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**About Moving Your Numbers**

*Moving Your Numbers: Improving Learning for Students with Disabilities as Part of District-wide Reform,* examines how school districts with vastly different demographics increase the performance of students with disabilities and other at-risk learners as part of whole-district reform efforts. Case studies of featured districts, as described in the full report, provide evidence that students with disabilities, like all other students, can learn at higher levels when adults focus their collective efforts on improving instructional practice, consistently implement core work across the district, and use assessment and accountability as a lever for ongoing system and student learning and improvement.

*Moving Your Numbers* identifies six essential practices that must be in place to improve the performance of students with disabilities. Evidence suggests that these six practices, when used in an aligned and coherent manner, are associated with higher student achievement. These practices are: use data well, focus your goals, select and implement shared instructional practices (individually and collectively), implement deeply, monitor and provide feedback and support, and inquire and learn.

*Moving Your Numbers* was initiated and is supported through the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) under the leadership of Dr. Martha Thurlow, NCEO Director; Rachel Quenemoen, NCEO Senior Research Fellow; and Dr. Laurene Christensen, NCEO Research Associate. Dr. Deborah Telfer, Director, School of Education and Allied Professions Grant Center, University of Dayton, coordinates the development and review of *Moving Your Numbers* on behalf of NCEO. NCEO was established in 1990 to provide national leadership in designing and building educational assessments and accountability systems that appropriately monitor educational results for all students, including students with disabilities and English Language Learners (ELLs).

Photographs used in this publication have been provided courtesy of the districts featured and the Ohio Department of Education.

Additional case studies of featured districts will be added to the *Moving Your Numbers* website as they are developed. Go to [www.MovingYourNumbers.org](http://www.MovingYourNumbers.org) for the complete report and additional tools and resources, and to submit success stories.

---

NCEO is supported primarily through Cooperative Agreements (#H326G050007, #H326G11002) with the Research to Practice Division, Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. Additional support for targeted projects, including those on ELL students, is provided by other federal and state agencies. The Center is affiliated with the [Institute on Community Integration](https://icircle.umn.edu/) in the College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota. Opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Education or Offices within it.
Compasses have long been used to navigate from point A to point B. However, the accuracy of the navigation process is dependent, in part, on knowing the “true north.” The professionals who comprise SAU 56 believe their true north is the education of children in ways that prepare each of them to be college and/or career ready and contribute to the greater community. “Our big ideas are our compass,” explained Assistant Superintendent Bob Marquis. Marquis, described by his colleagues as the major implementation driver, refers to the district’s stated beliefs in talking about the big ideas used by adults across the district to ground their collective work in the improvement of universal core instruction for all children in the district.

New Hampshire has 177 school districts organized into 71 Supervisory Administrative Units (SAUs). An SAU functions as the administrative component and employs a superintendent of schools. Some SAUs are comprised of a single district, while others have two or more school districts that share administrative services and the superintendent’s office. SAU 56, which comprises the Somersworth and Rollingsford school districts, is considered an urban district. Settled before 1700 as part of Dover, Somersworth was an early mill town. Today, with a population of about 12,000, Somersworth has the smallest area and third-lowest population of New Hampshire’s 13 cities. The Somersworth School District has four schools: Somersworth High School, Somersworth Middle School, Idlehurst Elementary School, and Maple Wood Elementary School. The Rollingsford School District has one school – the Rollingsford Grade School (RGS) – serving approximately 200 first- through sixth-grade students.

**Who We Are, NOT What We Do**

Response to intervention (RtI), defined by SAU 56 as the practice of providing high quality, evidence-based, differentiated academic and behavioral instruction using a flexible tiered system of intervention, is characterized by collaborative data-based decision making at all levels of the district, as well as ongoing monitoring of student progress to ensure that instructional decisions made and actions taken are having the desired effect.

