be made available by states.

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Elizabeth Graichen

Title:

Administrator II

Email:

elizabeth.graichen@doe.nh.gov

Phone:

603-271-4982

Submitted on:

04/29/20 1:54:02 PM

ED Attachments



NH-B Dispute
Resolution 2018-19.p



nh-resultsmatrix-2020
b.pdf



NH-aprltr-2020b.pdf



NH-2020DataRubricP
artB.pdf



2020 HTDMD Part
B.pdf