New Hampshire Department of Education Bureau of Student Support Monitoring Review for Approval of Private Provider Special Education Programs

> Regional Services & Education Center, Inc. Summary Report 2019 – 2020

Judy Koch, Executive Director Janet Reed, Director; RSEC Academy Amanda Reed, Director; Vista Learning Center Tom Jennings, Director, Longview School

> Coordinating Education Consultant; Rebecca Fredette

Monitoring Visit Conducted on February 4 & 5, 2020 Report Date: April 3, 2020

Overview of the Regional Services & Education Center, Inc. Programs

Regional Services and Education Center, Inc. (RSEC) offers three New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support Approved Special Education Programs for both male and female students with disabilities ranging from grades K-12. The three programs are RSEC Academy (RSEC Middle School and RSEC Academy High School), located in Amherst, NH, Vista Learning Center, located in Amherst, NH, and Longview School, located in Deerfield, NH.

RSEC programs prepare students for the next step in their educational or professional careers by helping them understand their learning challenges and creating ways to overcome their individual, academic and social barriers. Each program has a team of educators and staff specially trained and certified to teach children and students with developmental, behavioral and learning disabilities. RSEC programs provide summer programs, experiential learning opportunities, and adventure-based curriculum.

The mission of RSEC is to raise the capability of parents and schools to help all children and youth be successful. RSEC provides challenging and supportive environments for students unable to thrive in traditional school. Their programs offer unique learning environments, professional development to educators, and consulting services to schools and school districts.

RSEC Academy (RSEC Middle School and RSEC Academy High School) offers a school year program as well as a summer program. RSEC Academy has program approval for students ranging from grades 5-12. The 180-day school year program has the capacity to serve 39 students and the 15-day summer program has the capacity to serve 28 students. Students enrolled in this program have primary disabilities in the areas of Autism, Deafness, Emotional Disturbance, Hearing Impairment, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech-Language Impairments. RSEC Academy offers a regular High School Diploma. The leadership team at RSEC Academy consists of the Director, Assistant Director, and Transition Specialist.

The RSEC Academy Middle School helps students discover that important moment where confidence in their independent success sparks the desire to learn and prepare for high school. Students are provided with opportunities to understand their personal learning challenges and how to communicate them to others. This empowers students to advocate for themselves and use the resources they need to be successful, building and using contextually appropriate social pragmatic skills. The RSEC Academy Middle School is devoted to helping students understand what drives them academically, what affects them emotionally, and working within that framework to learn new things and gain confidence.

The RSEC Academy High School helps students gain confidence in their abilities and their capabilities to navigate challenging academic and social situations. With an emphasis on literacy, The RSEC Academy High School's team of educators and support staff help students see the path to their individual success while understanding how specific challenges impact

performance and interactions with others. Small class sizes and collaborative, inclusive projects emphasize individual value and build confidence for the next step in your academic or professional career.

Students at The RSEC Academy High School gain an understanding of themselves and the interpersonal communication skills they need to confidently and successfully transition to their school district, post-secondary education, or work setting. This is accomplished by providing opportunities for students to spend time outside the classroom to reinforce key concepts in context and by tailoring lessons to individual strengths and learning goals so students benefit with experiences and personal growth as they transition to the next step in their journey.

Vista Learning Center offers a year round, 210-day, program and has program approval for 13 students ranging from grades 5-12. Students enrolled in this program have primary disabilities in the areas of Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, Speech-Language Impairments, and Traumatic Brain Injury. Vista Learning Center offers a regular High School Diploma. The leadership team at Vista Learning Center consists of the Director.

The foundation of Vista Learning Center is the belief that no two students learn or are developmentally alike. Vista Learning Center explores every opportunity to capitalize on each student's abilities and interests. This approach requires a continuum of services as well as a range of environments that gradually transition from the most restrictive to a more traditional classroom setting. The core tenet of Vista Learning Center is a sense of community belonging. Increased academic knowledge combined with emerging social thinking skills, essential to navigating the ever-present demands of life, is accomplished through a collaborative effort by parents, school, and related service providers. This sense of community contributes to the development of a truly individualized education and life plan for each student. Vista Learning Center provides small group academic instruction, working closely with its sister-program at The RSEC Academy Middle School. Students are involved in small group adventure-based counseling and transitional activities weekly. They work on improving self-esteem and strengthening social skills including communication, cooperation, problem solving, trust, leadership, and recreation. Opportunities for students to experience a sense of belonging to a larger community are embedded in community outreach programs. Extending learning opportunities within the local community provides experiences for students to generalize their social thinking learning while promoting citizenship.