The district’s use of RtI as an organizing framework to drive improvement began about seven years ago when the district failed to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets. At that time, Marquis was in the role of director of special education for the district. After a year of study and exploration, the leadership of the SAU made a decision to move forward using RtI as a strategy for addressing the over-identification of students as students with learning disabilities, for supporting effective data use, and for focusing the district’s efforts to improve the quality of instruction on a district-wide basis. At about that same time, SAU 56 was selected by the New Hampshire Department of Education to participate in its State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) NH Responds, providing needed external support and guidance to the district.
Since 2004-2005, using RtI as a strategy for bringing adults together has changed the culture of the district and the way in which teachers, administrators, other personnel, families, and community members work together on behalf of all children. “We want it to be who we are, not what we do,” said Marquis. “It’s our responsibility as leaders to make sure staff understand that our beliefs and our goals are interconnected,” he added.

**Focus Your Goals.** Superintendent Jeni Mosca is clear about the district’s focus. “We’re about improving instruction and addressing the needs of all children by providing universal instruction to all kids; it’s not about programs,” she said. Each school has goals that align with the mission and beliefs of the district. The mission of the Somersworth School District, for example, is “to inspire all students to excel, to develop a thirst for knowledge, and to teach the essential skills necessary to be caring, contributing, and responsible individuals in an ever changing world.” Further, district leadership has taken steps to ensure that district and school improvement plans are aligned and that, of the 82 indicators of success required by the state to be considered, a limited number based on district and school need, is integrated into the district’s overall improvement strategy.

The overriding focus on instruction (for example, one strategy states: “instructional programming will be accorded the highest priority”) is reflected in the district’s RtI Manual, a document developed by all stakeholders that delineates critical concepts and guiding principles for what the district calls its RtI system.

Last revised in April 2012, the district notes that, “This manual represents a balance between the recognition that our schools have unique characteristics that must be acknowledged with the need to be unified in our common belief system. Our belief system provides the foundation of our RtI Model and cannot be compromised if we are to be successful with respect to implementation and sustainability. Lengthy, collegial discussion, reflection and examination, focusing on our core beliefs as well as practices relative to assessment, instruction and behavioral support systems is a clear illustration of our educators’ collective commitment in establishing the fundamental philosophical underpinnings and instructional practices needed so that all of our students can learn and grow.”

Collective commitment was fostered through an extensive process that involved virtually everyone in the district in identifying the big ideas used to anchor the work. “Because we’re not a top-down model, the work as represented in the RtI Manual, has become a living document,” said Mosca.

Clearly defined outcomes are used to anchor the work and guide the implementation of critical components at each (i.e., preschool, elementary, middle, high) school level. These outcomes, organized by tier of the model, include the following:

**SAU Definition of RtI: BIG IDEAS**

1. All students are part of ONE proactive educational system.
2. Behavior and academic success are inextricably linked.
3. Evidence based curriculum, instruction, and interventions are used.
4. Instructionally relevant assessments (for behavior and academics) are used.
5. A mix of problem solving approaches (with agreed upon decision criteria) and standard treatment protocols (e.g., all students having difficulty with “X” may get “Y”) are used.
6. Data (academic and behavioral) are used to guide (academic behavioral) instructional decisions.
7. Professional development and follow-up modeling and coaching (with a combination of external and internal coaches) is provided and individualized as needed to meet desired competencies. This is provided to ensure effective instruction at all levels of instruction.
8. Collaborative leadership, with strong iterative communication, is vital (e.g., SAU, school, grade/class).

“We want it to be about who we are, not what we do.”

Bob Marquis
Assistant Superintendent,
SAU 56
1. All students achieve grade level academic and behavior expectations. A minimum of 80% of students are proficient in response to Tier 1 curriculum and instruction (Focused Practice: Tier I);

2. As a result of Tier 2 instruction and interventions, an additional 15% (for a total of 95%) of our students will be at benchmark for academics and behavior (Focused Practice: Tier II); and

3. As a result of Tier 3 instruction and interventions, an additional 5% (for a total of 100%) of our students will be at benchmark for academics and behavior (Focused Practice: Tier III).

