Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Hampshire Application #3500NH-8

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**45**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	29
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) New Hampshire presents a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda clearly addressing the four RTT reform areas. The State offers a three-tiered approach to providing services to the lowest achieving schools, participating districts, and all of the State's districts. This approach will allow the State to intervene in schools to help those students most in need while building capacity statewide to make systemic changes that will benefit all students. The State has provided compelling evidence that it is committed to implementing the RTT reforms even if it does not receive a RTT grant. The State presents an honest assessment of the challenges it will face in making such sweeping reforms, especially in a strong local control environment. The score reflects a concern that the timelines the State has set to meet critical goals may not be ambitious enough to meet the spirit of the RTT program's efforts to aggressively drive reform. For example, the State does not set its targets for improving teacher and leader preparation programs until 2016 or increasing the distribution of highly effective teachers and leaders in high-need schools and districts by 25% until 2015.

(ii) New Hampshire has provided evidence that LEAs are committed to implementing the RTT reforms. While New Hampshire does not have universal participation of its districts, the 51% that have committed to the initiative represent almost two-thirds of all students enrolled across the State. The State appears to have obtained buy-in from its largest cities as well as from rural communities. The State has provided a detailed statement of work outlining the roles of the State, the participating districts, and those districts with the persistently lowest achieving students. All districts have signed the MOUs committing to the work specified in the statement of work. The State is commended for securing buy-in from the districts with the persistently lowest achieving schools. These districts, even rural ones where turning around schools can present unique challenges, appear strongly committed to embracing significant systemic reforms.

While the applicant appears to have garnered strong district support, there is concern about the lack of support from teacher unions. The State received signatures from the local teachers' union in 56% percent of the participating districts. It is not clear how many students are enrolled in these districts. At least one large district does not have union support. Additionally, the level of union support is not clear in table (A)(1). The State has entered blanks rather than indicate whether there was no signature (N) or if the signature was conditional on collective bargaining agreements (C). This reviewer has interpreted the blanks that no signature or support was obtained. The application also states that the New Hampshire American Federation of Teachers (AFT) was not supportive of New Hampshire's RTT effort. The narrative indicates that the NH-AFT represents only 10% of districts, but does not translate this into student enrollment. If the AFT represents large districts, its lack of buy-in could affect implementation in districts with large numbers of students. It is clear that the State has worked with the leadership of both unions and that there was NH National Education Association (NEA) representation in the grant-writing process. However, the perceived

low-level of union support could hinder the State's ability to move swiftly in implementing several of the RTT reforms, particularly the human capital initiatives required for Great Teachers and Leaders. The points awarded reflect the concerns with educator buy-in at the district-level.

(iii) While the State did not receive universal participation from LEAs, those that are participating will reach over two-thirds of all students and 70 percent of those living in poverty. The State's three-tiered approach will ensure that all students in the State will benefit from the RTT reforms. The application is strengthened with the support of all the LEAs with the lowest achieving students. There remains concern about educator buy-in in the participating LEAs (see above) that may hinder LEA progress in implementing the RTT reforms designed to increase student achievement, reduce achievement gaps, and increase high school graduation and college enrollment rates. Full points were not awarded because of this concern.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**22**
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	6

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The State has provided sufficient evidence that it will have the capacity to manage the RTT grant should it receive an award. This evidence includes:

- Strong leadership from the Governor's office;
- Placement of the grant within the SEA with oversight by the Commissioner and her extended cabinet;
- Resumes of key staff that show that the personnel assigned the project have the knowledge and experience to lead an effort of this magnitude;
- Assignment of an experienced grants manager to oversee the fiscal and program requirements; and
- A district monitoring system with supports and sanctions for under- or non-performing LEAs.

On balance, the State has clearly documented its capacity to implement the RTT reforms. New Hampshire is proposing to add 12 SEA staff should it receive an RTT grant. While there is some concern about how the State plans to sustain these positions after the grant terminates, this increased capacity does not seem unreasonable for this budget request; personnel and fringe benefits comprise approximately 11 percent of the State's portion of the grant. The budget provides a clear justification for each position along with roles and responsibilities. However, the application did not provide a organizational chart to show how these staff would interact. The budget appears to support building the necessary infrastructures and capacity needed to implement reforms in each of the four RTT areas. The application provided documentation and letters of support as evidence that New Hampshire is leveraging federal,state, local, and foundation funds to support key reform efforts. The State intends to use these funds to invest in sweeping education reforms even in the absence of an RTT award; this speaks to an authentic commitment by the State to make comprehensive reforms to its educational system.

New Hampshire's commitment to sustained reform is evidenced by its reorganization of the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE). The SEA will be restructured to support each of the reform areas. The application also notes that the SEA is moving from a focus on compliance to support, particularly in the area of turning around low performing schools. The State acknowledges this cultural shift and accepts the challenges in moving forward in a new direction. The active involvement of the legislature to change laws to support the RTT reforms also speaks to the seriousness of the State's commitment to make systemic reforms.

ii) The State provided evidence through letters of support that a wide range of stakeholders including educators, administrators, policymakers, colleges and universities, parents, the STEM community, and the public were involved in developing a comprehensive reform of its educational system and are committed to supporting the NHDOE in implementing the RTT reforms. In addition, the application details the number of meetings and committees held to discuss the RTT program with diverse groups of stakeholders. As stated

in section (A)(1), there is concern about the lack of teacher buy-in for this effort. The NH AFT affiliate did not support this initiative and it is not clear how willing the NEA affiliate is to support some of the human capital provisions that require schools to make personnel decisions based on measures of teacher effectiveness. Lack of teacher buy-in at this point of the process could delay rapid implementation of the RTT human capital provisions. Points were withheld for the tepid support of the teacher organizations.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**10**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	3
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The State has been somewhat uneven in the progress it has made in each of the four RTT reform areas. New Hampshire seems to have made more progress in the areas of standards and assessment and in turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools than in developing great teachers and leaders. For example, the State appears to revisit its standards and assessment on a continuous basis and adapt them to meet the needs of a changing student population. The Follow the Child Initiative uses a data-driven approach to ensure students are making progress on meeting the curriculum standards. On the other hand, the State did not provide significant evidence that it has made major reforms in the area of great teachers and leaders. The last major overall of the teacher certification system seems to have occurred 36 years ago and the state has not opened many pathways to teaching beyond traditional institutions of higher education.

(ii) As with its approach to reforms, the State has had mixed results in improving student outcomes over time. The application provided NAEP and New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) scores showing that, in general, New Hampshire's students perform above national averages and that they have made progress overtime. On the State assessments, progress on student achievement is slowing. Furthermore, the State's progress on increasing the achievement levels of subgroup populations is not stellar. In many grades and subjects across assessments an achievement gap continues to exist between the higher performing White and Asian student and all other subgroups, and in some cases the gap has widened.

There is concern about the achievement targets the State has set especially for non-White students. Across the NAEP grades and subjects, the State is setting higher achievement goals for all subgroups, but the goals are not always set to reduce the achievement gaps between subgroups. What is even more disconcerting on the NAEP goals is that the bar for 2014 for Black, Hispanic, English Language Learning students as well as students with disabilities is set lower than the performance levels of White and Asian students in 2009.

Students in New Hampshire perform better on the NECAP assessments than on NAEP. However, the State does not acknowledge this disconnect or discuss possible reasons for the difference in performance. As with the NAEP scores, there is concern that the 2013-14 proficiency targets are not set high enough for subgroup populations.

The State did not provide a convincing argument to explain what is driving the overall increases in student achievement or the reasons for the continued achievement gaps by race/ethnicity and poverty. The application notes that observed gains are due to effective uses of assessment data through the PerformancePlus tool, but does not provide enough information on how teachers are using data to improve their instruction that leads to improved student achievement. And with the continued achievement gaps, it is not clear that teachers are effectively using assessment data to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Serious gaps also exist among subgroups on the dropout rate. For example, 3 percent of Asians and 6 percent of White students dropped out in 2008-09 compared to 13 percent of Black and Hispanic students. While graduation rates have increased from 2002-03 to 2007-08 across all subgroups, Hispanic and Black

students continue to graduate at lower rates than White and Asian students. The State did not provide data on increasing college enrollment.

The points awarded reflect the State's lack of progress in addressing the achievement gap, the disparity across subgroups on the dropout/graduation rates, and the lack of discussion of programs that affected student achievement.

Total	125	77

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	**40**	**40**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State presented a timeline showing that it is on track toward implementing the Common Core Standards, which includes a majority of states, by August 2, 2010. The timeline details the policy review process for adopting the standards. New Hampshire will bring the standards before the State Board in July for adoption by August 2, 2010. [Note: the MOU could not be located in the binder; however, the narrative clearly details the adoption process.]

Full points were awarded for meeting all requirements of this element.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State is awarded full points because it is participating in multiple assessment consortia including Smarter/Balanced consortia which seeks to develop high-quality assessments and includes the majority of states.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**16**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State has presented a well-thought out plan to transition to the enhanced standards, but less so for the new assessments. New Hampshire realizes that developing the standards is only a starting point; standards must be translated into aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessments to improve teaching and learning. Strengths of the plan include:

- An early outreach plan including focus groups with legislators, school boards, parents, community members, business leaders and other key stakeholders to garner their understanding and support of the standards. The State will also work with statewide professional organizations to promote awareness and understanding of the standards;
- The development of a crosswalk between the NECAP and CCSS standards to help teachers better understand the transition to the new system; and

- Direct support of schools through school improvement coaches and the regional professional development centers.

The SEA is commended for its collaborative effort with its teacher preparation programs in embedding the standards in pre-service programs. The State will undertake a comprehensive review of the alignment between the CCSS standards and the program approval process. This will ensure that new teachers will begin their careers with a deep understanding of the P-16 standards and strengthen the connection between the needs of school districts and the responsiveness of teacher preparation programs in meeting those needs.

The State's plan for rolling out the assessments is less cohesive than that for the standards. The State admits that that it has "built lots of pieces of the [assessment] system." The narrative does not provide a detailed roadmap on how the assessments will be unified into a comprehensive accountability system or the role of the Smarter Balanced Assessment program in facilitating this change. The State acknowledges that assessment results must be accessible to educators and that the current informational systems are disjointed. The State also notes that many teachers are not highly literate in assessments or technology. The State plans to build a portal for teachers to access the assessment data and help them understand it in a user-friendly manner. However, it is still not clear from the narrative how the various IT systems will work together, what the costs are associated with building a comprehensive IT system, or why the the State has selected the portal vendor at this stage when systems are in flux. It appears that the State may not have conducted a thorough IT inventory and evaluation to help it select the best tools for service delivery. Points were not awarded because of these concerns.

The State provided a detailed timeline for implementing the rollout of the new standards and assessments which seem reasonable given its current status in the process. Most of the activities will be completed within the RTT grant period. The plan clearly describes which entity that will be responsible for implementing each phase of the project. However, there is some concern about targets set for the transition. The performance measure matrix indicates that 15-25% percent of the transition between the NECAP and CCSS performance standards will be completed by the end of 2013. It is not clear if the State is expecting that it will only need to transition 15-25% of the CCSS standards to the NECAP program or if the State will only accept up to 25% of the CCSS standards. This gives the reader some pause on the State's commitment to fully embrace the CCSS standards. Points were withheld for this concern.

Total	**70**	**66**

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**16**
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The State indicated that 8 elements of the America COMPETES Act were fully completed and 4 were partially completed (elements 4, 9, 10, 11). Points were only awarded for fully completed elements.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	**5**	**3**
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) While application states that the State has a history of giving teachers access to student data through its PerformancePlus system, it is not clear how many teachers are accessing and using these data to change instructional practice to improve student achievement. The State is in the process of developing its State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS)--the Initiative for School Empowerment and Excellence (i4see)--that will deepen the State's data collection and connect with other offices and agencies to provide data from preschool through postsecondary education. However, as discussed above in Section (B)(3), it is not clear		

where the State is in the process of transitioning to these new systems or how these legacy systems will interface. Data were not provided to give the reader a sense of how many teachers are currently using the PeformancePlus system or if they are using the data to their fullest potential.

The State is commended for its commitment to making assessment and other data available to broad stakeholder groups such as parents and students. However it is not clear why the State is setting a target of only 300 schools accessing the system (students and parents) by 2013-14. This number exceeds the number of schools in participating districts, but is lower than the total number of schools in the State (476). Data accessibility is an area where the State could provide services to all districts. Also, the State's goal for 30,000 annual log-ins from educators by 2013-14 is difficult to interpret. The State does not provide the total number teachers this might encompass, nor does it provide a measure of intensity which would show that teachers are logging into the system on a regular basis.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**8**
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	2
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	3

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) While the State has provided evidence that it has been giving educators access to student data through the PerformancePlus system, the narrative is lacking detail on how many teachers are using it, nor is it clear if the State intends to have all teachers across the State use the system in their practice in a regular and ongoing manner.

(ii) Again, the narrative discusses that it has made the PerformancePlus system available to educators. However, the plan for supporting educators on how to use the data is vague and it is not clear what professional development resources are available to teachers to help them understand the data to improve their practice that, in turn, will lead to improved student achievement. The applicant indicates that is has held trainings across the State targeted to struggling schools and for prospective teachers in preparation programs. The State also has developed a website that provides online training. It is not clear if this level of support is adequate to ensure that all teachers have the in-depth understanding needed to make data-driven decisions. It appears that the trainings focus mainly on understanding data and not how to change instructional practices, or how to tap into professional development to better meet the needs of students with diverse learning styles.

(iii) The State has taken several proactive steps to engage researchers in using data--including assessment data--contained in the warehouse. The State appears to have the involvement and support of the higher education community in developing a research agenda. The State also plans to award grants using RTT funds to stimulate research. It is not clear if the State intends only to allow researchers from the State's higher education community to access the data or if researchers must adhere to the State's research agenda. Prohibiting independent researchers from accessing the data could undermine the State's plan to promote reliable and valid research. The performance matrix contained in the application states that, at a maximum, NHDOE staff will process 15 data requests from policy and research stakeholders. The narrative does not explain why the State has set this target. It could be a reasonable goal if staffing resources are an issue and the file processing is labor intensive; it may be low if this is an arbitrary total number of requests allowable and the data are relatively easy to download.

Total	**47**	**27**

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**8**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	5
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	2
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	1

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The applicant provided evidence that State statute allows alternative routes to teacher certification. Specifically, three methods meet the conditions typically associated with non-traditional routes to certification:

- **Method 3** requires demonstration of teacher competencies through an interview and submission of portfolio, regional- or national-level certification (i.e., National Board of Professional Teaching Standards), or through transcript analysis.
- **Method 4** requires successful completion of a professional development plan within a listed critical shortage area, successful teaching under an approved mentor, and recommendation by the Superintendent of Schools.
- **Method 5** requires completion of a Bachelor's degree, 30 hours of course work in a particular academic area, one year of successful teaching under an approved mentor, and recommendation by the Superintendent of Schools.