Vista Learning Center, in collaboration with its sister-programs, The RSEC Middle School and The RSEC Academy High School, identify specific academic and social pragmatic skills to prepare students for the new challenges they may face. The intention of transition is to move students toward independence at a comfortable pace while still being challenging. Nurturing transitional skills promotes self-motivation, self-confidence, and self-awareness. The Transitional Curriculum focuses on building self-advocacy skills and a capacity for responsibility at home, school, and in the community. It also provides opportunities for problem solving/conflict resolution, goals setting, identifying and creating effective habits, leadership, and career exploration. Direct skill instruction in reading comprehension, vocabulary development, mathematics, speech and language, assistive technology, study and organizational skills, and time management (homework, test preparation, project benchmarks) all contribute to a strong transitional plan.

The Longview School offers a school year program as well as a summer program. The Longview School has program approval for students ranging in grades 9-12 and is located in a log lodge on a 154-acre campus bordering Pawtuckaway State Park. The 180-day school year program has the capacity to serve 21 students and the 19-day summer program has the capacity to serve 8 students. Students enrolled in this program have primary disabilities in the areas of Emotional Disturbance, Specific Learning Disability, and Other Health Impairments. The Longview School offers a regular High School Diploma. The leadership team at Longview School consists of the Director and Assistant Director.

The Longview School helps students focus on their seemingly out of reach goals and accomplish them with an individualized blend of project-based learning, classroom instruction, outdoor excursions, counseling, homesteading, and art therapy. The Longview School empowers students to oversee their own success through supportive staff and self-discovery, clearing the way for the next leg of life's journey. Small class sizes are comprised of no more than eight students. Unique programs and activities, such as multi-day hiking and camping expeditions, culinary arts, and outdoor classrooms, set Longview apart. Longview School can provide a creative approach to teaching struggling students by helping them understand their behaviors and build relationships in pro-social activities.

While following New Hampshire Curriculum Frameworks, basic skills, content, and values are taught through experiential, hands-on opportunities. In addition to a range of required academic courses, The Longview School programs include exciting options for elective classes and include courses taught by visiting artists, woodworking, ornithology, small engine mechanics, bike maintenance, desktop publishing, and others. Students may explore comprehensive technology classes including homesteading, woodworking, building trades, and mountain bike maintenance. While gaining skills in both hand and power tools, students gain practical experience in project management and problem solving techniques. Projects are designed to take advantage of the resources from the beautiful campus as well as to enrich their unique community.

Adventure-Based Counseling is a key component to The Longview School's overall therapeutic approach. Observations from an adventure excursion provides discussion during the next week's individual counseling sessions. While the activities themselves may appear recreational, with outdoorsy students having an advantage, their value is in how students conduct themselves during adventure based counseling sessions. During these activities, students must give and accept feedback while they work together towards a common goal. The program consists of on-site and off-site activities approximately once per week in the following sequence: ice breakers; deinhibitizers; communication; cooperation; trust; group problem solving; and social responsibility.

Like Adventure Based Counseling, The Longview School's Arts-Based Counseling happens through meaningful project work in the visual and culinary arts. The project-focused approach creates opportunities for students to react to unexpected events in unfamiliar situations while working together with others. The issues that arise in these interactions are meaningful, and even more so when they are addressed in real time, as this counseling approach encourages. While all students participate in outdoor activities, the arts based counseling program does not require overnight adventure expeditions. This allows students to engage in less physically demanding tasks, which might include pottery and sculpture, cultivating plants in our greenhouse, or visiting nursing homes to read to residents.

In addition to weekly group counseling within the arts or adventure-based programs, students meet with their counselor every other week. The primary focus of counseling is to help students overcome the issues that impact their academic success. Since many of the issues often extend beyond the classroom, counseling helps students set goals that will extend well beyond their time at the Longview School.