Critical components (e.g., differentiated instruction, professional development, family engagement) – also known as non-negotiables – are outlined for each tier, and the acceptable and unacceptable variation of each critical component is delineated. For example, the first critical component of Tier 1 focused practice is that “All students will participate in universal instruction.” The acceptable variation of this critical component is: “100% student participation (behavioral and academic); the unacceptable variation is: “students are pulled out of Tier 1 instruction or Tier 1 instruction is supplanted with Tier 2 or 3 intervention.” The bottom line is that all students will participate in universal instruction within the general education setting and any specialized educational instruction delivered will be used to supplement universal instruction, consistent with the guiding principles of RtI.¹

**SAU 56 RtI Model: Focused Practice: Tier 1 - Excerpt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Component (non-negotiable)</th>
<th>Define how does this Critical Component contribute to the Outcome</th>
<th>Ideal “Gold Standard” of the Critical Component</th>
<th>Emerging Practice (Acceptable Variation) of the Critical Component</th>
<th>Unacceptable Variation of the Critical Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>To ensure staff have expertise and skills to implement all aspects of the educational program and the SAU RtI Model.</td>
<td>PD is based on district goals and student needs. Follow up modeling and coaching is provided and individualized as needed to meet desired student competencies and to ensure effective instruction at all levels</td>
<td>PD is based on district goals and student needs. Current evidence indicates at least 80% of students are meeting proficiency expectations in response to Tier 1.</td>
<td>PD is not based on district goals or student needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use Data Well.** The guiding principles of the RtI system used by SAU 56 are graphically represented as a house with each pillar representing a key element. The effective use of data is represented as a primary pillar upon which the house is built. Mosca explains: “Data allowed us to look at ourselves in the mirror in an honest way. We have tons of data and we’re moving away from collecting all kinds of data to becoming much more intentional and collecting what we need to make better decisions about instruction.”

While the gap between the performance of students with and without disabilities is still large, state assessment data for the last several years show improvements in some grade and subject areas such as third-grade reading and math, seventh-grade reading and math, and fifth- and eighth-grade reading. In many cases, there are too few children to

¹ Source: SAU 56, 2012: RtI and Special Education.
Slight variations in the number of students scoring at various levels on the state assessment can dramatically change percentages, and the high rate of transience (i.e., a part of the student population moves frequently before/after winter months because state law prevents people from being evicted in the winter) contributes to challenges in comparing data over time.

The figures below show the percentage of children with and without disabilities by level of performance on a sample of state assessment results for Somersworth School District. Rollingsford Grade School does not have the minimum number of students with disabilities required for reporting purposes under the state’s accountability system. New Hampshire uses the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), and the NH Alternate Learning Progressions (NH ALPs) – the state’s alternate assessment. NECAP is the result of collaboration among New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Maine. NECAP reports are available for reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11. In addition, writing is assessed in grades 5, 8 and 11; science is assessed in grades 4, 8, and 11. Maple Wood Elementary School’s combined results (i.e., results from NECAP and NH ALP combined scores) for 2010 show a fairly even distribution of scores for students receiving special education services across each of the four NECAP levels of performance. Maple Wood’s NECAP results in Grade 3 reading and math indicate that 50% of the school’s students with disabilities were scoring proficient with distinction or proficient in 2010-2011.

In 2011-12, there were too few children to report by school level. Results for the district on Grade 3 assessment in reading and mathematics are provided for comparison. District leadership is diligent in acknowledging that its work is far from done; however, when compared with results of earlier state assessment (e.g., 60% of third graders with disabilities scored at level 1 in 2008), progress is evident.

Data use, which extends well beyond the use of state assessment results to identify critical need areas, is a cornerstone of the RtI model used by SAU 56. Several commercial products are used:

1. At the elementary level, the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) is administered three times per year, and the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) is used as an informal measure of reading used to determine the weakest areas and focus instruction.
2. At the elementary, middle and high school levels, the *Measures of Academic Progress* (MAP) is administered to assess progress in reading, language arts, and math. Students in kindergarten and first grade take the Primary MAP assessment in May. The MAP is a computerized assessment used to measure each child’s academic growth from one year to the next.

3. AIMSweb is also used at the middle school level, and is an online universal screening and progress monitoring system for assessing oral reading fluency in grades K-8.

4. End-of-course assessments are used at the high school level.

5. *The School-Wide Information System* (SWIS) – a web-based system used to collect office referral data to design school-wide and individual student interventions – is used on a district-wide basis.