It appears that Methods 4 and 5 allow districts to operate alternative routes outside of IHEs. The narrative discusses these routes in the context of teacher certification and NH Regulation Part Ed 505 addresses teaching credentials. One route, Method 3 (C) applies to principals. It appears that Methods 4 and 5 appear to require supervised school-based experiences and mentoring and both significantly reduce the coursework required for a certificate. Methods 3, 4, and 5 lead to the a regular initial teaching certificate. Points were awarded for these factors. It is not clear if testing out is an option. No evidence was located discussing the selectivity of the routes.

(ii) While the State has the authority to establish alternative pathways to certification, few educators are taking advantage of them. In 2008-09, 82 teachers out of 1,432 certified completed the requirements for Methods 3, 4, or 5. This constitutes approximately 6 percent of all teachers certified. Only 5 out of 83 principals were prepared through alternative routes in 2008-09.

(iii) The State did not adequately address how it monitors, evaluates, identifies or fills areas of teacher and principal shortages. While the narrative discusses several data sets the State consults to identify shortage areas, it does not indicate the unit of analyses (State, district, and/or school), whether principals are included, or provide any data on the nature of shortage areas across the State. Furthermore, it is not clear how the State is using these data in a constructive and proactive manner in supporting districts in filling shortage areas. For example, the applicant notes that the State has faced persistent critical shortages in the area of special education yet provides no data to support this claim. In order to address the shortage, the applicant notes that Granite State College recommended 58 teachers candidates for a general education certificate and that 70% of these candidates are now employed in NH schools. Evidence was not provided to show that these teachers were assigned to special education classes to help address the shortage.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**21**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	1
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	7

(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	5
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The State did not provide sufficient evidence on the progress it is making in measuring student growth. Students are not tested in all grades through the NECAP and information was not provided on how other tests might be used to measure student growth. The State did not adequately address how it would measure growth for students in non-tested grades and subjects. The State did not provide a clear plan and timeline for moving toward a growth model. The State targets on LEA use of the growth model do not seem aggressive; the State indicates that 85 percent of participating districts will be able to measure student growth by 2013-14. A point was awarded for the State's long-term goal of using a value-added model to measure student growth and for its commitment to work with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium.

(ii) Without a clear understanding of how and when the State will have a growth model for all students, it is not known how it will factor student growth as a significant factor into the educator evaluation systems. This concern led to a medium rating on this element. On the positive side, the State has done a commendable job examining the evaluation rubrics that LEAs are using to evaluate teachers. The State provided a crosswalk showing the alignment between the Danielson and Saphier rubrics which are commonly used across the State. The State plans to build on this work to develop a statewide evaluation model to assess teachers across five domains. While statewide evaluations for teachers and principals currently are not in place, the applicant provided a detailed plan and timeline for implementing them. The State intends to implement the systems in the summer of 2011 targeting the persistently lowest performing schools, then rolling the evaluations out to the larger education community. The commissioner of education has created a Task Force on Teacher Evaluation and a Task Force on Principal Evaluation to design the evaluation systems; both task forces include a broad range of stakeholders including educators.

(iii) The State has presented a detailed framework for evaluating teachers and principals annually, however there is concern that the framework differentiates the evaluations based on educator experience and certification status. It is not clear if veteran teachers will be held to a lower standard than new teachers. There is not enough information to make a determination of the rigor of the evaluations for experienced teachers. There also is concern about the availabity of the growth model to be included in the evaluation system (see above). These concerns aside, the plan is strengthened in that it ties the evaluations to professional development supports.

(iv) While the State is moving forward to redesign its evaluation systems for educators, there are concerns on how these evaluations will be used to inform all personnel decisions. As mentioned above, the State has aligned professional development supports with the new evaluation systems. Teachers receive tenure after a successful evaluation after three years in a school district and the State plans to use the new evaluation system to make these determinations. While the application notes that educators will be able to receive additional compensation for meeting student growth or other targets, the plan is not well-articulated. Further, it is not clear how the State can compensate educators on student growth without a robust model in place.

Although the State clearly has plans to use educator evaluations to make personnel decisions, its targets fall short in using them for the majority of the educator workforce. For example, the State has targeted only 50% of participating LEAs to have qualifying evaluation systems in place and using them for personnel decisions by the end of 2013-14. This does not meet the spirit of RTT to aggressively reform state and local human capital systems. Low points were awarded for these targets.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**5**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	3
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i and ii) The State presented its ESEA equitable distribution plan that focused on highly qualified, not highly effective, teachers. The State noted that there were no staffing inequities based on the highly qualified teacher analyses. The State's narrative did not adequately address how it might move its policy discussion from the equitable distribution of highly qualified to highly effective educators. The State did not provide additional ways of analyzing the data to target inequities across schools within districts. The State focused on staffing inequities within its juvenile corrections system, but did not offer any creative solutions for addressing these inequities. The State did not provide any data by high/low poverty or high/low minority schools or for hard to staff subjects and speciality areas. There was no discussion of the equitable distribution of principals across the State. Minimal points were awarded for the State's plans to research the equitable distribution issue through the Teacher and Principal Evaluation task force and for budgeting for this research using RTT funds.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**5**
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	2
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	3

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) It is clear from the narrative that the State has strong P-20 collaboration including the means to collect and share data between K-12 and postsecondary education systems. However, the State did not provide sufficient information on how it plans to measure and link student growth between the two systems in order to measure the effectiveness of graduates from educator preparation programs into the classroom. As discussed above, it is not clear that the State currently has the means to measure student growth or a coherent plan to develop such a model. The application states that a complete data system will be up and running by the spring of 2011, but this does not seem reasonable given the State's lack of a growth model. Points were awarded for the State's commitment to move forward in this direction.

(ii) The State provided evidence that it has been thoughtfully reexamining it program approval processes and standards for teacher preparation programs. For example, the State is revising its program approval standards for CTE to focus more on outcomes than on inputs, eliminating redundancy between state and national program accreditation programs, and establishing a statewide partnership of P-20 programs. While the State has been focusing on improving the quality of existing teacher preparation programs, little discussion was devoted to expanding quality programs with the exception of the proposed residency models. Residency models have shown promise for expanding the teacher pipeline with quality candidates because of the intensity and supervision of the candidates' school-based experiences. Points were awarded for New Hampshire's piloting of these potentially effective programs.

The applicant did not discuss the expansion of effective programs to prepare principals.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**8**
(i) Providing effective support	10	6
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	2

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) New Hampshire presented an overview of its approach to professional development which is driven by the Professional Development Master Plan (PDMP). The State currently links professional development (PD) to its recertification cycle. While it is evident that New Hampshire has invested significant resources in PD, the current system does not appear to be highly job-embedded or data-driven. The PD seems to be comprised of several disjointed programs rather than a comprehensive approach to to identifying educator PD needs based on data. For example, the narrative indicates that the PDMP links evidence of teacher

and principal performance to student growth and achievement, but does not address how teachers access student achievement data on an ongoing basis to help them identify areas where they may need PD supports. The State has articulated a plan to move forward in implementing several of the PD innovations outlined in the RTT notice. In particular, the proposed mentoring and induction program appears positioned to provide intensive, job-embedded supports to beginning teachers. The State also has a program to train 100 content-based instructional coaches, but does not give any indication if this number is adequate to meet the needs across the states. The State provided a timeline for implementing data-informed PD reforms; most are targeted for completion by 2014. The State did not provide targets on the number of teachers and principals who will received high-quality PD supports.

(ii) As with its approach to providing PD, the State's plan for measuring PD to improve effectiveness seems disjointed. It is not clear how PD interventions will be evaluated in a systematic manner, or how they will be linked back to classroom practices and student achievement. It appears that PD will only be evaluated for the mentoring and induction program (NHNIM) and not for all teachers across the State. The narrative notes that that teachers and principals participating in NHNIM will develop portfolios, but does not address how the portfolios will be evaluated.

Total	**138**	**47**

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	**10**	**10**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant provided the legislative citations giving the State Board and Commissioner the authority to intervene in both schools and districts.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**35**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The State provided evidence that it has a process in place to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools. The State has identified 12 schools through this process (7 elementary/middle schools; 5 high schools).

(ii) New Hampshire provide an honest assessment of its current status with regard to turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools. The narrative demonstrates that the lowest-achieving schools have been a major concern within the SEA, and that stakeholders from across the State have been examining innovative strategies for turning around these schools. Moving forward, the State plans to keep what is working and improve what is not. As discusses earlier, New Hampshire has structured its RTT application with a three-tiered service model with the persistently lowest-achieving schools receiving the most intensive and comprehensive supports. The SEA will establish an Office of Innovation and Improvement to support LEAs with the lowest-achieving schools and contract with external providers to provide direct support to these LEAs and schools. The State plans to use a transformation model to affect school change. The State presented a clear plan and timeline for securing the services of the external providers through an RFP process to support districts with low achieving schools. The plan also defines the roles and responsibilities of the SEA, LEAs, external consultants. The plan makes provisions for firing the principal and installing leadership team (principal, LEA leader, and/or lead teacher). While the application notes that PD supports will be provided, it does not provide a cohesive delivery plan for these supports in general, but does address PD for teachers of English language learners for schools with large enrollments of ELLs.

The State provided evidence that its plans for turning around schools with the persistently lowest-achieving students are based on lessons learned in this area. The State reported some success with its Title I school restructuring process with 4 of 6 schools in restructuring planning during 2008 making AYP. Results were not as good for 2009 when only 2 of 14 schools in restructuring planning made AYP. The State also detailed that, while student performance increased in schools in need of improvement, few schools have been able to exit that status since 2003. The State's proposed model will allow the lowest-achieving schools to access the Center for Innovation and Improvement's Rapid Improvement model that has led to some success for schools in restructuring.

Total	50	45

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**8**
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	3
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The percentage of revenues available to the State used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education was substantially unchanged from 33.02% in FY2008 to 33.14% in FY2009.

(ii) The State ensures equitable funding for high poverty LEAs and schools through the Adequacy Aid and and Fiscal Capacity Disparity Aid formulae. Both are weighted to provide funding for high poverty schools and LEAs. The Adequacy Aid formula also provides additional funding to districts with high concentrations of students with disabilities and English Language Learners. Full points were awarded because the formulae are weighted to address funding inequities in high poverty schools and districts.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**16**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	7
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	5
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	4
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The applicant states that there is no cap on the number of charter schools established at the local level. The application also states that legislation recently was passed to remove caps for State authorized charter schools, but the Governor had not signed this legislation at the time of the application. However, this reader is assuming the State has removed the caps. The State has indicated that 20 charters schools have been authorized since 2003.

(ii) New Hampshire's charter schools are designed to serve at-risk populations, but it is not clear how the State holds them accountable for increased student outcomes. While the State indicated that charters are held accountable based on student outcomes, the data presented reveal that charters have closed due to lack of enrollment or for fiscal issues rather than student performance. However, Appendix F-1-1 provides data by charter school that suggests that charter school students are scoring well on state assessments,

are graduating, and are going on to obtain a postsecondary education. While it is not clear how charter schools are performing compared to their traditional school counterparts, it is clear that the State is monitoring student outcomes.

(iii) According to the narrative, charters can receive funding equal to at least 80% of the districts average per pupil costs. This falls into the "medium" point range for this criterion.

(iv) The narrative states that no funding is provided for school facilities, including charters. Since no schools receive funding for facilities, charters are equal to all schools. While no facilities funding to all schools may seem equal, the inequalities to charters is greater since they do not have local tax revenues to draw to support school facilities.

(v) The application discusses a consortium of five New England states aimed at "empowering the next generation of citizens, workers, and leaders to be prosperous, knowledgeable, and responsible participants in our global community." It also mentions that New England schools will work together as a League of Innovative Schools. The State does not provide evidence that these efforts meet the definition of "innovative, autonomous, public schools." There is no mention of open enrollment, the authority these entities have on defining instructional models independent from LEA or SEA policy, or whether they have control over their budgets.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	**5**	**4**

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State provided a discussion of various efforts that suggests that New Hampshire's policy environment fosters educational reform. Most notable is New Hampshire's shift to requiring high school credit to be based on a demonstration of competence rather than seat time. In order to meet this mandate, the State aligned course-level competencies with NECAP standards and the State's curriculum framework. This effort will lay the groundwork for the State to adopt the CCSS standards.

Total	55	28

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	**15**	**0**

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State did not provide any narrative, documentation, or evidence on Competitive Preference Priority: Emphasis on STEM. Because the State did not address this competitive priority, no points were awarded.

Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		**Yes**

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New Hampshire has demonstrated that it is committed to implementing the RTT reforms even if the State does not receive a grant. The State offered a three-tiered approach to providing services to the lowest achieving schools, participating districts, and all of the State's districts. This approach will allow the State to intervene in schools to help those students most in need while building capacity statewide to make

systemic changes that will benefit all students. The State has received the support of LEAs that will serve over two-thirds of all students and 70 percent of those who live in poverty.

The State has provided evidence that it will restructure the educational system beginning at the SEA and stimulate change at the local level. The State provided a cohesive management plan that demonstrates its understanding of the capacity and oversight needed to implement the RTT reforms. New Hampshire's application clearly shows that it is shifting from a compliance to a supportive model to foster quality teaching and learning across the State.

While New Hampshire's application falls short in some areas of implementation, the State clearly articulated its vision of reform in each of the four RTT reform areas and meets the absolute priority.

Total		**0**

Grand Total	**500**	**290**

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Hampshire Application #3500NH-5

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**40**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	24
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	11

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(1)(i) New Hampshire earned the maximum five points for articulating a reform agenda. Reasons for that high score are that the New Hampshire Race To The Top (RTTT) plan articulated major activities, levels of services and ultimate goal. The plan is credible, balanced and responsive to both the expectations of RTTT and the needs of New Hampshire.

The plan is built around four activities:

- Rigorous standards and high quality, balanced assessment
- PreK-20 data systems to support instruction
- Total revamp of the state's system to assure teacher and leader effectiveness and the equitable distribution of effective educators
- Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools

The State of New Hampshire will provide services for districts and schools at three levels of intervention. The levels are described below:

"The third, and most intensive, level will involve all of the State's 5% lowest-achieving schools and their districts. Each school will be matched with a vetted external partner, who will guide, coordinate, and manage the school's transformation with support from the Department and other specialized resources, as needed. Schools and districts at this level have agreed to make broad changes in all education reform areas."

"The second level of intervention will consist of participating districts, consortia of districts, or professional organizations that submitted proposals for specific innovative work that is aligned with the State plan, has value-added potential, and is replicable. They will engage in piloting approaches with an accompanying rigorous evaluation of effectiveness."

"The first level includes services provided by the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) to all schools. Within this level, the Department will coordinate networks of schools, districts, institutions of higher education, and professional organizations that will provide vehicles for sharing findings and promising practices, solving problems, and identifying ways to scale up effective practices in the state and across the region."

The ultimate goal of the RTTT plan is that "All New Hampshire students will graduate from high school prepared to persist in college and/or a financially sustaining career through an educational system that supports the development of personal and civic responsibility and creates human and social capital to grow and strengthen the State's global economic position in the 21st century."