The Longview School works with school districts to aid in part/full time transitions, and provides support during the transitional period. The Longview School graduates have entered college, technical school, the military, and into the job market. The Longview School not only looks to acquire the skills and training needed to succeed in the workplace, they address the attitudes and behaviors employers desire, such as best effort, social skills, dependability, respect, and the ability to work within a team.

Noteworthy Practices and Areas in Need of Refinement

Noteworthy Practices

During the monitoring visit, it had been revealed that the RSEC includes several practices in their teaching, lessons, and expectations, which are noteworthy. Such practices include:

- Google for Education partnership where students have access to engaging tools at anytime, anywhere, on any device.
- A fully-functional science lab.
- Provide opportunities for students to observe models, practice new skills, and receive feedback in natural settings and across the curriculum by using fun and engaging experiential activities.
- Teachers process social skills "in the moment" during the flow of a team challenge or conflict.

- Mimeo smartboards in every classroom to integrate curriculum into engaging visual and audio opportunities.
- Regular meetings with parents and others involved in a student's academic and home life creates opportunities for reaching personal and educational goals by working together.
- Integrating adventure/hands-on activities throughout the curriculum and during counseling.
- Providing real-world transition opportunities (culinary arts, bike repair, woodworking).
- Using a three-tiered curriculum to meet the student's needs through providing assistance with creating the foundations for learning before accessing the general curriculum. This method creates a unique learning path for each student that ranges from developing basic life skills to achieving a high school diploma in preparation for college.
- Building upon students' strengths and knowledge while strengthening areas of weakness.
- Combining verbal information with visual examples, as well as providing students with multiple modes of communicating their knowledge of learned material.
- Working in conjunction with the School Districts to keep students connected to their communities.

Overview of the Monitoring Review for Approval of Special Education Programs Process

The Monitoring Review for Approval of Private Provider Special Education Programs process ensures that students with educational disabilities have access to; can participate in; and can demonstrate progress within the general education curriculum, thereby improving student learning. The primary focus of the monitoring review is to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities.

Monitoring is done on a cyclical basis. During the year prior to monitoring, the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Student Support (Bureau) offers training to each private provider who is involved in the monitoring process. Training encompasses writing Measurable Annual Goals, Written Prior Notice, Self-Assessment, and a topic selected by the private provider based on current need. During this time, the private provider will be given the option to include a director from outside of their Local Education

Agency (LEA) area to participate in the on-site file review, as well as at least one special education administrator from another private school who has been trained in the process by the Bureau. At the beginning of the school year in which the private provider is being monitored, the private provider will send the Bureau their completed application for renewal of Bureau special education approval/nonpublic school approval in addition to the program's policy and procedure manual and any special education forms that are used by the private program. Following a review of these documents, the monitoring team will conduct an on-site review in which student files are examined for evidence of implementation of the policies and procedures through the special education process. The Bureau will also conduct a follow-up review to verify the implementation of corrective actions as defined in the summary report.

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Student Support review members for Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc.'s on-site monitoring review included Rebecca Fredette, Heidi Clyborne, and Katherine Sisneroz, Special Education Director, from Monarch Academy.

Procedures and Effective Implementation

Each private provider must have special education procedures, and effective implementation of practices that are aligned and support the implementation of IDEA and the *New Hampshire Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities*.

The monitoring team reviewed the following special education procedures for compliance with State and Federal regulations regarding administration, confidentiality of information, program requirements, responsibilities of private providers of special education implementation of IEPs, behavioral interventions, RSA 126-U Limiting the use of child restraint practices in schools and treatment centers, qualifications and requirements for instructional, administrative and support personnel, change in placement or termination of enrollment, physical facilities, health and medical care, photography and audio-visual recording, and emergency planning and preparedness.