6. *The School-Wide Evaluation and Planning Tool* (SWEPT-A) for Middle School Literacy is used by staff to gauge the effectiveness of the district’s reading program in improving knowledge and skill acquisition by all children, and a variety of other screening tools – locally developed and commercially purchased – are used to monitor student learning.

“We need to figure out how to more effectively use the variety of data available,” said Marquis. Despite the acknowledged need to get better at using data more systemically and systematically, the district has set expectations and modeled the use of data as an essential practice. *NH Responds* facilitator Kathy Francoeur, formerly a Crisis Intervention Coordinator for the middle and high schools in Somersworth City Schools, explains: “Data use makes the team more efficient. Before, we admired the problems; now, we’re asking the right questions and focusing on the right problems. Everything is focused on data.”

**MOVING FROM “ME VERSUS YOU” TO “US”**

Kate Segal, Somersworth Middle School Assistant Principal, spearheaded the school’s use of data to improve parent-school communication in ways that supported student learning. “We asked all teachers to provide data on the supports being used at home to reinforce what children were learning in school,” she said. “As a result of what we learned, we changed the infrastructure of the school by altering the schedule of paraprofessionals to stay one hour after the close of school. This allowed us to provide targeted support in identified areas of need, while improving the ongoing communication between staff and families about how best to support student learning.”

**Select and Implement Shared Instructional Practices.**

“When you systematize accountability measures for staff, you make improvements,” offered Segal. Francoeur, now with the University of New Hampshire Institute on Disability (IOD), agrees. “We noticed a 64 percent failure rate in wellness and students were being referred so they would pass for graduation. The question we asked was, ‘have all teachers taught the same content the same way?’ and we began monitoring student performance and found that not all kids could meet the expectations. After systematizing the instruction being provided and using tiered instruction, the failure rate dropped to eight percent by the second semester,” said Francoeur.
Improving the quality of academic and behavioral instruction is the work of the district. “We’re not going to add resources; instead, we’ve realigned and focused the work,” explained Marquis. “A lot of people stay even though the pay is low because of the value of the work we do. We can compete on a human scale, but not on a monetary one,” added Marquis. That realignment of the work of the adults, supported by the University of New Hampshire Institute on Disability (UNH IOD), has had far-reaching effects, leading to fundamental changes in use of time, how professional development (PD) is delivered, and who’s involved in making decisions about instructional practice. “We’re looking differently at the use of time, and have unified PD in terms of focusing on improvements in reading, math, and behavior,” said Marquis.

_NH Responds_ has been the primary source of PD for the district and everyone has been involved. Ten teacher workshop days were provided in 2011-12 for all staff. Of the 10 days, three were used to focus on positive behavior intervention supports (PBIS) at the universal/tier 1 level; three days focused on tier 2 behavior teams; and two days were dedicated to tier 3 behavior teams. In 2012-13, the final year of the current NH SPDG, eight days will be provided to SAU 56 through the project. In addition to this district-wide PD, faculty from the UNH IOD work with the district providing ongoing coaching, consultation, and support to ensure that what’s learned in PD can be effectively and consistently applied in all classrooms across the district.

Clinical Assistant Professors Michael McSheehan and JoAnne Malloy, along with Francoeur, support the district in multiple ways. “The high school’s involvement with PBIS began in 2006 when the district began to look at factors affecting graduation and drop out rates,” said Malloy. But, McSheehan, who grew up near Somersworth, has had a longstanding relationship with SAU 56. “The district’s partnership with Michael goes back many years over multiple projects,” said Marquis. “With Michael’s help, we’ve moved from a ‘me versus you’ mentality to an ‘us’ mentality. His work around inclusive practices set the stage for reform at Maple Wood Elementary School, and from there allowed us to implement reforms across the district and move away from supplanting instruction for children with disabilities, to supplementing it with the right supports,” added Marquis. Sandy Crockett, Reading Consultant at Maple Wood, concurs, highlighting the fact that now “every kid, including those with the most severe disabilities, is present.”

The University of New Hampshire Institute on Disability (IOD) currently develops and provides training and technical assistance (TA) to the schools in five SAUs in the three-tiered model of RtI for literacy. In addition, the IOD personnel that have implemented the _Achievement in Dropout Prevention and Excellence_ (APEX II) dropout prevention project provide training and TA in three-tiered behavior support and secondary transition to demonstration high schools.