(A)(1)((ii) New Hampshire earned 24 points for commitment to the state's plan. Reasons for that middle score are:

Concerns about the plan are:

- The 83 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in NH that are participating in Race to the Top represent only 51% of the districts in the state and their 286 schools make up only 60% of the schools statewide.
- The LEAs signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that have statements that seriously weaken the power of the agreements. Specifically those clauses state: "Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school districts and school district employees under Federal, State, or local laws (including applicable regulations or court orders) or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements. By way of the signatures below, the LEA and local collective bargaining representative agree to confer in good faith over matters within the scope of the Memo of Understanding (MOU).
- Only 56% of the teacher representatives (45) signed the MOU even with the significant Opt-out clause noted above.

Positives about the plan are:

- The participating LEAs signed up for 100% of the "Elements of State Reform Plan."
- The student population in the participating districts (121,490) consist of 70% of students in poverty statewide.
- All the superintendents and 93% of the school board presidents of participating districts signed the MOU and work plan.
- The MOU work plan was very detailed and clear on tasks and expectations.

(A)(1)(iii) New Hampshire earned points in the high range for how well its plan will translate into broad state -wide impact of ambitious yet achievable goals overall and by student subgroups. Reasons for the score are:

A negative is that the 83 LEAs in NH that are participating in Race to the Top represent only 51% of the districts in the state and their 286 schools make up only 60% of the schools statewide. A slight positive is the student population in the participating districts (121,490) has 70% of students in poverty statewide.

(A)(1)(iii)(a) A positive is that New Hampshire has challenging but doable targets for increasing the percentage of students who annually meet state standards and growth targets. New Hampshire would increase the number of students meeting targets by four to seven percent for all students and approximately 12% for minorities during the four years of the RTTT grant. This would mean that 60% of all 4th graders and 50% of 8th graders would be proficient or higher in mathematics in 2014. Fifty percent of 4th graders and 55% of 8th graders would be proficient or higher in reading in 2014.

(A)(1)(iii)(b) A positive is that New Hampshire would reduce achievement gaps in student performance on National Assessment of Educational Progress(NAEP) and New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) by 25% between 2010 and 2014, and another 15% by 2016. Achievement gaps in mathematics are presently 30 to 40 % in mathematics and 12% in reading. Two points are not earned because the gaps would remain large in 2016.

(A)(1)(iii)(c) A positive is that NH increases the percentage of high school completers to 100% by 2012 (including students who receive a GED, obtain an alternative certificate, or move on to college). NH would increase the percentage of students graduating with a standard diploma from 89% to 95% by 2012.

(A)(1)(iii)(d) A positive is the NH, in its plan, would increase the percentage of students who enroll in a postsecondary program within 12 months of completing high school from 74% to 80% by 2012. It would also increase the percentage of high school completers (NH residents and non-residents) finishing two-year degrees at public colleges from 27% to 32% and four-year degrees at public colleges from 61% to 67% by 2016.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**21**
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	13
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(2)(i) New Hampshire earned points in the middle range for ensuring that it has the capacity to implement the proposed plan. Reasons for that score are noted below in each subsection.

(A)(2)(i)(a) New Hampshire appears to have relied on the creation of four cross-departmental working committees to provide the general direction of its RTTT work. The committees have membership from the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) and key stakeholder and partners outside the department including key educator organizations. This is a positive as it would develop greater buy-in.

New Hampshire indicated that it would add twelve positions, including a Race to the Top director, to implement the RTTT work and that the work would be coordinated by the "Commissioner's extended Cabinet." The RTTT director would be a member of the "extended Cabinet." In the proposal, New Hampshire indicated that it would likely reorganize NHDOE to reflect RTTT responsibilities.

(b) New Hampshire had good strategies on how it will support participating LEAs in successfully implementing the RTTT grant through its own leadership and working with many partners in three primary ways. They are:

- LEAs will have opportunities to participate in innovation networks, the piloting of tools and models, and statewide professional development activities tied to the four education reform areas.
- LEAS will have access to effective practices identified by the "What Works Clearinghouse", the "Doing What Works" tools and website, and tools and resources posted on NHDOE's website.
- The persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts will be matched with a support team consisting of an external partner and an NHDOE liaison and required to participate in specific capacity-building activities..

The proposal did not provide sufficient information on evaluation strategies and how it would hold districts accountable for progress. It did outline a two year process that be used to intervene when districts were not fulfilling their responsibilities but it was overly general and appeared insufficiently rigorous as to expectations.

A weakness of this subsection waslack of detail about evaluations and follow-up to negative findings.

(c) New Hampshire has determined that NHDOE staff and external facilitators, when appropriate, will work with collaborative projects to monitor progress toward their goals and document effective practices. There appeared to be no plan to use a neutral external evaluator which could be problematic in gaining credibility for the reports.

NHDOE liaisons and external partners will work with the lowest-achieving schools and districts to ensure they remain on track or to determine interventions to get them back on track. Also problematic, there appeared to be no direct NHDOE accountability for this work and no plan to use a neutral external evaluator.

(d) New Hampshire intends to use other funds to accomplish the state's plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds. However, the only concrete discussions in the proposal involved making certain that other federal funds and, specifically, the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG) were coordinated with Race to the Top efforts. Discussions about state and local funds did not provide much information. This subsection lacked sufficient discussion about state and local funds.

(e) New Hampshire received high points for this subsection because it provided numerous options and plans for continuing significant RTTT work after the grant ends. It indicated that, by design, state initiatives

now are aligned with the RTTT work and soon the NHDOE will be. It provided example of the new integration and congruence.

(A)(2)(ii) New Hampshire included numerous support statements from a broad group of stakeholders.

- The state's teachers and principals, which include the teachers' unions or statewide teacher associations, indicated support for the RTTT proposal. Two point were not added because the MOU and work plan did not conform to the model agreements provided by the USDE.
- Other important stakeholders were very supportive of the proposal. The many letters from State officials and governmental entities were especially noteworthy.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**22**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(3)(i) New Hampshire earned points for making progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and for strategically using its American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) and other federal and state funding to pursue such reforms. Reasons for the high score are the examples of progress noted in each of the four areas:

Standards and Assessment

- The 1993 New Hampshire Education Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP) guaranteed common, high quality standards and assessments for all students.
- NH, Rhode Island, and Vermont in 2002 built a common summative assessment system (NECAP) in reading, mathematics, and writing based on identical curriculum standards, assessments, performance standards, and reporting.
- NHDOE worked with professional organizations in the State to promote understanding of the standards, to help teachers to align their curriculum to the standards, and to use summative assessment results with their own formative and benchmark assessments to inform instructional decisions in their classrooms.
- NHDOE's web site contains resources and materials on standards and assessment for educators.
- In 2006, NH developed a growth model as part of the Follow the Child Initiative.
- In 2009, NH began working on a new student growth percentile model that includes data visualization software that will allow teachers, administrators, and parents to track student growth and performance of schools and districts.
- Performance-based assessments were developed in 2009-2010 for assessing student mastery of high school competencies both in and outside the classroom.
- In 2009, NH joined the Common Core Standards Initiative.

Data Systems to Support Instruction

- In 1974, NH began student-level collections for subgroups within the State.
- In 2004, NH inaugurated its longitudinal data system. It created the Initiative for School Empowerment and Excellence, a web-based application that allowed educators and schools access to these data. The State developed tools and began a train-the-trainer program to build capacity across schools to access and use student-level data.
- In 2008, NH developed a new Educator Information System that mandates identification of every teacher and every course they teach in 2008, and built a website for teachers to access training online.
- In 2010, the NH legislature passed a law that expands data collection in postsecondary to include courses, remediation, and additional information as well as early childhood data.

Great Teachers and Leaders.

- In 1974, NH established the Professional Standards Board and the Council for Teacher Education, a nontraditional route to certification to address critical shortage areas, and ended the issuance of nonrenewable life licenses.
- In 1996, the State Board of Education added another nontraditional route, which was not limited to critical shortage areas.
- Since 1997, the State has provided online resources for "just in time" professional and curriculum development through the NH Educators Online web-site at NHEON.org.
- Since 2001, all NH educators have developed Individual Professional Development Plans(IDPD) that require evidence of student growth and achievement.

Turning Around the Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools.

Since 2003, NH has had the statutory authority to intervene in the lowest-achieving schools, and has required all schools and districts in need of improvement to conduct a needs assessment, attend professional development, and develop improvement plans based on their strengths and weaknesses.

(A)(3)(ii) New Hampshire earned points in the middle range on issues associated with improving student outcomes overall and by student subgroup. New Hampshire had very good explanations for the connections between the data reported and the actions that have contributed to those results. Reasons for the allocation of points is noted in each subsection.

(A)(3)(a) Since 2003, New Hampshire's students in grades 4 and 8 have exceeded the national average in English, language arts, and mathematics on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and their scores have ranked them in the top five states. NH's attributes its high achievement to "teachers and administrators aligning curriculum and pedagogy to teach the standards and using data to inform classroom and school-wide decisions."

New Hampshire showed increases in achievement for all subgroups in mathematics. The percent proficient or better scores for Black students went from 10% in 2002-2003 to 15% in 2006-2007 on 4th grade NAEP. Hispanics also showed improvements moving from to 15% in 2002-2003 to 21% in % in 2006-2007 on 4th grade NAEP. At the 8th grade Black student scores moved from 7% to 12% in mathematics and Hispanic scores moved from 11% to 17%. Reading scores improved slightly for both groups. Nine of nine points were added for these positive results.

(A)(3)(b) High White student scores and comparatively much lower minority scores means NH has a huge achievement gap. In most cases, the gap between White students and minority students is 37% or more for students scoring proficient or better. The achievement gap has remained basically the same over the years. Zero of eight points were added because the achievement gaps remain very large and no significant improvement was evident.

(A)(3)(c) New Hampshire reported cumulative data to determine graduation rates. Using this way of collecting data, New Hampshire shows an overall graduation rate of 87.9%, considerably exceeding the national average of 69 percent. Using the cumulative approach to determining graduation rates, that data indicates that high school graduation rates have improved over the last seven years for Black and Hispanic students. In 2002-2003 school year. Black graduation rates were 74.8% and increased to 78.9% in 2007-2008. For Hispanic students, the graduation rates went from 65.9% in the 2002-2003 school year to 75.9% in 2007-2008. White student graduation rates went from 84.5% to 88.2% during those years. Significant points were added for these positive results.

Budget Notes: Budgets associated with Section A appeared appropriate and connected to work described in the proposal.

Total	**125**	**83**

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	**40**	**40**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(1) (i) New Hampshire earned full points. The reason for the high score is that it has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards by being an active member of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSS) jointly led by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association in partnership with Achieve, Inc., ACT, and the College Board. Forty-eight states are participants in this effort.

(B)(1)(ii) New Hampshire earned full points. The reason for this score is that the New Hampshire State Board of Education is empowered to officially adopt the academic standards. It intends to adopt the Common Core State Standards on August 2, 2010. New Hampshire does have a detailed plan for implementation of the standards. Much of the plan is detailed in (B)(3) below.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(2) New Hampshire earned full points for demonstrating its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments. The reason for this high score is that it joined the Summative Multi-state Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER BALANCE) As of May 12, 2010, thirty-three states have joined together in the Smarter Balance Consortium to apply for the Race to the Top Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant Application.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**20**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

B)(3) NHDOE will work in collaboration with its participating LEAs to implement internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments tied to those standards. New Hampshire earned full points for the quality of its assessment plan. The reasons for that high score are the comprehensiveness, quality and detail of the plan. The plan has six major activities and some of the highlights are noted below.

As part of the plan to support the transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessment, NHDOE will:

- Deploy a cadre of school coaches to LEAs and to the six regional Professional Development Centers.
- Create teams of four coaches in the areas of mathematics, literacy, data, and leadership, who are skilled in implementing effective learning strategies powered by technology.
- Expand the OPEN NH eLearning for Educators Program.
- Enlist the resources of the NH ASCD branch, NH Staff Development Council, NH Special Educators Association, NH School Administrators Association for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment as

well as other professional education organizations to create an ongoing statewide system of professional development.
- Convene teacher groups that will create a moderation system that will support the review and examination of student work within and beyond the school day.

Part of the work will include "gathering and disseminating clear examples of student work that demonstrate proficiency of our performance standards that will lead to more comparability of local assessments that support our statewide summative assessment and become part of our comprehensive assessment system."

Budget Notes: Budgets associated with Section B appeared appropriate and connected to work described in the proposal.

Total	70	70

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**16**
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) **(C)(1)** The reason for the score is that New Hampshire has eight of twelve possible America Competes elements completed in it statewide longitudinal data system.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	**5**	**5**
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) (C)(2)New Hampshire received the maximum points for having a plan for accessing and using student data. This high score was given because much of the necessary infrastructure has already been developed or is already designed. New Hampshire has an elaborate plan for providing users with the necessary training through its regional Centers and other partners noted in (B)(3). The North East and Islands Regional Laboratory in a report indicated that NH had the most advanced access and use of state data in the northeast. NH noted that the statewide longitudinal data system is already receiving high use with daily logins of over 600 per day.		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**18**
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) (C)(3)(i) New Hampshire earned full points for its previous four years of work and for its plan for increasing the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness. This high score was given because New Hampshire has a credible, high quality plan to provide all teachers, principals and district administrators role-based access use of instructional improvement systems by Spring 2013.		

Four years ago, NHDOE partnered with PerformancePLUS "to deliver to all LEAs a solution, which included three critical components: 1) the ability to analyze data and tie the analysis to specific state and local standards, effectiveness of program, and outcomes such as college success; 2) the ability to connect the analysis to the district's curriculum; and 3) the ability to create new benchmark assessments when needed to inform decisions." NH claims to have built the infrastructure to achieve the work noted above.

The system allows administrators and teachers to examine the success of programs for an individual child or specific subgroups, to identify individual needs, and to target instruction. Through agreements with major assessment providers, schools are able to access state and local assessment data from one central location. Examples of assessments available are: Measures of Academic Progress (Northwest Evaluation Association), DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), AimsWeb (Response to Intervention Assessment) and College Placement tests (e.g., PSAT, SAT). Schools also have access to "student characteristics such as suspension, course completion, specific program participation, attendance, etc. provides educators with a wealth of data upon which to make wise decisions about their schools, their curriculum, and their instructional strategies." This higher capacity is a positive because it will let educators to customize instruction much more effectively.

(C)(3)(ii) New Hampshire earned full points for the quality of its plan for supporting participating LEAs and schools in using instructional improvement systems and providing effective professional development on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement. This high score was given because New Hampshire has a credible, high-quality detailed plan and it will use a regional support system (Centers) and many educational organization partners noted in (B)(3) that has worked well in the past. The budget was appropriate both fiscally and for its connections to the activities. The three major components are:

- NHDOE training teams develop high level expertise.
- NHDOE working with key stakeholders partners who jointly develop professional development modules and tools for data literacy and using data to improve instruction that are appropriate for role needs.
- Train people to provide educators the training they need to understand and use student growth and value-added data reports in the classroom to improve instruction.