Based on the review of Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc.'s special education procedures the monitoring team determined there were **2 findings of noncompliance**.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
1. Ed 1119.01(b)(2)	Destruction of Information
Finding of Noncompliance : In reviewing RSEC's special education procedures the monitoring team was not able to find evidence that prior to destruction of records the private provider needs to send all records or copies of records to the most recent LEA.	
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: RSEC must revise its procedure manual to include a statement in their description of record destruction that prior to destruction of records the private provider needs to send all records or copies of records to the most recent LEA.	
Provide the revised procedures and a description of the method used to inform staff of the revision to the	

NHDOE as soon as possible but no later than 6 months from the date of this report.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
2. Ed 1114.05(b)(5)	Program Requirements
Finding of Noncompliance: In reviewing RSEC's special education procedures the monitoring team was not	
able to find evidence regarding discharge procedures.	
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: RSEC must revise its procedure	
manual to include information regarding their discharge procedures.	
Dravida the variant avaged upon and a degraintian of the	

Provide the revised procedures and a description of the method used to inform staff of the revision to the NHDOE as soon as possible but no later than 6 months from the date of this report.

Private Provider Curriculum and Effective Implementation

As part of the review, the monitoring team looked for evidence that Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc. is providing students with access to the general curriculum. The monitoring team reviewed the grades K-12 curriculum provided by Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc. for compliance with learning areas in Arts Education, English/Language Arts, Health Education, Physical Education, Family & Consumer Science, Information & Communications Technologies, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Technology Education, pursuant to Ed 306.261(b)(1) and (2) & Ed 306.27(c).

Based on the review of Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc.'s curriculum, the monitoring team determined that there were **no findings of noncompliance**.

Personnel

The Bureau of Special Education has reviewed Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc. personnel certifications using the New Hampshire Educator Information System. The review process was for educators employed during 2018 – 2019 school year.

The personnel roster that was provided by Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc. was compared to the data in the New Hampshire Educator Information System. Each personnel

member's endorsement was compared to the subject/assignment. This process was used for personnel that hold Beginning Educator Certification (BEC) and Experienced Educator Certification (EEC). If the endorsement was appropriate to the subject/ assignment then the renewal date of the endorsement was verified to ensure that the endorsement was current.

If there was a discrepancy between endorsement and the subject/assignment, the private provider was given an opportunity to verify the data. If the discrepancy could not be resolved a finding of noncompliance was made based on Personnel Standards pursuant to Ed 1114.10(a), 34 CFR 300.18, and 34 CFR 300.156.

Based on the review of Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc.'s personnel certifications, the monitoring team determined there were **no findings of noncompliance**.

Approval Requirements

Each private provider must meet the requirements for special education program approval pursuant to The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) (2004), The New Hampshire Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities, and New Hampshire State Statutes (RSA 186-C:5, RSA 189:64). If seeking nonpublic school approval each private provider must meet the requirements of The New Hampshire Rules for the Approval of Nonpublic Schools (Ed 400, 2005).

The monitoring review for the approval of private provider special education programs includes an application with specified materials that must be submitted to the Bureau by October 15 in the year they are monitored.

Based on the review of the Regional Services & Educational Center, Inc.'s application materials, the monitoring team determined there were **no findings of noncompliance**.

Monitoring of the Implementation of Special Education Process

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

student specific finding(s) of noncompliance, the sending District is cited for noncompliance, as well as the private provider.

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

There are two main components to the corrective actions entitled, "Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance" and "Corrective Action Regarding the Implementation of the Regulations". The first component, "corrective action of individual instance of noncompliance," is for any noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement. There must be evidence that the private provider has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer placed at the program. These areas must be corrected as soon as possible with state timelines given in the report for each area. The Bureau will return to the program, typically within 3 months of the date of the report, to verify compliance for each individual instance identified in the report. The second component, "corrective action regarding the implementation of the regulations" would typically involve the private provider's participating in professional development training to appropriate personnel with regards to areas found to be in noncompliance. The Bureau will review updated data collected after the identification of noncompliance to demonstrate that the program is correctly implementing the specific requirement. This involves a follow-up on-site review of new student files, selected typically within one year of the original on-site compliance & improvement monitoring.

Overview of the Student Specific Findings of Noncompliance

The chart below identifies the area of compliance based on student files that were reviewed by the compliance & improvement monitoring team during the onsite visit. The chart is broken down into the **compliance citations** and **area of compliance**. The compliance citations are based on the *CFR* found in the federal regulations of IDEA and the *Ed* found in *The New Hampshire Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. The chart aligns the regulatory components to the numbered questions in the self-assessment. Regulatory components and self-assessment numbers are bolded in instances where noncompliance was noted by the compliance & improvement monitoring team.