Crockett, who has been a reading specialist and classroom teacher for more than 20 years – most of it spent in SAU 56 – acknowledges that while making needed change has been easier at the elementary level, “there have been major shifts in the way we do instruction and in the system-wide attitude.” “It’s about instruction,” she added. “McSheehan credits this system-wide shift in attitude and practice to

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fingers</th>
<th>Levels of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I strongly support this decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I support this decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The decision is OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am uncomfortable with this decision, but I can live with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I dislike this decision but defer to the wisdom of the group and promise not to sabotage it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the district’s decision to allow “real engagement and consensus.” “Everybody at the building level was involved; we didn’t see this level of engagement in other SAUs, and where the SAU chose to go was a local decision. SAU 56 chose a different path,” observed McSheehan.

**Implementing deeply** and consistently agreed on practices in such areas as identifying clear objectives, differentiating instruction, using student-friendly language, and fostering student engagement helped the district get everyone on the “same page” and define and avoid interruptions to core instruction. “As people came together and the conversation became more friendly, staff began to understand that the RtI model wasn’t another thing; instead it became part of how we did the work,” said Marquis. “Because it was a systematic approach, it allowed for other folks to come in and they could see where they fit in,” added Mosca. Implementation stages and drivers – as defined by State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) – are used by district leadership to gauge the quality of implementation and factors affecting it (go to [http://sisep.fpg.unc.edu](http://sisep.fpg.unc.edu) for additional information).

It also helped district leadership set expectations around shared responsibility for the education of all children. Just making progress isn’t good enough for children who are struggling and lag far behind grade-level expectations. In SAU 56, “general education teachers own kids with complex support needs. If you’re not willing to differentiate for them, you’re in the wrong profession,” said McSheehan.

**Monitor and Provide Feedback and Support.** SAU 56 takes seriously its responsibility to monitor implementation of agreed-on actions and relies on a combination of strategies to collect data, make decisions, and provide feedback to principals, teachers, and others across the district.

Structures have been put in place at all levels to facilitate collaborative learning among staff, starting with an 18-member SAU 56 (district) RtI Leadership Team, the composition of which includes administrators, general and special education teachers, and other staff from each building. Multiple perspectives are intentionally represented on the team, which meets monthly to monitor the work of the schools. The goal of the district Leadership Team is to assess the degree to which schools are building capacity to meet the instructional needs of all children. McSheehan’s ongoing support of the district’s work through attendance at the meetings is viewed by Marquis and Mosca as a continuing form of PD for team members.

Parallel structures have been established at the school and teacher team levels to align the work and support consistent implementation. Accordingly, each school has a Leadership Team that oversees implementation of the school improvement plan (Schools in Need of Improvement or SINI plan), as well as an Instructional/PBIS team and grade-level/department teams. These teams serve as a “vehicle for shared leadership,” according to Marquis. For example, at Maple Wood Elementary, the Leadership Team met with every grade-level team to talk about beliefs, identify potential areas of training, and establish norms of collaboration. Grade-level/department discussions are data-based, using a variety of data (e.g., state assessment, progress monitoring data, etc.) to review an implementation log, analyze the effectiveness of universal instruction, and identify changes that need to be made to reach all students. The use of teams is becoming more systematic across schools within SAU 56 and the purpose of the teams, particularly at the middle and high school, is shifting to focus on instructional improvement. Somersworth High School collapsed some teams to improve consistency in team functioning. As an example, the high school Data Team is now being incorporated into the school’s Leadership Team. At Somersworth Middle School, staff members are beginning to use vertical teaming.
Members of the district-level Leadership Team conduct walkthroughs using *The Framework for Teaching* by the Danielson Group, reviewing patterns across classrooms. Teachers’ goals, as represented in their individual portfolios, must be connected to their school’s SINI plan and the district RtI model, and approved by their building administrator. Principals conduct their own walk-through in addition to the district team, gathering data on established “look fors.” “The role of the principal is always a balance of leadership and management,” said Marquis, now in his 37th year in education, having served in a variety of roles. “We wouldn’t be where we are without principals being at the table and helping to reinforce expectations for shared leadership and responsibility for all students. They participate in all PD,” he added.