(C)(3)(iii) New Hampshire earned full points for making the data from instructional improvement systems available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students. This high score was given because New Hampshire has:

- Convened, since 2009, a group of researchers from colleges, universities, and nonprofit policy organizations across the state to increase their awareness of the data available in the SLDS, to generate topics for research, and to begin to develop a research agenda for the state.
- Built a web-page to share knowledge of the scope and depth of the data warehouse with researchers and the public.
- It has crafted a Memorandum of Understanding, which researchers can use to request student-level data.

If awarded Race to the Top funds, NH intends to provide grants to researchers and research institutes to conduct important research.

Total	47	39

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**17**

(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	5
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	5
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	7

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(1)(i) New Hampshire earned full points because it has legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals particularly routes that allow for providers outside of institutions of higher education.

The New Hampshire State Board of Education has statutory authority relative to the certification of teachers, supervisors and administrators in New Hampshire public schools; approval of teacher preparation programs; procedures for the electronic certification of educator credentials; and the establishment of certification fees (RSA186:11 X). The State Board retains the authority to enter rulemaking and adopt final administrative rules governing the teaching profession.

New Hampshire delineated five pathways to educator certification. Two are traditional methods and involve successful completion of (1) in state and (2)out of state higher-education teacher preparation programs. New Hampshire has three non-traditional, or alternative, certification pathways. They are:

Method 3 requires demonstration of teacher competencies through an interview and submission of portfolio, regional- or national-level certification (i.e., National Board of Professional Teaching Standards), or through transcript analysis.

Method 4 requires successful completion of a professional development plan within a listed critical shortage area, successful teaching under an approved mentor, and recommendation by the Superintendent of Schools.

Method 5 requires completion of a Bachelor's degree, 30 hours of course work in a particular academic area, one year of successful teaching under an approved mentor, and recommendation by the Superintendent of Schools.

Points were awarded because Methods 4 and 5 incorporate all five characteristics noted in the reviewer guidance. However, there was insufficient information on the principal route to make appropriate judgments. Clearly an alternative route for principals does exist as five principals were certified through alternative routes.

(D)(1) (ii)New Hampshire earned points in the high range because alternative routes to certification are moderately used. New Hampshire reported that in school year 2008-2009, 45 teachers (153 over the past three years) were certified through alternative program Method 4 and 28 were certified through Method 5. All those methods were not affiliated with higher education institutions. During that same year, five principals were certified from programs that were not administered by higher education institutions.

(D)(1)(iii)New Hampshire earned full points because it has defined processes for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and especially because it has several strong programs for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage. The high score was given because New Hampshire's educator critical shortage areas are determined on an annual basis through an analysis of the following three data sets:

- Statewide Critical Shortage survey data.
- Reports from NH approved teacher preparation programs indicating the number of candidates who complete programs, receive certification, and are hired within all endorsement areas.
- Report of the number of candidates who have received certification through one of the non-traditional, alternative certification pathways.

Those data sets are analyzed collectively to determine gaps in supply and demand for all of the NH endorsement areas. The results are shared with educator preparation organizations so that they can adjust their programs appropriately. They are also sent to "all superintendents to assist them in the hiring process

and in recommending qualified candidates for one of the non-traditional/alternative certification pathways in order to fill hiring gaps."

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**31**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	9
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	13

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(2)(i) New Hampshire earned points in the middle range for its plan to establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student. It earned those three points because NH recognizes the complexity of measuring student growth and the need to use multiple measures New Hampshire is committed to using "multiple measures of student growth, including formative assessments; standardized benchmark and summative tests, curriculum- and course-based assessments and individual student work, projects and performances."

It did not earn points because NH believes the student growth measures are not sufficiently developed to be used for measuring teacher and principal effectiveness. NH believes that accurate measures of student growth are limited to only a few subjects and grades, and even then, they provide a one-time snapshot that does not define an individual student. It indicated that it was working with various organizations to develop better measures of student growth. It believes that the consortium work of Summative Multi-state Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER BALANCE) may offer the best opportunity for measuring student growth.

(D)(2)(ii)(a) New Hampshire earned points for designing and implementing rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals. New Hampshire will implement and differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories. One of the five rating categories would use data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as one of the evaluation criteria. Points were not given because New Hampshire lets local districts determine how important student growth will be and what the other specific measures will be included in the evaluation. The most significant role the State of New Hampshire is to provide information, criteria and models for developing evaluation systems but, clearly, the crucial decisions will be made locally. Given that student evaluations will be locally determined and given that teacher and principal evaluation systems will be locally developed, there appears to be little possibility that there will be a "New Hampshire" evaluation system for teachers and principals that measures student growth in the same way in all districts in NH. It is true that one of the models (Danielson) is quite dominant and in nearly two-third of the districts but, even then, local control allows modifications in categories and weights.

(D)(2)(ii)(b) New Hampshire earned points because New Hampshire acknowledges the importance of having teachers and principals as key participants in the design and implementation of model evaluations. In the proposal, NH noted "the development and implementation of a rigorous and sustainable educator evaluation system requires that these systems be developed collaboratively with teachers, principals and other stakeholders. The development of an effective evaluation system is a shared enterprise based upon a common understanding of what is *valued* and, therefore, *evaluated.*" The expectation is clearly there. However, because evaluations will be determined locally, it is assumed but not certain that teachers and principals will be key participants.

(D)(2)(iii) New Hampshire earned points in the middle range because the proposal stated that there would be annual evaluations of all teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback. Part of each evaluation for teachers and principals will be concerned with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools. However further examination of the evaluation expectation seemed to say a different thing. It stated "Evaluations will be differentiated on the number of years of service and prior evaluations. Beginning teachers and principals will be evaluated on each domain in the evaluation system during their

first three years in the profession. For experienced teachers on continuing contracts and for experienced principals, summative evaluation will coincide with their certification renewal cycle. During intermediate years of the evaluation cycle, experienced educators will be responsible for engaging in professional development activities and for gathering data on the five domains for use in their summative three-year evaluation and recertification." Points were not added because it appears that except for new teachers with less than three years experience, evaluations will actually take place every third year.

(D)(2)(iv)New Hampshire earned points because it will use evaluations that consider student growth and data use at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding three of the four following factors.

(a) Points were awarded because New Hampshire will use the new evaluation to develop teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development for both new teachers and experienced teachers. However, the section did not appear to give much attention to improving teacher and principal effectiveness linkages to student performance beyond considering it one of five factors in the evaluation. Only 50% of participating districts indicated that they would exercise student performance and growth as a factor of evaluation.

(b) Points were awarded because New Hampshire indicated that the new evaluations, that include student growth and use of data, will be used in compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, with opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities. Student performance and growth is one of five factors to consider in the new evaluation but local decisions will determine the weight of that factor. Only 30% to 50% of participating districts indicated that they would exercise student performance and growth as a factor in addressing this expectation.

(c) Points were awarded because New Hampshire will use the new evaluation system, that include student growth and use of data in determining whether new teachers will be retained and whether to grant tenure after three years of highly effective evaluations to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures. However local control options will mean that each district will define how this is implemented. Only 50% of participating districts indicated that they would exercise student performance and growth as a factor in addressing this expectation.

(d) Points were awarded because New Hampshire will use the new evaluation system to inform ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures. New Hampshire intends to retain only those teachers who are effective (including evidence of student growth and the use of student growth data to improve practice). However, local district will determine how this will be implemented. Only 50% of participating districts indicated that they would exercise student performance and growth as a factor in addressing this expectation.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**25**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	15
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	10

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(3)(i) New Hampshire earned full points for its plan to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals. The criteria required developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students. This score was given because New Hampshire has in the past had an equitable distribution according to the most recent reports. The high score also was given because it has a plan and numerous studies and initiatives underway to better address inequities that may emerge with changing populations.

(D)(3)((ii) New Hampshire earned full points for its plan to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers and principals through the following strategies. These strategies are comprehensive and credible. NH intends to:

- Encourage teacher preparation programs to address areas of needs and shortages.
- Accelerate the use of alternative routes to teacher and administrator certification through more use of Models 4 and 5 previously described.
- Continued use of data systems to forecast emerging needs and shortages.
- Provide incentives and financial supports to recruit and train teacher candidates in the critical shortage areas.
- Work with the math science partnership to provide content support to the math and science alternative pathway candidates.
- Increase the support of the NH Future Educators Academy that encourages and prepares future teachers.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**11**
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(4)(i) New Hampshire received the maximum seven points for its plan to link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State. The New Hampshire RTTT proposal noted that: "Senate Bill 503 has received overwhelming bipartisan support in conference committee and is on the docket of the full House and Senate on June 4, 2010...This legislation will provide for the connection of early childhood, K-12 and postsecondary student data. By linking student and postsecondary program information, over time the State will be able to see if specific college course work translates to success in student achievement." Passage of this bill will ensure the intent of (D)(4)(i) is accomplished.

(D)(4)(ii) New Hampshire earned points for it plan to expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals and terminating those that are unsuccessful. It has a three strategy plan for accomplishing its goals. The plan is of high quality and unique because NH would:

- Have several teacher preparation organizations use a residency model that provides a rich clinical experience for pre-service preparation that extends across all four years of the baccalaureate program. Teachers would spend most of their four years in K-12 districts. Higher education staff would come to the K-12 setting and give their classes instead of having students going to the college campuses.
- Evaluate the residency model to determine if the graduates of the residency program perform better in their summative performance evaluation than their traditionally prepared peers.
- Make transparent the connections in P-20 learning outcomes and achievement at individual, school, district and state levels of resolution.

Additional points were not given because NH did not provide sufficient detail for improvements for programs that were not part of the residency model design. Very likely a significant number if not a majority of new teachers will not be participants in this model. Also the proposal did not have sufficient discussion about how poor programs would be identified and terminated.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**17**

(i) Providing effective support	10	10
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	7

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(5)(i) New Hampshire earned full points for its plan for providing professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. New Hampshire received positive points because it provided guidance on what the professional development experiences should provide. It also received positive points for its plan to provide resources that districts could use if they chose to do so. NH after doing extensive analysis has identified the following statewide content priorities for NH districts over the next three-four years:

- ***Assessment*** e.g. formative assessment; analysis and use of benchmark and state assessment data; International Board Exam
- ***Data-informed instructional practices*** e.g. early learning and ELL, Response to Intervention
- ***Teacher effectiveness*** e.g. mentoring new teachers; content-based coaching; teacher evaluation model
- ***Leadership*** e.g. mentoring beginning principals, leadership institutes, principal evaluation model
- ***High school redesign*** e.g. early warning indicators, personalized learning, dropout prevention, extended learning opportunities
- ***STEM*** e.g. content-based courses, institutes and workshops in mathematics, science and technology

New Hampshire intends to use five delivery mechanisms:

- Technology integration
- Innovation networks
- New Hampshire Induction and Mentoring
- Leadership academies
- Content-based professional development

The plan has obvious overlaps with RTTT goals. The budget for this activity was appropriate both fiscally and its connection to support activities.

(D)(5) (ii) New Hampshire earned points for its plan to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of the professional learning supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice). NH has developed a detailed plan with 17 strategies to conduct evaluations of professional learning supports. This evaluation plan had an excellent design and was developed so that numerous sources of information were representative of the many participants. The evaluations are numerous and utilize many strategies including: "written evaluations/participant feedback from professional development sessions, on-site observations, classroom and school walk-throughs, pre- and post-assessments of teacher and leader content knowledge, analysis of teacher and leader performance based on performance-based teacher and leader evaluation data, analysis of NECAP scores for cohorts of teachers and leaders disaggregated by school, student work samples, student aspiration data (i.e., My Voice Survey), student attendance data and school/district audit of organizational effectiveness."

While the response is very rich in evaluation methodology, insufficient attention was given to how the information would be utilized and what assurances there would be that the problem programs, procedures or strategies would be modified or ended.

Budget Notes: Budgets associated with Section C and D appeared appropriate and connected to work described in the proposal with the major exception of the STEM budget. The STEM budget had no anchorage to a specific activity or text except that found in the budget itself.

Total	138	101

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	**10**	**10**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(E)(1)New Hampshire earned full points because the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly BOTH in the State's persistently lowest achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status. Evidence for the high score may be found in the following citations.

"Enacted in 2003, New Hampshire law (RSA 193-H: School Performance and Accountability) provides statutory authority to both the State Board and Commissioner of Education to identify and intervene in public schools and districts not meeting state performance targets. The law further establishes a legislative oversight committee to work with the State Board and Commissioner in identifying the operational principles upon which the intervention plan should be based (RSA 193-C-IV)."

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**35**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(E)(2)(i) New Hampshire earned full points because it has a clear procedure for identifying persistently-low achieving schools and has identified 12 schools as persistently low-achieving. The New Hampshire proposal provided the following detail.

New Hampshire's "persistently lowest-achieving schools" are: "(a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that:(i) Is among the lowest-achieving 5% of Title I Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years; AND (b) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that (i) Is among the lowest-achieving 5% of secondary schools or the lowest achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years."

New Hampshire identified " seven elementary and/or middle schools (5% of 132) from the Title I Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring list, and five high schools from the Title I Eligible list." New Hampshire indicated that there were no high schools with graduation rates less that 60% in the last few years.

(E)(2)((ii) New Hampshire earned points in the high range for supporting its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models. The NH plan is exemplary for both its demanding expectations but also the wealth of support it provides schools.

The following are some of the highlights of the plan:

The NHDOE will develop an Office of Innovation and Improvement to support LEAs as they reform the 12 schools.

The NHDOE will create a specific Request for Proposal (RFP) that will recruit external providers that have a proven track record of successful, bold school reform. The NHDOE will review all RFPs and select the most appropriate external providers to meet the needs of the schools and successfully implement one of the four school intervention.

The NHDOE will then have an approved list of external providers and work with each LEA to select one of the providers that best fits their target performance issues, chosen model, and action plan.

In addition to the external providers, the NHDOE will hire consultants to work within a Focused Monitoring Team This team will be deployed to the 12 schools, providing targeted coaching support (based on specifically selected expertise) and serve as liaisons between the external providers, NHDOE, and the LEA.

During the ninety day period following the acceptance of the NH RttT grant, the NHDOE and the selected external partners would work with the six LEAs to develop custom reform plans for each of the 12 schools.

Each of the six LEAs has signed a Memorandum of Understanding that binds them to choosing one of the four school intervention models and at minimum the following to support their persistently lowest-achieving schools:

- Be matched with an external partner and NHDOE designated personnel, whose focus will be on teaching, learning, assessing, leadership, and coordination of the reform effort.
- Replace principals who have led the school for two or more years.
- Participate as a team (principal, LEA leader, and/or lead teacher) in an 18-month leadership development program, and build their own capacity by identifying future trainers.
- Participate in professional learning experiences focused on instruction and using an array of online resources, with the NH longitudinal data system (i.e., PerformancePLUS).
- LEAs build a data-informed culture and increase student achievement.
- Engage new teachers in a three-year induction and mentoring program, with an emphasis on instruction, multiple measures of assessment, analyzing, and using data in instructional decision making and collaborative improvement, and capacity building.
- Participate in the development and piloting of state teacher and leader evaluation models, while implementing district's current model.
- Pilot the expansion of the statewide longitudinal data system, including an early warning system for dropout prevention that is supported by funding from the National Governors Association.