The **review status** identifies the **number of files reviewed** for the self-assessment question as well as the number of files that were found to be in compliance. For example "5 out of 6 files demonstrated evidence that a copy of the procedural safeguards, available to the parents of a child with a disability, was given to the parent one time in the school year." This means that 6 files were reviewed and 5 files were found to be in compliance. In cases where there was a finding of noncompliance for a particular student, the chart identifies the **First Stage Corrective Action of Individual Instance(s) of Noncompliance**. In the case of an individual instance of noncompliance, the corrective action would generally involve the IEP team convening to resolve the finding of noncompliance. Timelines for these corrective actions are also noted. For the First Stage Corrective Actions, the Bureau will return to the private provider program within 3 months following the program receiving written notification of noncompliance (the report) to review all student files in which there were findings of noncompliance in order to verify compliance with the corrective action stated in the report.

In cases where there was a finding of noncompliance for a particular student, the next section of the chart identifies the **First Stage Corrective Action Regarding the Implementation of the Regulation**. This section informs the private provider program of any practices or procedures which need to be corrected as well as trainings for personnel to inform them of the corrections as a result of the findings of noncompliance. The required corrective action for the program and a timeline for the corrective action is also provided.

In cases where there was a finding of noncompliance for a particular student, the final section of the chart identifies the **Second Stage Corrective Action Regarding the Implementation of the Regulation**. Identified in this section will be the number of new student files that will be selected at the program to demonstrate correct implementation of the regulations for the section of the self-assessment in which noncompliance was found. For the Second Stage Corrective Actions, the Bureau will verify compliance through a subsequent on-site review of the new files within one year from the date of the report. **The total number of student files selected for the Second Stage Corrective Action Regarding the Implementation of the Regulation will not exceed the original number of files reviewed at the private provider program**.

Findings of Noncompliance

When determining compliance, the NHDOE reviews the currently agreed upon/signed IEP at the on-site monitoring visit. During the on-site monitoring visit there were **no files** which could not be reviewed for sections B(#2), D(#11-17), E(#18-22), F(#23), G (#24-26), H(#27), I(#29), J(#30-31), K(#32-41), L(#42), and M(#43-45) as there was no parent and/or LEA signature indicating consent / approval of the provisions of the IEP.

СОМР	LIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 111	4.05	A. Record of Access; Confidentiality Requirements
	ssessment Question Number llatory Component	Review Status
1.	34 CFR 300.614 Ed 1119.01(a)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a record of parties that have obtained access to the education records collected, maintained or used under Part B of the Act, including the name of the party, the date access was given, and the purpose for which the party is authorized to use the records.

СОМР	LIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFI Ed 110	R 300.323)9	B. Individualized Education Program
	ssessment Question Number ulatory Component	Review Status
2.	Ed 1109.04(a)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that a copy of the IEP has been provided to each teacher and service provider listed as having responsibilities for implementing the IEP.
3.	34 CFR 300.324(b)(1)(i) Ed 1109.03(d)	7 out of 7 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP was reviewed at least annually. (<i>1 student file was of a student with initial IEPs or moved from another state or district.</i>)
4.	34 CFR 300.323(a) Ed 1109.03(d)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP was in place at the beginning of the school year. (<i>No student files were placed after beginning of school year</i>)

СОМІ	PLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
	R 300.321 03.01	C. IEP Team; Participants in the Special Education Process
	Assessment Question Number gulatory Component	Review Status
5.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(1) Ed 1103.01(a)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that one or both of the parents are present at the IEP team meeting or are afforded the opportunity to participate
6.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(2) Ed 1103.01(a)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that not less than one regular education teacher of the child (if the child is, or may be, participating in the regular education environment) participated in the meeting. (No student files had regular education teacher(s) excused per 34 CFR 300.321(e).) (No student files were of students that are not and will not participate in the regular education environment.)
7.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(3) Ed 1103.01(a)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that not less than one special education teacher or, where appropriate, not less than one special education provider of the child participated in the meeting. (<i>No student files had special education teacher(s) or special education provider(s) excused per 34 CFR 300.321(e).</i>)
8.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(4) Ed 1103.01(a)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team included an LEA representative.
9.	Ed 1103.01(d)	4 out of 4 IEP files demonstrated evidence that, if vocational, career or technical education components are being considered, the IEP team membership included an individual knowledgeable about the vocational education programs and/or career technical education being considered. (4 student files were students for whom vocational education/CTE were not considered.)