One area of emphasis for walkthroughs during the 2012-2013 school year is in math. “We know what we’ll be looking for,” said Marquis. Similarly, Reader’s Workshop is used to improve the consistency and quality of what’s being taught and monitored. A commercial program, Reader’s Workshop provides a structure for teachers to engage in individual or group student conferences during independent reading. Walkthrough “look fors” are supported through such statements as the current unit of study is evident on anchor charts or other visual displays in the room; the anchor charts summarize the key concepts related to each strategy or genre, and celebrate the students’ emerging understanding of those concepts; and paraprofessionals (and other staff) support the classroom teacher by working with small groups or conferring 1:1 to differentiate reading instruction for struggling readers.

**Hearts Held High**

SAU 56’s watchwords are continuity and commitment. “You have to have a presence, but you also have to be present to make the kind of changes needed,” offered Marquis. The district’s efforts to improve coherence and consistency in the delivery of universal instruction, as well as tier 2 and 3 intervention supports is evident in the beliefs and actions of the adults. Consistency in the language, vocabulary, and terminology used by personnel at all levels contributes to the collective capacity of the system to intentionally implement shared work, replicate successes, and address critical needs.

---

**SAU 56: Mathematics Learning Indicators (Excerpt) (for administrative walkthroughs) – January 2012**

- The objective of the lesson is clear and posted in student friendly language (e.g., “Today you will learn...”).
- The student is able to state in his/her own words what they are learning about, what they are supposed to be able to know or ‘do.”
- The teacher follows the learning objective of the math program and the teacher’s instruction is differentiated based upon classroom profile/student needs.
- There are anchor charts/mathematics word walls posted.
- The lesson is presented is within an acceptable range so that completion of the curriculum by the end of the year is ensures (i.e., appropriate pacing).
- Students are engaged in activities that assess or demonstrate student learning/knowledge.
- Homework is listed (on line, via parent newsletters or on the “board” or assessed via a conversation with students) reflects agreed upon parent friendly strategies focusing on supplementing program curriculum with “rote” math facts.
- Elementary School: Instruction uses strategies from EDM (e.g., student math kits are available).
- Middle School: Instruction allows exploration of strategies.

---

1 The Framework for Teaching provides levels of teaching performance (rubrics) across four domains of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities.
Inquire & Learn. “We’re past finger pointing, especially at the middle and high school levels, in terms of who to blame for student failure. Now, all staff need to be responsible for all kids,” said Segal. “We’ve made a pact with schools,” said Marquis. “We won’t change anything in the RtI Manual for one year; it can only be changed at the district level and no one at the school level can change it,” he explained.

At the same time, the district is committed to continuous improvement and to building the capacity of each school to provide quality instruction to all children. An RtI implementation assessment (National Association of State Directors of Special Education) has been conducted by the district for the past three years as a way to identify areas that need to be addressed as the district continues to focus and align its core work around teaching and learning.

“As we vet and re-introduce refinements in the system, the foundation we’ve created by using RtI has created a touchstone, providing a vehicle for looking at the data and bringing the collective discussion back to those pillars or big ideas,” said Marquis. “It’s been a marathon over the last five years and sustaining our energy has been one of our biggest successes,” he said. Kate Segal summed it up: “For every kid who graduates, for every kid who didn’t need an IEP because we had the instructional supports and accommodations in place, for every kid who leaves us with hearts held high, these are our greatest successes.”

Advice from SAU 56

1. Persevere.
2. Be flexible but have non-negotiables to guide the work.
3. Use data for collective continuous improvement, not in a punitive way.
4. It’s a process and the process has to be valued as much as the product is valued.
5. Promote shared leadership and reach/involve everyone.
6. Program monitor the system as much as the progress of the students.
7. Ensure the school board’s engagement to sustain the district’s focus.
8. Communicate information and data with everyone.

Supplementary information related to SAU 56’s ongoing improvement efforts can be found by clicking on the Additional Resources tab. For additional information about SAU 56, contact Robert Marquis, Assistant Superintendent, 51 West High Street, Somersworth, NH, 03878; 603.692.4450 (phone).
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