One weakness of the plan is that there seemed to be no design for shared learning among the participating schools relative to what has worked and what has not so that successes could be adapted and failures avoided. This is especially true of efforts that are common to all such as parental involvement, communications with the community, developing a positive invironment, etc. There is a danger that the schools might become isolated silos reinventing the wheel at every turn.

Total	50	45

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(1)(i) New Hampshire earned full points because New Hampshire increased the percentage (33.02% to 33.14%.) of the total state revenues used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for

FY 2009 than the percentage of the total revenues used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008. Actual education dollars increased from $1,193,331,105 in FY 2008 to $1,241,839,541 in FY 2009.

(F)(1)(ii) New Hampshire earned full points because the State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b)within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools. In the New Hampshire proposal, they gave this answer to this section. "ALL students at a school (including those not eligible for meal subsidies) are funded at the same per pupil level. The State's policy to direct substantially more funding to high-need LEAs and schools is demonstrated by the fact that per pupil funding above the base level increases Adequacy Aid by 28 percent. The formula contains a second equity allocation, Fiscal Capacity Disparity Aid, which provides aid to towns that have a low property tax base. A low property tax base results in higher local tax rates for education. This allocation adds an additional 7% to Adequacy Aid. Allocations for special education and English Language Learners add another 8%."

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**36**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	4
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(2) (i) New Hampshire received full points because it has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools. There is no limit or restriction on the number of charter schools that can be established. Most charter schools are authorized by local boards of education and the State Board of Education. New Hampshire has 11 charter schools operating with two more scheduled to open in the Fall of 2010. This represents 6.7% of all schools.

(F)(2) (ii) New Hampshire received full points because it has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools. Charter schools are assessed in the same manner as traditional public schools and students. Charter school renewals are largely driven by success in fiscal management, student enrollment and achievement.

(F)(2) (iii) New Hampshire received points because charter schools receive 80% equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and several other categories of funding that may or may not equalize funds.

(F)(2) (iv) New Hampshire received full points because it provides charter schools with similar per-pupil funding for facilities as public schools which is no funding. NH does not have a separate facilities funding.

(F)(2) (v) New Hampshire received the maximum eight points because it enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools. The schools most associated with this part of the law are those associated with the New England Secondary School Consortium. These schools planning and operation were partly funded by the Nellie Mae Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Those schools are aimed at "empowering the next generation of citizens, workers, and leaders to be prosperous, knowledgeable, and responsible participants in our global community."

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	**5**	**5**

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(3)New Hampshire earned full points because it had several examples of having created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

The New Hampshire RTTT proposal provided the following examples:

- Course-level competencies created in 2005 that had competency requirements and not seat time.
- "Running Start" provides college credit for courses taken in high school that meet community college standards.
- New England Secondary School Consortium—a multi-state partnership working to foster forward-thinking innovations in the design and delivery of secondary education across the region.

Total	55	51

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	**15**	**0**

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New Hampshire did NOT meet the conditions necessary to earn the 15 points associated with emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) and thus earned zero points. This was surprising given that it had a budget for $2,609,108 for this purpose. However there was no equivalent text that put the program in context. NH did not have a separate section on STEM in its proposal and as such NH did not indicate how it had a high-quality plan to address the "need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering; (ii) cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics."

The budget indicated the money would be used to:

- Contract with an external partner to implement model STEM programs in middle and high schools to include professional development, teacher training, curriculum delivery and assessment of outcomes in a minimum of two LEA's.
- Provide grants to collaborative partnerships that would transform an industrial arts/tech education into a cutting edge pre-engineering program in grades 6, 7 and 8. This project will connect to the high school with shared resources, shared networks, peer mentoring and classroom collaboration.
- Contract NH public colleges to implement college level math courses to better prepare students for technical and math oriented careers.
- Contract NH public colleges to implement focused teacher training in science for regional LEAs.

Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The New Hampshire Proposal meets all the conditions of the "Absolute Priority." The State's application comprehensively and coherently address all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. It described how the state, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The proposal had all the required and optional charts filled out. The appendices were well organized and helped in understanding the proposal. The budgets, with the exceptions noted for STEM were well though-out and provided additional insight. One concern throughout the proposal was that New Hampshire does at times seem uncertain as to how much leadership to provide in areas that have been exclusively local control.		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	389

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Hampshire Application #3500NH-10

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**47**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	30
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New Hampshire has clearly outlined a comprehensive and coherent agenda for achieving its overall goal and objectives for reform of its schools. Most impressive is its stated ultimate goal, focused on students and their achievement, who "will graduate from high school prepared to persist in college and/or a financially sustaining career through an educational system that supports the development of personal and civic responsibility and creates human and social capital to grow and strengthen the State's global economic position for the 21st Century." Expected outcomes, a theory of action, and growth targets are then articulated to underpin the ultimate goal for student achievement. Of particular note is not only the state's outcomes relative to increasing student performance on state standards and reducing achievement gaps among various subsets of students, but its commitment to increasing the percentage of high school completers to 100% and increasing the percentage of students who will enroll in and complete postsecondary programs. Both include viable options to students, such as earning a GED or obtaining an "alternative" certificate for high school graduation and enrolling in career and community colleges as evidence of postsecondary transition.

The overall support for the substance of the application at the state level is high. There are strong letters of endorsement from a broad array of stakeholders, including representatives from federal and state government, professional associations, education groups, nonprofits, and others. Suport at the local level is not as strong as the apparent support at the state leadership and political levels. Cumulatively, at the local level throughout the state, 51% of the school districts (N=83) have signed on to participate. This represents 60% of the schools statewide (286 schools), 63% of the state's k-12 public school students, and 70% of students in poverty. Of those participating, all of the school districts have agreed to participate in 100% of the elements of the state reform plan as aligned with the Race to the Top criterion. Those who are participating include the state's three largest cities and schools. However, the converse is also true; that is 49% of the school districts representing 40% of the schools statewide, 37% of the student census, and 30% of students in povery have not agreed to participate in New Hampshire's RttT reform initiatives.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been signed by 100% of the participating school superintendents, 93% of the local school board presidents, and 56% of the presidents of the local teachers' unions. There is little explanation as to why more local teachers' unions chose not to support the application, other then that it is their belief "that the process was not collaborative." From the state level, NEA-NH has supported the application as noted in a support letter from its state president. There is no statement from the AFT-NH which represents 10% of the districts in

the state. The narrative in the application and statements in the MOU emphasize that the scope of work will be a collaborative process. In fact, a detailed scope of work for the districts will be negotiated with the state within 90 days of receipt of notification of a Race to the Top award. Phrases such as the state and districts "will work together to develop the final scope of work," "negotiate to continue to achieve the overall goals," and "confer in good faith" are a part of the language of the MOU. Still, the apparent lack of support for the state's RttT-related reform initiatives from its teachers is a concern.

The local districts that are participating and the structure that is planned should have considerable impact throughout the state. All districts, regardless of their participation in RttT activities and funding, will implement the Common Core State Standards, next generation assessments, and other practices that are being planned to scale up relative to reform elements and thus participate in related professional development, communication processes, and consultation. Those that agreed to participate and signed the MOU will be involved with projects, the processes and results of which will be disseminated statewide. Finally, the six districts with 12 schools that comprise the lowest-achieving 5% of all schools in the state have all signed the MOU. It is noted that this is a relatively small state with many school districts and thus cross-district communication and impact would appear to be reasonably good.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**24**
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	17
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

As stated in the narrative, the New Hampshire Department of Education's (NH-DOE) number one priority has been creating a comprehensive system for school reform by organizing its staff into five working groups, four of which align directly with the four major components of the RttT application and one for oversight of the grant and its various initiatives. Within this framework, the State has reorganized the NH-DOE to transition from primarily a compliance organization to one that will offer support to schools in their continued focus on student learning and achievement. A statewide advisory group was convened for the purpose of involving leadership from various stakeholders, including the Governor and leaders of education committees in both chambers of the state legislature, NEA and AFT, school administrators' association, and institutions of higher education. A Research Group has been assembled to conduct and report on related studies.

With RttT funds, New Hampshire anticipates establishing twelve positions to oversee the leadership, implementation, and operation of grant activities, evaluation, and accountability. A full -time director, administrative assistant, auditor, and longitudinal data coordinator will report directly to the Commissioner. Others will work directly with the districts and consult on activities aligned with the four education reform areas of RttT. Funding has been allocated in the budget for these positions, as well as for the various projects and activities that will be undertaken in support of the work within the four reform areas. More intensive support has been allocated to both state-internal and external human and financial resources to assist with its goal of improving persistently low-achieving school and districts. The state has started the process to leverage funds from other federal grants to best support schools in need of targeted support and resources. Staff members from networks, associations, consortiums, foundations, and research and development centers have signed on to support the work of school reform in the state and its school districts. The Governor's P-16 Council has committed to aligning the reform plan with its goals. In sum, the conditions, staffing, and proposed budget allocation should provide capacity to complete successfully its envisioned work. The line-staff relationships within the NH-DOE relative to the RttT director, 12 new positions, the districts, external consultants, staff who work with collaborative consortia and related accountability have not been discussed.

The NH-DOE has reached out to a broad array of stakeholders and estimates that over 1,000 have participated in various meeting over the course of the past 10 months. As noted previously, staff members from networks, associations, consortiums, foundations, and research and development centers have signed on to support the work of school reform in the state and its school districts. Many outlined their specific contributions and envisioned work in their support letters for this application. Plans have been presented to include wide-spread involvement in implementation by educators, especially school administrators, state and local school board members, local and state politicians, parents, and business groups. Noticeably absent is wide-spread, enthusiastic support from the state's teachers, either through endorsements and/or as strong evidence of their involvement in the extensive planning that appears to have gone into the preparation of this application. The word "collaborative" is used frequently as a process in achieving RttT goals in New Hampshire, and the narrative throughout does state that collaboration with be done with teachers – presumably at the local as well as at the state level. However, thus far, support from the principal stakeholders (i.e., teachers) is not strong.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**22**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The philosophy, legal authority, related systems, and funding have been put in place over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas. Since 1993, state law has required "common, high quality standards and assessments for all students." In 2002, New Hampshire and three of its neighboring states built and now administer a common summative assessment system (NECAP) in reading, mathematics, and writing, based on identical curriculum standards, assessments, performance standards, and reporting. Science was added in 2009, and the common summative assessment system is now expanding to all subjects. In 2004, the state added content standards and English language proficiency assessments for students with limited English proficiency. Performance-based assessments were added in 2009-10 for "assessing student mastery of high school competencies both in and outside the classroom." In 2005, New Hampshire developed a growth model as part of its follow-the-child initiative. Further, the state has committed to adopting the Common Core State Standards by August 2010 and to support schools and districts "in a gradual transition to new standards and assessments."

Recent innovations in educator preparation have included the "establishment of a Professional Standards Board and the Council for Teacher Education, a nontraditional route to certification ..., an opportunity to demonstrate competencies and equivalent experiences, professional development requirements for recertification linked to local master plans, and ending the issuance of nonrenewable life licenses." The recertification process for a state educator license requires a link between student achievement and professional learning goals. Further, the state upped its certification requirements in 2010 to increase rigor in math and science preparation.

The NH-DOE does have statutory authority to intervene in the lowest-achieving schools. There are 11 charter schools open in 12 locations, one more scheduled to open this year, and 3 are proceeding through the local authorization process. The state has used some if its ARRA funds to support three Title I positions at the Department of Education.

Since 2003, New Hampshire students in grades 4 and 8 have consistently scored in the top five U.S. states in English and math on the NAEP. However, reading scores have remained relatively flat, and the achievement gap has widened among some subgroups, for example, English language learners who are primarily schooled in four cities. On the state's NECAP data, scores have

consistently risen over 5 years of data for all students and all segments, and achievement gaps have decreased for several subgroups on one or more exams (e.g., limited English proficient learners, African American, economically disadvantaged). Nevertheless, the overall achievement and gaps among subgroups appears large when compared with the total student census and white students.

Statewide, the four-year cumulative dropout rate has decreased from 14.4% in 2003-04 to 6.6% in 2008-09. The state attributes this reduction in its overall drop-out rate to efforts in high school redesign that feature student-centered learning, focus on standards, addressing student mastery over seat time, and offering extended learning opportunities. Within the over-all data, differences are noted. The percentages of students in special education (32%) and receiving free or reduced-price lunches (46%) who drop-out are large, as well as about 26% of the total drop-out population is from Hispanic and Black, non-Hispanic students. Further, 60% of the total drop-outs are male.

The state has recognized the increasing diversity of its student body, and is focusing on training districts and teachers to gather, analyze, and use data. The state now has a central, accessible place to store assessments results and, through the use of Performance PLUS tools, more educators are now using summative and formative data from classroom assessments to make informed instructional and programmatic decisions. The state has also implemented "focused monitoring" to expand the skills of classroom teachers in gathering and analyzing data and with a focus on at-risk subgroups. In addition, the NH-DOE has created a taskforce dedicated to addressing learning challenges of the rising immigrant population, particularly those with little or no schooling prior to arriving in New Hampshire.

Total	125	93

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	**40**	**40**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Since 2002, New Hampshire has worked with Rhode Island and Vermont to build and administer a common summative assessment system in reading, mathematics, and writing based on identical curriculum standards and assessment processes. The standards were reviewed by Achieve, Inc. for their comparability in reading, writing, oral communications, and mathematics with the American Diploma Project (ADP) and its predictability for college success. Achieve generally concluded that the consortia's standards (i.e., as studied with those from Rhode Island) aligned well with the ADP benchmarks and provided students solid opportunity for preparation and success in postsecondary education. Maine joined the consortium in 2009. Thus, philosophically and through implementation, New Hampshire has demonstrated its commitment to a common, multi-state adopted, set of K-12 standards and assessment through most of the 21st Century. And, the work has been successful in identifying and assessing world-class college and career readiness standards.

New Hampshire has participated meaningfully in the joint effort by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers in partnership with Achieve, ACT, and the College Board to develop the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English language arts

and mathematics for grades K-12. In July of 2010, the State Board was to have reviewed the process and final standards with a planned adoption date of August 2, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Concomitant with its development of a common set of standards with NECAP has been the development of a common set of assessments. The NECAP assessments have been widely recognized for rigor and quality as verified through expert review and some data (e.g., gains in math achievement on the NAEP). Interesting, too, is this state's and NECAP's commitment to improving universal assessment design and accessibility for all learner populations (e.g., those who needed adaptive technology, those with skills or knowledge that are not thought to be accurately assessed through large-scale measures, and those with limited English proficiency).