10.	Ed 1103.02(a),(c), (d)	0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the parent(s) received a written invitation no fewer than 10 days before an IEP meeting which included the purpose, time, location and identification of the participants or the parent agreed in writing that the LEA could satisfy this requirement via transmittal by electronic mail <u>or</u> demonstrated evidence of written consent of the parent(s) that the notice requirement were waived [Ed 1103.02(b)]. (8 student files were students for whom the written invitation
		is the responsibility of the LEA.)

COMP	PLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CF	R 300.320	D. Individualized Education Program (Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance)
	Assessment Question Number gulatory Component	Review Status
11.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(i)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the team considered the strengths of the child.
12.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(iv)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the team considered the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the child.
13.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(ii)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child were considered.
14.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(iii)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child were considered.
15.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(1)(i)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement in the IEP that describes how the student's disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum. <i>(No student files were preschool age students.)</i>
16.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4)(ii)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement in the IEP that describes how the student's disability affects non-academic areas.
17.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(1)(ii)	For preschool children, 0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement in the IEP that describes how the disability affects the child's participation in appropriate activities. <i>(8 student files were not of preschool age students.)</i>

СОМРІ	LIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
	. 300.324(a)(2)(i) 9.03(h)	E. Consideration of Special Factors
	ssessment Question Number Ilatory Component	Review Status
18.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(i) Ed 1109.03(h)	When a child's behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others, 7 out of 7 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the team considered the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address that behavior. (1 student file was not of a student whose behavior impedes learning.)
19.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(ii) Ed 1109.03(h)	When a child demonstrates limited English proficiency, 0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the team considered the language needs of the child as those needs relate to the child's IEP. (8 student files were not of students who demonstrated limited English proficiency.)

20.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(iii) Ed 1109.03(h)	When a child is blind or visually impaired, 0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the team provided for instruction in Braille and the use of Braille unless the IEP team determined, after an evaluation of the child's reading and writing skills, needs, and appropriate reading and writing media (including an evaluation of the child's future needs for instruction in Braille or the use of Braille), that instruction in Braille or the use of Braille was not appropriate for the child. <i>(8 student files were not of blind or visually impaired students.)</i>
21.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(iv) Ed 1109.03(h)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team considered the communication needs of the child, and in the case of a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, considered the child's language and communication mode, academic level, and full range of needs, including opportunities for direct instruction in the child's language and communication mode.
22.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(v) Ed 1109.03(h)	4 out of 4 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team considered whether the child needs assistive technology devices and services. (4 <i>student files were not of students who need assistive technology.</i>)

COMPI	LIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 110	9.01(a)(10)	F. Courses of Study
	ssessment Question Number llatory Component	Review Status
23.	Ed 1109.01(a)(10)	For each student with a disability beginning at age 14 or younger, if determined appropriate by the IEP team, 6 out of 6 IEP files demonstrated evidence a statement of the transition service needs of the student under the applicable components of the student's IEP that focuses on the student's courses of study such as participation in advanced-placement courses or a vocational education, or career technical education (2 student files were students aged 13 or younger who will not be turning 14 during the IEP period and no evidence the IEP team determined this is necessary.)

СОМР	LIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
	R 300.320(a)(2)(i) 09.01(a)	G. Measurable Annual Goals; Short-term Objectives or Benchmarks
	ssessment Question Number ulatory Component	Review Status
24.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement of measurable annual goals, including academic and functional goals.
25.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i)(A) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the measurable annual goals meet the child's needs that result from the child's disability to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum as well as the child's other educational needs that results from the child's disability.
26.	Ed 1109.01(a)(6)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of short-term objectives or benchmarks for all children unless the parent determines them unnecessary for all or some of the child's annual goals.

