

# SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING NEW HAMPSHIRE'S ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

---

## CONSULTATION

- Please provide more specific information on the steps New Hampshire took to meaningfully engage and solicit input on its request from teachers and their representatives, or describe how New Hampshire will meaningfully engage these stakeholders as it continues to develop and implement its ESEA flexibility request. *See Consultation Question 1.*
- Please provide more specific information on the steps New Hampshire took to meaningfully engage diverse stakeholders and communities, including representatives of English Learners or students with disabilities, or describe how New Hampshire will meaningfully engage these diverse stakeholders and communities as it continues to develop and implement its ESEA flexibility request. *See Consultation Question 2.*

## PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS

- Please provide additional information regarding New Hampshire's plan to transition to college- and career-ready standards, including details of implementation activities, proposed timelines and resources for completion of key tasks, and mechanisms for monitoring local implementation. *See 1.B, Part A.*
- Please provide additional information regarding New Hampshire's plan to provide instructional supports and resources that will ensure that all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gain access to content aligned to college- and career-ready standards. *See 1.B, Part B.*

## PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

- Please address the following issues regarding New Hampshire's proposed system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support:
  - Provide a complete description of New Hampshire's proposed system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support, including detail on each of the components of New Hampshire's proposed system for measuring school performance. *See 2.A.i and 2.A.i.a.*
  - Describe how New Hampshire's proposed system will create incentives and provide supports that are likely to be effective in closing achievement gaps for all groups of students. *See 2.A.i.b.*
  - Clearly describe the proposed use of a combined subgroup in New Hampshire's proposed accountability system, including any safeguards proposed to prevent the use of that subgroup from masking chronic low performance by an individual ESEA subgroup. *See 2.A.i.b.*

- Describe how New Hampshire will include graduation rates in its proposed accountability system, including whether it has identified all high schools with graduation rates below 60 percent as either priority or focus schools, and how that system will create incentives and provide supports for the improvement of graduation rates for all students and all subgroups. *See 2.A.i, 2.A.i.a, and 2.A.i.b.*
- Please address issues regarding reward schools:
  - Demonstrate that New Hampshire has identified both high-performing and high-progress reward schools that meet the definition in ESEA flexibility. Refer to the document titled *Demonstrating that an SEA's Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions*. *See 2.C.i.*
  - Describe how New Hampshire's proposed recognition and rewards programs are aligned with its proposed criteria for reward schools. *See 2.C.iii.*
- Please address issues regarding priority schools:
  - Clarify that priority schools implementing interventions consistent with the turnaround principles of ESEA flexibility will implement each element of the turnaround principles. *See 2.D.iii.*
  - Describe how New Hampshire's proposed priority school interventions will improve student achievement and graduation rates for English Learners, students with disabilities, and the lowest-achieving students. *See 2.D.iii.b.*
  - Describe the criteria that New Hampshire will use to determine when a priority school is making sufficient progress in improving student outcomes to exit priority status. *See 2.D.v.*
  - Describe the steps New Hampshire will take to ensure meaningful consequences for priority schools that do not make progress after full implementation of interventions.
- Please address issues regarding focus schools:
  - Demonstrate that New Hampshire has identified the required number of focus schools that meet the definition in ESEA flexibility. Refer to the document titled *Demonstrating that an SEA's Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions*. *See 2.E.i.*
  - Describe any safeguards used by New Hampshire to ensure that its proposed focus school identification methodology does not mask the performance of individual ESEA subgroups. *See 2.E.i.*
  - Provide specific examples of and justifications for the interventions that focus schools will be required to implement, and how those interventions will be based on the needs of the students in the schools. *See 2.E.iii.*
  - Provide a clear timeline demonstrating that interventions in focus schools will begin in the first semester of the 2012–2013 school year. *See 2.E.iii.*
  - Describe the criteria that New Hampshire will use to determine when a focus school is making sufficient progress in improving student outcomes to exit focus status. *See 2.D.iv.*
  - Describe the steps New Hampshire will take to ensure meaningful consequences for focus schools that do not make progress after full implementation of interventions.
- Please address the following issues regarding supports and incentives for other Title I schools:
  - Demonstrate that New Hampshire's new AMOs and other measures, including graduation rates, are used to identify and provide incentives and supports to other Title I schools that are not making progress in improving student achievement, closing achievement gaps, or increasing graduation rates. *See 2.F.i.*

- Describe additional incentives and supports for improvement other than not being identified as a priority or focus school, including interventions focused on the specific needs of students such as English Learners, and a mechanism for how these will be selected and implemented. *See 2.F.i and 2.F.ii.*
- Describe additional mechanisms for accountability for ESEA subgroups beyond public reporting, including how New Hampshire will ensure that schools and LEAs with persistently low-performing ESEA subgroups will address the needs of those subgroups. *See 2.F.i and 2.F.ii.*
- Please address issues regarding SEA, LEA, and school capacity:
  - Provide additional information on New Hampshire’s process for ensuring timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools. *See 2.G.*
  - Provide additional information on how New Hampshire will hold LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance beyond public reporting, including by describing a system of incentives and supports for struggling LEAs. *See 2.G.*
  - Describe how New Hampshire will leverage funds that LEAs were previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10) to support the implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under New Hampshire’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system. *See 2.G.*

### **PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP**

- Please address issues regarding New Hampshire’s process for ensuring each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements evaluation and support systems consistent with the guidelines:
  - Describe how New Hampshire will ensure that all measures used in LEA evaluation and support systems are valid and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across all schools within an LEA. *See 3.B.*
  - Provide additional information on how New Hampshire will include teachers of English Learners and students with disabilities in the development, adoption, piloting, and implementation of evaluation systems. *See 3.B.*
  - Provide additional details regarding how New Hampshire will ensure, beyond its proposed peer review process, that all LEAs adopt principal and teacher evaluation systems consistent with the State’s final guidelines. *See 3.B.*