New Hampshire is participating in multiple assessment consortia, Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium, Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for Colleges and Careers (PARCC), and the State Consortium on Board Exam System. Assessment staff from New Hampshire is part of the design team for Smarter Balance, specifically working on universal access and the technology of computer adaptive testing. As of April 29, 2010, 32 states are members of the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium. New Hampshire has also agreed to work with PARCC to collaborate on the development of common, high-quality assessments aligned to the CCCS in English language arts and mathematics for grades 3-8 and high school. In its application, New Hampshire states its interest in working with PARCC is based on its work with end-of-course exams at the high school level. As of May 13, 2010, PARCC has 26 participating states. Finally, the state has signed on for at least one year with the State Consortium on Board Examination Systems, founded by Marc Tucker, President of the National Center on Education and the New Economy. Ten states are seminal consortium members. The aim of the consortium is to "install in the member states a system based on international best practice that will greatly raise the proportion of their high school students who leave high school ready to do college-level work."

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**15**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant submitted a detailed chart delineating goals, strategies, activities, timeline, and responsible party in support of its transition to implement CCSS and its related assessments. In essence the activities will center around the following: (a) crosswalks between current NECAP standards and those adopted through CCSS; (b) deploying school improvement coaches to local districts to provide coaching, modeling, and professional learning activities in support of principals and teachers; (c) using the state's six regional professional development centers to assist with implementation; (d) delivering relevant courses and communities through its Learning for Educators on-line professional development system: (e) examining existing teacher preparation programs approval standards with a focus on aligning teacher education with the CCSS and newly-developed teacher and principal effectiveness; (f) enlisting educator associations in a statewide system of professional development, focused on standards and assessments; (g) convening teacher groups to create a system to support the review and examination of student work both within and beyond the school setting; (h) extending its research capability and productivity, particularly in item design technology and assistive communication resources; (i) improving the assessment literacy of educators through data coaching; and (j) continuing to develop a student growth percentile model that will include all past assessment histories of students and allow the state to track effectiveness of instruction and programs at the classroom, school, district, and state levels.

The plan is very ambitious and is certainly meant to include the principal players in transitioning to the implementation of standards, related assessments, and the use of standards and data to improve instruction. However, a *system* **or** *interconnectedness* **or** delineation of *criticalness* **or** "must do's" is not apparent. It begins to read as too much, jumping on all initiatives or becoming a member of all consortia, or opening up too many avenues from which to participate, learn, train, or get training. The concern here is for the teachers and principals – those in the trenches, in the rural and city schools, in the Kindergarten or 7th grade classes, in high schools, and with a myriad of questions and challenges related to implementation. What is critical and most helpful to them is to be allowed to share in the state's vision, to ensure that the state's vision for this reform plan criteria is being met, and be sufficiently prepared at their level and in their classroom to achieve the vision. As a reminder, the vision: *Improve student performance and teacher effectiveness in all content areas through the development and implementation of a comprehensive preK-16 system of rigorous college and career-ready standards and assessments that provide differentiated access for ALL students.*

Total	70	65

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**16**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Beginning with the 2004-05 school year, the state developed a full student-level, longitudinal data collection system. Thus, a data *system* is available that could and will include all of the America COMPLETES Act elements. Eight of the elements have been completed, and four more are in progress—and completion dates set for them. State legislation was passed to ensure the system(s) would cull out the data to be responsive to all 12 elements in the Act. According to the narrative in the application, it was anticipated that the Governor would sign this piece of legislation in June of 2010. However, at this point in time, only eight of the 12 COMPLETES Act elements are in place.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	**5**	**5**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has contracted with Performance PLUS to implement access portal for teachers and administrators to use longitudinal data. In addition to educators, some evidence was also provided that the state's data analysis and tools have been used by parents at home, policymakers at the state level, and researchers in postsecondary institutions. The applicant submitted a work plan describing its strategies, goals, timeline, and responsible parties for continued implementation of the state's longitudinal data system.

Over the next 2 years, the state plans to train additional personnel, build further capacity, leverage funds and support of districts to integrate data tools into services and decision-making at the local level, enhance tools, establish critical communities (i.e., support groups), engage researchers, and publish reports.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**15**
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4

(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	5

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The NH-DOE has contracted with Performance PLUS to deliver to all local education agencies support and training to "1) analyze data and tie the analyses to specific state and local standards, effectiveness of program, and outcomes such as college success; 2) the ability to connect the analysis to the district's curriculum; and 3) the ability to create new benchmark assessments when needed to inform decisions." The state is able to include local student assessments results in the data repository so schools are able to access a wealth of state and local assessment data. In addition, the data include such student characteristics as suspensions, course completion, specific program participation, attendance, special education needs, etc. The system also allows for schools to create their own local formative and summative benchmark assessments to further identify student needs and refine instruction.

Thus far, the state has apparently used a "training team" to visit schools to engage educators with the use of the data system. A website for teachers to access training online has been constructed. The various work plans related to data systems do include activities to reach out to more educators and schools essentially through online training and courses. The technology tools and specific training (i.e., content) needed to access the data systems, specific goals and objectives for use of the data that is capable of and should be mined, and any evaluation of success related to the education and training of educators to input, access, and use data are not sufficiently evident. This is especially important for teachers and principals and their ability to make improvements at the classroom level.

The plan does call for the convention of a group of researchers from colleges, universities, and nonprofit policy organizations to increase their awareness of the available data and to begin to develop a research agenda for the state. A Research Group has been identified as a strategy in the overall reform plan for New Hampshire. Specific research topics, evaluative studies, and any study or foci of implementation processes for the myriad goals and objectives was not specified or suggested.

Total	47	36

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**10**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	4
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	2

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

According to New Hampshire regulations and statues, the State Board of Education has statutory authority and responsibility for the certification of teachers, supervisors, and administrators in the public schools. It is advised by two groups: (a) the Professional Standards Board (PSB) which advises the State Board on professional growth, certification, and governance of the education program in the state and (b) the Council for Teacher Education (CTE) which coordinates teacher education in the state in an advisory capacity. New Hampshire state regulations permit five pathways to certification. In essence, two are most closely aligned with traditional pathways; that is, (Method 1) graduation from an approved teacher preparation program at a college or university in the state or (Method 2) graduation from an approved program or certified in another state.

Alternative routes to teacher certification are allowed through at least three options and variations therein: (Method 3) through demonstration of competency, (Method 4) completion of a professional development plan within a critical shortage area, and (Method 5) a site-based (i.e., local school district) certification plan approved by the local superintendent of schools. A variation on one of three alternative pathways (Method #3) is specifically for administrators, namely candidates for school superintendent, principals, special education administrators, or career technical directors "can quality for certification...[through] transcript analysis, that the candidate meets specific requirements for that area of administration." All three alternative methods, at least at the policy-setting level, operate independently of institutions of higher education (IHE).

Collectively, the three alternative pathways address the five characteristics in the RttT definition for *alternative pathways to certification* although no one pathway addresses all five characteristics, nor do all five address other characteristics mentioned in the RttT definition, such as "demonstration of ... high-quality instruction in pedagogy and in addressing the needs of all students in the classroom including English language learners and students with disabilities...." In sum, it appears as though the New Hampshire state regulations do permit alternative pathways specifically for teachers and administrators, at least technically, by drawing on one of the pathways - or its variation - that may address the specific credentials presented by an applicant. However, more specific criteria to judge "high quality" for each of the five characteristics for each of the pathways is not evident in the proposal.

Apparently, the state does not make wide use of alternative routes to certification. About 6% of the teachers (82 out of 1,434 total) were certified in 2008-09 through an alternative pathway. The majority of those so certified (N = 45) were through a professional development plan in a critical shortage area. Only five principals were certified through an alternative pathways in 2008-09. Interestingly, data were not provided to indicate the preparation source of most newly-certified educators in the state (e.g., through a traditional pathway at a state IHE or through an out-of-state IHE with program approval or reciprocity with that state).

A description was provided as to how the state monitors areas of teacher shortage, primarily through surveys, but with insufficient detail to render survey effectiveness or usefulness. The only area cited as experiencing a shortage is special education. Nothing specifically was stated as to how principal shortages were monitored, evaluated, and/or any action plan taken as a result of shortages. It is surprising that more information to address this criteria was not provided. For example, data indicate that the state issued 837 certificates to 1,204 new candidates for certification from IHEs in 2009; however, only 424 of these candidates were employed. This is only about 30% of the total numbers of teachers (N = 1,434) and principals (N = 83) newly certified in the same year. No information was provided on preparation sources for the other newly-certified educators.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**29**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	9
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	5
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has both the philosophy and the approach to promote and measure individual student growth. Through its follow-the-child initiative, the state is measuring student growth within personal, social, physical, and academic facets of each student's schooling and defining related support systems through development of student-level personalized learning plans. The state has joined the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium which is developing coherent systems of student growth and related assessments to support and inform classroom instruction. Further, since 2007, the state has been using Performance Tracker (part of the Performance PLUS product line) "to measure and monitor student progress, make inferences about the effectiveness of prior year

instruction, plan and align curriculum to identified gaps in student learning, and make inferences about school effectiveness."

As described in the narrative, two state-level tasks forces, one focused on principals and another on teachers, were to be put in place in the summer of 2010 to "oversee the implementation and assessment of high quality, sustainable educator evaluation systems." An interim report is due in November with a goal of filing needed legislation in January, 2011. (Note: application says January of 2010; the assumption is that this is a typing error and that the applicant means 2011.) The state-level task forces are to include current members of various professional groups of educators such as the PSB, CTE, NEA-NH, AFT-NH, school administrators' groups, parents, community groups, etc. Thus, the design and implementation of transparent evaluation systems, as developed with teacher and principal involvement, is a work in progress. Activities related to it are included in the state's plan for RttT activities and funding. But, using available data on student growth as integral to the educator evaluation system may have a way to go. Data provided in New Hampshire's application indicated that, in 2009, a student academic growth measure was only used as a factor to evaluate 12% of all teachers and 16% of all principals in the state. Growth as a significant evaluation factor was 2% for teachers and 4% for principals. It is noted that the state's Commissioner of Education has discussed educator evaluation with consultants and all have concurred that evaluations ought to include "multiple measures of student growth and school effectiveness related to student achievement on state assessments." Translating this agreement from the state level into practice at the local level by using student growth on state achievement assessments as a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluation will take some careful research, stakeholder involvement, planning, and assurance of validity and reliability of the measurements as related to the work of the specific teacher(s).

A two-year action plan provided by New Hampshire has stated goals, activities, and strategies to design an educator evaluation system to be used statewide to develop, compensate, promote, and retain teachers and principals. Beginning teachers and principals will be evaluated on five domains, including student growth, during their first three years in the profession. Principals will be evaluated according to the standards for school leaders from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium and performance indicators and the work of the Wallace Foundation. For experienced teachers, presumably those on "continuing contracts" and for experienced principals, annual "formative" evaluation will be conducted and "summative assessment" will coincide with their "certification renewal cycle." The operational meaning of those terms in quotes is not clear.

The guidelines and related detail to underpin the activities to develop an educator evaluation system are not clear. A framework for both teacher and administrator evaluations has been established by the Department of Education with consultation from "experts." Presumably, the detail work and processes have yet to begin or has just begun with the first task being to appoint the task forces. How the state plans to measure and use student achievement growth as related to educator evaluation has yet to be determined. The migration from frameworks to specific evaluative elements, forms and processes, and uses of resulting data have yet to be determined. Apparently "external partners" and "vendors" will be used to design, test, and implement the system. How this will translate into practice and use at the local level was not discussed in the proposal. Little was mentioned about the use of these data other then that those who meet targets for students' growth (whatever that may mean) will be eligible for additional compensation and that those who are deemed "ineffective" can be removed under current law provided they have had ample opportunities to improve.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**14**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	12
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

With regard to the equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals, two studies recently reviewed that the state does not have a problem with inequitable distribution, nor is there a discrepancy in the distribution of experienced educators as compared to beginning educators across the state. However, these studies were based on inputs rather then educator effectiveness (outputs) measures, and the state has agreed (through its two new educator evaluation tasks forces) to study and research models, including incentive models, that will attract highly effective teachers to those schools with a significant percentage of students who are minority and in need of free- or reduced-price lunch. It is noted that only 4 schools within the state's two largest urban districts have schools with 50% or less white, non-Hispanic demographic. About 17% of students state-wide are considered in poverty. However, the student census is increasingly growing with refugees, Hispanics, students in poverty, and males in the juvenile correction system. The state realizes that it needs to dig "deeper" into it studies and analysis to determine if there is, indeed, equitable distribution of effective teachers across the state.

Little information was provided in the proposal to address the state's plan to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. The state apparently does not have a coherent, focused STEM initiative. The state did revamp the certification process for those on an alternative certification pathway who are employed on the basis of an approved professional development plan and the recommendation of the teacher's local superintendent. These candidates now must complete an online introductory course that apparently is designed to streamline and help guide them through the process to earn "full" certification. The applicant also discussed the state's high school future educator academies which are designed to give future teachers a jump-start on college-level work while still enrolled in high school. However, the specific need to fill areas of critical shortage (if, indeed, there are any in New Hampshire) was not well addressed nor was there an adequate discussion of plans to move from highly qualified (i.e., inputs) to highly effective (i.e., outputs) in the distribution of teachers.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**7**
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	2

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Two general goals were proposed (but not discussed) that did set baseline data on the percentage of teacher and principal preparation programs in the state for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth of the graduates' students. For principals, the goal is 100% by the end of 2012 and, for teachers, 100% by the end of 2014. The New Hampshire application did state that it is "creating both the technological and analytical capacity to link student achievement and growth data to educators and their preparation…." The policy arena (through state Senate Bill 503, if passed) and the state's data system plan are apparently preparing to permit the connection between early childhood, K-12, and postsecondary student data, and the state should eventually be able to determine if specific college programs or course work translate into student achievement.

There was little substantive discussion in the applicant's proposal about its plans to improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation. Some subcommittee work and conversations have taken place and a group of nine attended a conference in Texas about redefining teacher preparation. Two state colleges and one university that prepare teachers (out of 15) plan to implement "teacher residency models" that appear to be, essentially, an extensive clinical experience in special education (Granite State) or early elementary education (Keene State) for prospective teachers. There was no discussion about any aspect of principal preparation programs in the state. Notably, the state's largest producers of educators (Plymouth State University and the University of New Hampshire) were not mentioned in the proposal nor are there any discussion of

plans to expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**16**
(i) Providing effective support	10	10
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

According to the narrative, the state has a 35-year history of supporting and encouraging professional development, primarily through the New Hampshire Professional Development Master Plan, a requirement for each school district to submit its plan to the NH-DOE for approval every 5 years. These plans are congruent with state regulation of educator recertification, current teacher and principal evaluation, state and district professional learning targets (e.g., use of portfolios, job-embedded professional development), and identifying and implementing procedures on the collection and use of data as they relate to student achievement and learning. The state collects and analyzes evaluative data and then establishes priorities for districts over a 3-4 year time period. For example, data led to six priorities for 2010-11: professional development focused on (a) assessment, (b) data-informed instructional practices, (c) teacher effectiveness, (d) leadership, (e) high school redesign, and (f) STEM. It is noted that these six priorities are quite congruent with the major elements of RttT. Based on these priorities and analysis of its own data at the local level, the districts submit its PD master plans for state approval. The state has established a system from which to deliver professional development through such mechanics as technology integration, innovation networks, induction and mentoring, leadership academies, and content-based professional development (e.g., through coaching and tutoring).