COMP	LIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 110	9.01(a)(8)	H. Review and Revision of IEPs (Measuring Progress)
	ssessment Question Number ulatory Component	Review Status
27.	Ed 1109.01(a)(8)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP includes a statement of how the child's progress toward meeting the annual goals shall be provided to the parents.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 1114.06(b)		I. Responsibilities of Private Providers of Special Education or other Non- LEA Programs in the Implementation of IEPs
Self-Assessment Question Number & Regulatory Component		Review Status
28.	34 CFR 300.325(b) Ed 1109.05 Ed 1114.06(a);	For the purpose of initiating the process for all matters concerning possible changes and/or modification in the identification, evaluation, development and/or revision of an IEP or changes in placement of a child with a disability, 5 out of 5 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the private provider contacted the sending school district. (<i>3 student files had no changes in the child's identification, evaluation, development or revision of the IEP or placement</i>)
29.	Ed 1114.06(i), (j), (k)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that a minimum of 3 comprehensive reports per year are completed on each child with a disability enrolled in the program.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.323(d)(2)(ii) Ed 1109.03(a); Ed 1109.03(v); Ed 1102.01(b)		J. Accessibility of Child's IEP to Teachers and Others (General Accommodations and General Modifications)
Self-Assessment Question Number & Regulatory Component		Review Status
30.	Ed 1102.01(b)	If accommodations are included, 8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the accommodations are changes in instruction or evaluation determined necessary by the IEP team that do not impact the rigor, validity, or both of the subject matter being taught or assessed. (<i>No student files were students with no accommodations.</i>)
31.	Ed 1102.03(v)	If modifications are included, 4 out of 4 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the modifications are changes in instruction or evaluation determined necessary by the IEP team that impact the rigor, validity, or both of the subject matter being taught or assessed. <i>(4 student files were students with no modifications.)</i>

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.320(a) Ed 1109.01(a)(1); 1109.04(b)		K. Definition of Individualized Education Program (Special Education and Related Services, Supplementary Aids and Services, and Program Modifications or Supports for School Personnel)
	Assessment Question Number gulatory Component	Review Status
32.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement of special education.
33.	Ed 1109.04(b)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to all special education services provided.
34.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement of related services. (<i>No student files were students for whom there was no evidence that the IEP team determined this is necessary.</i>)
35.	Ed 1109.04(b)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to all related services provided. (<i>No student files were students for whom there were no related services in the IEP.</i>)
36.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement of supplementary aids and services. (8 student files were students for whom there was no evidence that the IEP team determined this is necessary.)
37.	Ed 1109.04(b)(2)	0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to any supplementary aids and services provided. (8 student files were students for whom there were no supplementary aids and services in the IEP.)
38.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	3 out of 3 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement of the supports for school personnel. (5 student files were students for whom there was no evidence that the IEP team determined this is necessary.)
39.	Ed 1109.04(b)(4)	3 out of 3 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to supports for school personnel. (5 student files were students for whom there were no supports for personnel in the IEP.)
40.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a projected date for the beginning of the services and modifications described in the supports and services section of the IEP.
41.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those services and modifications described in the supports and services section of the IEP.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.320(a)(5)		L. Definition of Individualized Education Program (Justification for Non-
Ed 1109.01(a)(1)		Participation)
Self-Assessment Question Number & Regulatory Component		Review Status
42.	34CFR 300.320(a)(5) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	8 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated evidence of an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and in the activities described in the supports and services section of the IEP.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFI	R 300.320(a)(6)	M. Definition of Individualized Education Program (State and District
Ed 1109.01(a)(1)		Wide Assessments)
Self-Assessment Question Number & Regulatory Component		Review Status
43.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i) Ed 1109.01(a)(1) RSA 193-C Ed 1114.05(k)	7 out of 7 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement of any individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on State and district wide assessments. (1 student file was of a student for whom there were no state or district wide assessments for the student's age/grade level.)
44.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(ii)(A) Ed 1109.01(a)(1) RSA 193-C Ed 1114.05(k)	When the IEP Team determines that the child must take an alternate assessment instead of a particular regular State or district wide assessment of student achievement, 0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence of a statement of why the child cannot participate in the regular assessment. <i>(8 student files were of students not taking an alternate assessment.)</i>
45.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(ii)(B) Ed 1109.01(a)(1) RSA 193-C Ed 1114.05(k)	When the child is taking an alternate assessment, 0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence describing why the particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the child. <i>(8 student files were of students not taking an alternate assessment.)</i>