The state does plan to measure and evaluate the various activities and mechanisms that will be used to deliver professional development. A wide array of evaluative techniques and instruments were suggested. The various activities and strategies proposed in its state plan include evaluation of impact on participants and student achievement. At this point in the process, further detail was not provided. No comprehensive approach to data analysis was discussed nor how resulting data might be used to inform policy, practice, or improvements. Particularly noted was the lack of information about the effectiveness of these supports or the lack thereof and their relationship to recertification, contract renewal, compensation, etc. of educators.

Total	138	76

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	**10**	**10**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has statutory authority to identify and intervene in public schools and districts not meeting state performance targets under the state's School Performance and Accountability Act. The New Hampshire Department of Educating oversees improvement and corrective action processes of the LEA/schools in conjunction with a legislative oversight committee

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**37**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	32

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has identified its 5% lowest-achieving schools by simply identifying schools at the top of a rank-ordered listing, based on 5 years of data for elementary and middle schools and 3 years of data for high schools, from the state's reading and mathematics assessments. This has resulted in the identification of 7 elementary and/or middle schools and 5 high schools that are collectively within 6 school districts. It is noted that no New Hampshire high school meets the criteria for low graduation rate; that is, a graduation rate of less than 60% over a number of years.

The state plans to use a "*revised* school turnaround" model (a term it used in the narrative) which draws on increased stakeholder involvement, technical assistance from the state, an external partner, and a foci on six elements that are generally considered integral to school reform: school leadership, high quality teaching, rigorous standards and assessment, professional development, a safe and supportive school environment, and alignment of fiscal and human resources to support student achievement.

To further fast-track efforts on school turnaround, the state will develop an Office of Innovation and Improvement to support the 6 LEAs as they seek to reform the 12 schools. External providers of support will be recruited to assist with the schools' turnaround. The external provider will be asked to implement one of the four school intervention models as described in the RttT RFP. No further information was provided in the narrative as to the criteria for recruiting and selecting the external provider, criteria for determining which of the 4 school intervention models will be used, or the expected outcomes. Each of the six LEAs into which the 12 schools are administered has signed a MOU that binds them to choose one of the four school intervention models. In addition, the state has outlined several conditions under that must be followed, such as replacing the principals who have led the school for two or more years, participating in an 18-month leadership development program, and participating in the development and piloting of state teacher and leader evaluation models.

The state also plans to hire consultants to work within a "focused monitor team" which will be deployed to the 12 schools to provide targeted coaching support in such areas as data analysis, assessment, curriculum, instruction, leadership, and high school redesign.

In sum, the state plans to use a combination of an on-line system to assist schools to prioritize needs and create an action plan; external providers; consultants' targeted professional development; induction, mentoring, and coaching; early intervention programs; personalized learning plans for at-risk students, and others to assist the schools in their turnaround efforts. An action plan with goals, strategies, timelines, and responsible parties was submitted. Appropriate budgetary resources have been included. The explicit role of the "external providers" (i.e., What does this mean? Who are they? What will they do?) needed elaboration.

Total	50	47

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

As a percentage of the total budget funded from state revenue, education **increased** from 33.02% of the state budget in FY 08 to 33.14% of the state budget in FY 09. Stated another way, this represented a 4.1% increase in total state dollars to education from FY 08 to FY 09.

State policy does lead to equitable funding between high need LEAs and other LEAs and within high poverty schools and other schools. The state uses five per pupil funding levels. Beyond the base level, tiers are determined by the percentage of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch at the school level. A second equity allocation provides additional aid to towns with a low property tax base and/or for special education and/or for English language learners. This is a new formula, and a transition plan is in effect for FY 10 and FY 11. The full implementation of tiered per pupil funding and accountability for school-level spending will begin July 1, 2011.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**26**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	5
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has authorized the creation of public charter schools at the local level since 1995, with the approval of the State Board of Education, and at the state level (i.e., by the Board of Education) since 2003. There is currently no limit or restrictions on the number of charter schools that can be established at the local level, and in spring of 2010, the legislature lifted the moratorium (i.e., N = 20) it had placed on State Board-initiated charters, this law pending approval by the Governor in June of 2010. Thus, if approved by the Governor, there will be no caps on the number of charter schools that can be operated in this state.

The applicant provided a general description as to how it authorizes, monitors, holds accountable, renews, and could close charter schools. It publishes guidelines for monitoring and reporting accountability factors related to charter schools. To date, the state has approved 16 charters; 11 are currently in operation, 3 have closed due to lack of students or financial challenges, one never opened, and one will open in the fall of 2010. Each region of the state has a charter school. According to data provided, the state is achieving good success relative to student achievement with its existing charter schools, including those targeted to under-served or at-risk students.

The state's 1995 charter school law required each school pupil's district to pay the **local** charter school an amount equal to at least **80%** of that district's average cost per pupil for the prior fiscal year. Current law provides that charter schools "shall match funds provided by the state through private contributions in order to receive funding that exceeds the state's average per pupil cost of the grade level weight of the pupil." Fiscal policies passed in FY 2010 for **state** charter schools allocated the state's "adequacy payment for each student in the state" and then added $2000 for the support of each student in a state charter school and possibly additional funding based on "special needs" or "entitlements." It was not clear which of the 11 current charter schools in New Hampshire were established at the local level and which were established by the State Board. Also, it was not clear if the dollars contributed through local per pupil funding follow the student into **state** charter schools. It appears as though local charter schools are guaranteed an amount to 80% of that district's average cost per pupil for the prior fiscal year.

The state does not provide funding for any school facilities.

The applicant stated that New Hampshire does enable LEAs "to operate innovative, autonomous public schools…other than charter schools." It provided as evidence its planning with five other New England States a secondary school consortium aimed at "empowering the next generation of citizens, workers, and leaders to be prosperous, knowledgeable, and responsible participants in our global community." The intent is to work with the League of Innovative Schools to support preparing graduating career- and college-ready students. Beyond the fairly general descriptions of this possible consortium, there is no further evidence as to how the state enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools or evidence of any existing "innovative, autonomous public schools."

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	**5**	**5**

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A most impressive innovation that New Hampshire has implemented is an outcome-based proof of competency whereby high schools can award credit earned through student demonstration of mastery of required competencies as "approved by certified school personnel." This permits out-of -school learning opportunities, alternative pathways to graduation, college-level courses taken in high school, a virtual learning academy charter school, and a possibility of awarding a high school graduation to students "when ready." As noted previously, the state is also involved with a consortium of other New England states to improve secondary schools in the region. Legislators in all consortium states have passed joint resolutions in support of this initiative which has been created "to foster forward-thinking innovations in the design and delivery of secondary education across the region."

Total	55	41

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	**15**	**0**

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

There was no significant discussion of STEM in the proposal nor was a section provided of any summary of a focus or plan related to STEM. Interestingly, a project budget was submitted associated with this STEM competitive priority; however, the amount requested was for "contractual" service, with insufficient detail to warrant the "all" points of the "all or nothing points" that could be awarded for this priority.

Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		**Yes**

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New Hampshire has comprehensively and coherently addressed all of the four education reform areas specific in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. Fifty-one percent of the school districts have signed on to participate which represents 60% of the schools statewide, 63% of the state's k-12 public school students, and

70% of its students in poverty. Evidence was provided that sufficient political and educational leadership in the state is supportive of the state's efforts to reform its schools in accordance with RttT criteria. The state is in good stead to participate in consortia that have developed high-quality standards and assessments and use related data to improve student achievement. It is committed to turning around its lowest-achieving schools, and the LEAs and principals of all such schools have signed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The state has put forth a comprehensive plan with related goals, activities, timelines, personnel or agency assignments, and proposed funding to support its efforts to reform its schools. Teacher buy-in is evaluated as "fair" with 56% of the local teachers' unions from the participating schools signing the MOU. Throughout the proposal, the state provided assurance that it will continue to work and "collaborate" with teacher's unions, administrators, and other stakeholders to achieve its proposed goals in education reform. New Hampshire has continued to allocate consistently its percentage of state revenue to education; that is, from 33.02% in FY 08 to 33.14% in FY 09 - a real dollar increase of 4.1%. It also has been and continues to be supportive of charter schools and is committed to operate other, autonomous public schools - especially high schools. The general tone and tenor of the proposal is that state leadership is committed to reform its schools as necessary with a focus on students and their achievement.

Total		0
Grand Total	500	358

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Hampshire Application #3500NH-4

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**31**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	20
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	6

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(1)

(i)

New Hampshire's theory of change to accomplish the goals of its reform agenda challenges a long tradition of local rule to forward the goal to engage all towns in a state education system. The strategies and tactics for New Hampshire's education reform agenda is based on the Race To The Top four reform areas and criteria. The reform agenda includes:

Implementation and Scale Up Activities: There are three levels of engagement – lowest performing schools, collaborative partnerships and innovation networks and professional development capacity building – informed by data systems and research;

Expected outcomes for improvement: Increases in student achievement, decreases in the achievement gap, increases in graduation rates, increases in students enrolling and completing post secondary education, improved teacher and leader preparation programs, ensure the equitable distribution of highly effective teachers;

Student and Systemic Impact: All students will graduate prepared to persist in college and/or pursue a financially sustainable career and an educational system that supports the development of personal and civic responsibility.

The agenda, at first glance, lays out a clear intention for improvement with specific goals, is data informed, focuses on the students and schools that can have the greatest growth and reflects a plan based on reflection of what has been learned from past failures and successes.

(ii)

(a) The terms and conditions in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establish a basis for transparency and accountability. The language in the section Joint Responsibilities, Item 5, "...or under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. By way of the signatures below, the LEA and local collective bargaining representative agree to confer in good faith over matters with the scope of the MOU", raises a red flag, especially as it relates to the number of LEA local union leaders that *did not* sign the MOU (more detailed information provided below).

(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	10
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	4

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(2)(i)

(a) The NHDOE, under the direction of the Commissioner, has created four State Department cross-departmental work teams aligned with the four reform areas. External resources will be contracted. The narrative states that the Commissioner's extended Cabinet will monitor operations; however, it is not clear from the application how this group fits into the construct for oversight and LEA support of the four reform areas and six projects (mentioned in the budget). It is mentioned that RTTT funds will be used to add twelve positions. These positions are not defined in the narrative, although there is evidence in the budget for the addition of a Race to the Top Director, Administrative Assistant, Education Consultants (5), Project Manager for the Data Warehouse, Business Analyst and Data Base Administrator, Program Specialist and Race to the Top Auditor. The five Education Consultants, DOE Content Specialists and School Improvement Teams will work with LEAs beginning with the lowest achieving schools. The absence of an organization chart makes it difficult to determine the extent to which the four cross-departmental teams and LEAs support resources are positioned to achieve the NHDOE goals.

(b) The NHDOE has a two-pronged approach, including services to all districts and intensive support to the lowest achieving schools. All LEAs will be exposed to promising practices through Innovation Networks during the statewide effort to define the specific tactics for each of the reform areas. Currently, all LEAs have access to information in the What Works Clearinghouse, the Doing What Works tools and website and other tools on the NHDOE website. Monthly NHDOE Commissioner statewide meetings provide a platform to share best practices regarding Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment. The evaluation of data, reports, and case studies will be overseen by the State's Research Group. A process, used by the State Board to hold LEAs accountable for high school graduation and drop out rates, is the model to improve performance of low achieving schools. It is not evident that this model is legislatively mandated to hold LEAs accountable for RTTT progress and performance or to provide a pathway to intervention. There is no mention of other means to hold LEAs accountable.

(c) There are not currently formal and structured processes or a system of checks and balances in place to oversee the efficient and effective operations and processes for the implementation of the RTTT grant. The narrative describes the staffing of new internal and external positions, funded by the RTTT grant, as well as new work processes that are planned to be embedded within the current leadership oversight processes.

(d) The budget narrative names several sources of state funds totaling $7,811,500 and describes federal funding sources that will be used to supplement the RTTT grant. The state funds are those used for local education improvement, special education improvement, and career and technology education. The Federal fund sources include the Title I School Improvement Grant, Title II grants. Funds from the Nellie Mae Foundation will also be directed to support the RTTT reform initiatives.

(e) The State has laid the foundation and momentum for a sustained reform agenda that began with the Governor's commitment to education. This commitment has resulted in the political will to link funding to educational policy with student outcomes as the goal and has focused attention on the NH adequate education formula. The NHDOE has invested its human capital to engage in two multi-state consortia for secondary schools and standards and assessments. Most notably, the NHDOE believes that its reorganization is a reflection of a transformative shift from a compliance organization to one that will offer

support to schools by powerfully modeling a continued focus on student learning and success. While the State and the NHDOE exhibit a strong commitment to reform, the use of external resources (supported by budget data) as a primary strategy during the early years of the grant raises the question of capacity and transfer of knowledge and expertise that will be needed to sustain the reform efforts.

The NHDOE's intention to implement its reform agenda is tempered by the introduction of experienced administrators, the use of contractors to provide expertise and the limited infrastructure to support the grant effort.

(A)(2)(ii)

(a) The narrative portrays broad inclusion of State teachers unions and principal associations, as well as other stakeholders, in the process to define and write the application. A disparity exists between the narrative which cites State level inclusion in the process to define and even write aspects of the application and the absence of local union leadership's support of the MOU (although there is a tepid letter of support from the NEA-NH). Also, the AFT has chosen not to support the application. The NH Principals Association is cited as being actively involved in the process although there is no letter of support. The distinction between inclusion and support is critical. Without overt support and commitment from the local and state union leadership and the teachers it will be difficult, if not impossible, to implement and sustain the State's reform agenda. A letter from the Health, Science and Technologies Teachers cites support for the RTTT application.

(b) Letters of support are included from State Legislators, post secondary institutions, associations and contracted resources. There are many letters of support that reference support of NHDOE STEM efforts. The letter from the NEA-NH cites support as are letters from the NH School Administrators Association. Letters from the NH Parent Information Center, Department of Corrections and Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Juvenile Justice were also present in the application. The letter from the Department of Resources and Economic Development contained the "letter guidance notes". The letter from the Great Schools Partnership was written for Connecticut.

The letter from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is for first round funding.

The predominance of support from external stakeholders – the policy makers - relative to seeming absence of support from those counted on to implement the reform agenda may challenge the State's intention to collaborate rather than mandate practice.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**13**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	3
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(3)

NECAP for High Schools - The NECAP data for high schools indicates that students' mathematics scored slowed from elementary/middle grades to high school. It shows that from 2007-2009 only 33% of all high school students scored at or above proficient compared with 72% of students in elementary/middle school. African American students' proficiency actually *declined* with only 9% of high school students scoring proficient or above. Economically disadvantaged students experienced an achievement gap consistent with Hispanic students. The scores for reading were slightly lower for student in high school, 73% compared to 77% for student in elementary/middle school.

The difference between grade levels is troubling in that it suggests that students are more likely to perform worse as they progress through New Hampshire's K-12 system.

(b) Overall the State has experienced steady increases in Elementary and Middle School achievement in both Mathematics and English Language Arts from 2005-2009. A closer look at the subgroups in these grade levels indicates a persistent and significant achievement gap in Mathematics between White and African American students (a 27% difference) and White and Hispanic students (a 24% difference). A similar persistent, yet lesser gap in Reading exists between White and African American and Hispanic students (a 20% difference for each). In high school, a closer look at the data suggests that with the exception of White students who improved by 1% in mathematics and by 10% in reading, and Hispanic students who improved by 1% in mathematics and 13% in reading, the gap is widening for African American students with gap that increased from 16% to 24% in mathematics and from 21% to 23% in reading.

The State says that its effort to provide teachers and leaders with increased access to data to inform instructional decisions has contributed to overall improved student outcomes. It is noted, however, that these efforts may not focus on strategies to meet the unique needs of individual students in the subgroups caught in the achievement gap.

(c) The Governor has a goal to increase the high school graduation rate to 100% by 2012. The data provided in the application indicates that the drop out rate has decreased from 14.4% in 2003-04 to 6.6% in 2008-09 suggesting a high school graduation rate of 93.4%. A closer look at the subgroups indicates improvement in the graduation for all subgroup. When comparing subgroups, African American and Hispanic students are dropping out at more that *twice the rate* of White students. Economically disadvantaged students dropped out at a rate of 45.5%, almost *seven times the average rate for the State.*

Conclusion

New Hampshire makes slow, but steady progress in achievement. However, when comparisons are made from elementary to middle to high school it appears that there is a decline in the average percent of students at or above proficient. What is most compelling about the data is the persistent and increasing achievement gap between the demographic subgroups and economically disadvantaged students. The narrative suggests that investments in curriculum, instruction and assessment are contributing to gains in student achievement. This is not borne out in the anlysis of the data and persist achievement gap.

Total	**125**	**58**

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	**40**	**40**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(1)

(i) The narrative states that NHDOE is a participating member of the 50 State member CCSSO Common Core Standards consortium. The consortium involves a majority of the States in the country. A letter from the Council of State Governments was included in the Appendix; however, a CCSSO MOU was not provided.

(ii) The NHDOE has actively engaged a number of different educator groups to review and provide feedback regarding the adoption of the Common Core Standards. The NH Teachers of Mathematics and literacy specialists organized the review and feedback sessions that included over 200 teachers for the Draft 1 and 2 review and organizaed the curriculum leaders representing over half of the LEAs and higher education faculty (for literacy) for the Draft 3 and 4 review. A meeting sponsored by the Concil of Governments and funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation was scheduled for June 1, 2010. Parents, legislators, unions, community groups and business leaders are also being invited to comment on the standards. In July 2010, the State Board will initiate a review process for the Common Core Standards with a planned adoption date of August 2, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(2)

(i) NHDOE has a history of working with Consortia to develop common assessments and was a founding member of the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). It has committed to participate in the SMARTER /Balance Assessment Consortium. NHDOE assessment staff is part of the design team for universal access and technology of computer adaptive testing and accommodation. It is also working with the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) to work towards end-of -course exams at high school.

(ii) The SMARTER/Balance Assessment Consortium has 32 members. The signed MOU is provided in Appendix B

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**10**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(3)

The NHDOE outlines a plan complete with goals, strategies, activities, timelines and identification of the responsible party for a game plan. The plan details NHDOE driven activities to implement the new standards and assessments in all LEAs with specific action to participating LEAs.

The steps in the plan include -

- Adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to establish a universal understanding and buy in;
- Integration and Dissemination of the CCSS (mapping to existing standards; integration into the curriculum alignment and integration into the Pre-K – 16 continuum, as well as into teacher preparation programs);
- Creation and Implementation of a comprehensive statewide next generation assessment system (formative and summative assessments embedded into the statewide system to be used to inform instruction);
- Mapping differentiated paths to provide students open access to curriculum and assessments (advance use of Universal Design for Learning and Assessment and alternative assessment processes); and
- Expansion of NH's data system to build assessment literacy (enabling educators to data mine multiple measures of performance to inform and improve instruction and increase student achievement);

The plan balances NHDOE's need to take a leadership role to introduce and support the new CCSS standards and assessments with the need to have LEA and key stakeholder (policy and practice leaders) participation to define local processes. The plan leverages a "high touch" and "high tech" approach by enlisting contracted teams of school improvement coaches, data coaches, new media coaches, content and leadership coaches supported by its professional development centers to work with educators to use the extensive professional development and assessment technologies. The school improvement teams will be contracted for the duration of the grant period. A total of four teams are budgeted in the first year, increasing to 8 teams for years two to four. It's not clear from the narrative or the budget the ratio of school improvement teams to LEAs, so it is not possible know the depth of the improvement team involvement and impact. The MOU outlines additional LEA requirements. The plan does not include specific milestones, especially for strategies that extend to multiple years.

The Performance Measures outline a game plan from 2010 to 2014. The thinking behind the timing of activities and their relationship to one another is not evident. For example, the State does not explain why the summative assessment will not be available until 2014 and what formative and summative assessments will be used until then to measure student achievement.

An organizing structure for the defined processes and use of resources is not evident. Other than beginning with the lowest performing schools, it is not clear how the State will organize, coordinate and manage the cadre of contracted resources being deployed into LEAs. It is not evident within LEAs how the strategies will be sustained. Feedback loops between NHDOE, the contracted resources and LEAs to inform progress and continuous improvement don't appear to be a part of the plan. There is no mention of utilizing the Research Group to identify trends and patterns of best practices that could improve the game plan and accelerate educator and student progress. Also, it is important to remember that while the State expects all LEAs to adopt the CCSS and assessments, it will only offer the support described in the plan to LEAs that have signed the MOU (49 of 163 LEAs).

Total	70	60

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**16**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(C)(1)

(i)

The State has fully implemented 8 elements of the America COMPETES Act. The elements not completed include 4, 9, 10 and 11.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	**5**	**3**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(C)(2)

The State will build upon its current SLDS to expand access and use of the system to key stakeholders. Of note, the State will expand its data collection of K-12 to P-20 and enable the "real time" transfer of data to impact decision making by all stakeholder groups. Creating awareness of the SLDS is an important State strategy and enlisted the use of a train the trainer model as well as working with the Research Group to promote use of the SLDS to higher education staff and students. Additionally, the State is focused on working with communities to build expertise in data use and collection. Performance measures target increase usage by USDOE staff, researchers, educators and parents. However, there is no way to determine the appropriateness of the targets and the impact that will be derived.

The primary focus of the SLDS usage is instruction and policy. No mention was made of the value of the system for use to inform operations, management, resource allocation and overall effectiveness.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**14**
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(C)(3)

(i)

Through the State's partnership with PerformancePLUS the State provides all LEAs with the ability to assess the impact of programs and analyze student data to target instructional strategies. It includes the ability to create formative and summative benchmark assessments to refine instruction. All components of the system are tied to state standards. As well, the State has a data repository for a wide array of P – 12 assessments and other statistics such as suspension, course completion, attendance, etc. that can be used to inform instruction.

(ii)

The strategies outlined appear to be focused on building capacity to use data as opposed to learning to leverage the instructional improvement systems for local impact. Although it can be inferred that the instructional improvement systems are used as part of the capacity building, the narrative suggests that the State provides LEAs with reports rather than teaching LEAs educators and leaders how to increase the use of the resident systems.

The Performance Measures do suggest a focus on increased involvement in professional development and increased PerformancePLUS use by parents, students and educators. The State's goal is that by 2012 every educator in New Hampshire will be trained to use the instructional improvement system and there will be a 200% increase in the number of system logins each day. The activities and timeline suggest that the State will build additional online training tools to encourage the use of the technology based systems and create an early warning system that advances the reform agenda. The State's goal for professional development and system use is very ambitious, especially given that the plan lacks precise details about how the State will enlist school data "champions", how it will increase resources for "train the trainer" efforts and how the training will be integrated into other programs.

(iii)

The State, since 2009, has encouraged partnership with researchers from universities, colleges and non-profit organizations throughout the State. A web page is available to create awareness about the availability of the data warehouse. Researchers can sign an MOU to request student level data. The narrative indicates that the NHDOE plans to use RTTT funds to fund research grants. Ensuring that researchers have access to NHDOE's data warehouse to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional methodologies and materials is aligned with the criteria; however, using RTTT to fund the research appears to extend beyond the bounds of the criteria.

Total	47	33

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**13**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	4
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(1)

(i) The State provides for alternative pathways to certification as described in Appendix D-1-3, NH Regulation PartEd 505 and Description of NH Certification Pathways. It is not evident from the document that the NHDOE meets all five of the RTTT Alternate Routes to Certification criteria. For example, there is no evidence that alternative independent providers are selective in accepting candidates or significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses. There is no specific evidence of Alternative Routes to Licensure for principals.

(ii) Three methods are used for non-traditional pathways to certification. These methods include a demonstration of competency based on the preparation of a portfolio and/or regional or national certification, a professional development plan focused on a critical shortage content area and support by an approved mentor or a Bachelor's degree plus 30 hours in a specific content area. Each of these methods

includes the use of formative and summative assessments to ensure competency. During 2008 - 2009 a total of 82 teachers and 5 principals were certified via an alternative pathway. This represents approximately 6% of the total number of certified teachers and principals during 2008 - 2009.

(iii) The State has a process to determine areas of critical shortage; however, there is no evidence of a plan to fill these shortages beyond communicating the information with stakeholders to fill these positions. The State uses three data sets to determine areas of critical shortage: the Statewide Critical Shortage survey data, reports from NH approved teacher preparation programs, and the number of candidates receiving certification through non traditional methods. Information about teacher shortages is provided by the State through its website to colleges and universities and through the promotion of education as a career to high school students. The data provided in Appendix D-1-4 shows that 35% of those who enter the NH teacher preparation programs are employed by the NHDOE.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**19**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	7
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	2
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(2)

(i) NECAP measures student achievement at prescribed grade levels throughout the student's educational path. And according to the State, this data does not provide a basis to assess student growth. The State provides LEAs with resources to create individualized learning plans by using NECAP, a student survey, local benchmark formative and summative assessments, competency based assessments (high school), end of course tests and performance assessments. These sources of data and PerformancePLUS are described as being used until the State completes its plan for a normative growth model. The narrative does not provide for a game plan and the budget does not specify funding allocations to develop the growth model.

(ii) The State describes a statewide teacher and principal performance management system designed to link career progression, performance outcomes and student growth. The performance management system includes performance standards, the use of multiple measures, incentives, professional development and the opportunity to collaborate for continuous improvement. LEAs are currently using three different methodologies to evaluate performance. The highest percentage of LEAs are using Charlotte Danielson's model. This model, with the addition of a student growth metric, will become the foundation for the State's new model. LEAs will be able to substitute a different model and replace the state recommended domains. Effectiveness, as it is described in the narrative for both teachers and principals, seems to be focused on *process* rather than *student outcomes*. It is not apparent from the narrative how effectiveness will be defined and evaluated. The State plans to convene two statewide task forces. Teacher unions as well as other associations, parents and students will be invited to participate. It is not clear that teachers and principals will be actively engaged in the design of the performance management system and definition of teacher and principal effectiveness. It is also not mentioned what needs to occur at the local level for the adoption of a new performance management system in those LEAs whose union leaders did not sign the MOU.

(iii) The State outlines a two-tiered evaluation plan and distinguishes between beginning and experienced educators based on the number of years of service and prior evaluations and allows for local differentiation based on local context and student needs. The plan does include a provision for the annual evaluation of teachers and principals. As a result, the plan is not consistent with the criteria and as described does not hold all teachers and principals accountable for annual student growth; nor does it portray a sense of urgency and degree of focus on performance criteria and outcomes needed for a rapid response to improve instruction and close the existing achievement gaps. This plan appears to be more focused on teacher rather than student needs.

(iv)

(a) The State will contract an external resource for 3 years to provide professional development for teachers and coaching for principals. A variety of methodologies will be used to support the professional development including a one year pilot, summer institutes and regional training at the Regional Professional Development Centers. Central offices in LEAs will be provided professional development. This effort will be supported by the purchase of an off the shelf web tool that includes rubrics for evaluation, portfolio storage and additional training. The process for incorporating induction was not addressed in the narrative or in the budget.

(b) The narrative describes that the results of the evaluation system will be used to inform compensation, promotion and retention decision. It is not evident from the information provided how the evaluation system will be used to provide any substantive insight when the evaluation system does not provide for an annual summative teacher and principal evaluation. The data derived from the interim years do not offer enough insight into the performance rigor and links to student growth that need to be the basis for these decisions. The information provided in the narrative does not describe the processes for making these decisions nor does it describe how these programs will be developed and implemented. There is an absence of consideration for how the evaluation system will inform the educators' career and succession paths.

(c) The State uses the performance evaluation to award certification. The State's plan as outlined and previously mentioned is not a rigorous process holding teachers accountable for annual performance and outcomes. The three year evaluation calendar does not serve students' interest and has the potential to retain ineffective teachers.

(d) Based on the evaluation system described in the narrative, it could take up to three years to remove an ineffective teacher or principal. State law allows LEAs to choose not to re-nominate an educator due to unsatisfactory performance.

Conclusion

The State's plan lacks performance rigor and a focus on linking educator evaluation to student growth needs. As detailed, it does not represent the spirit of the RTTT innovation needed to affect profound improvement to create great teachers and leaders. Additionally, the performance measures reflect a poor adoption of the plan among participating LEAs over a four year period of time. Finally, the adoption timeline is slow to affect changes that are needed to impact student achievement.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**12**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	7

(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(3)

(i) The state has focused its attention to ensure Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) are in every school. Data from a 2007 research project found that NH had an equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers. The shifting focus from highly qualified to highly effective challenges the State to create a plan to maintain this effort and to bridge information from its various data systems to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals. The increase in the State's overall poverty, the increase in minorities, and the increase of students in the juvenile corrections system are compelling the State to look more closely at its processes. The State plans to research various models, including incentive models, that impact the distribution of effective teachers and leaders. The Performance Measures suggest rigorous targets to increase the number of effective teachers in high poverty and/or high minority schools. This ambitious plan is inconsistent with the limitations of the evaluation system.

(ii) The narrative describes how NH's alternative pathways has resulted in 153 teachers being hired to staff difficult to fill positions in math, science, world languages and special education. Legislation has streamlined the pathway by revamping the certification process to speed certification and maintaining rigor and consistency. No mention was made of a strategy to entice current staff to move into the difficult to fill positions. Performance measures show rigorous targets to increase the percentage of effective math, science and special education teachers in the absence of a rigorous and assured plan to populate these positions with external or internal candidates.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**7**
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	2
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	5

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(4)

(i) As noted in (D)(2)(i) the State uses NECAP to determine student achievement; however, the State did not provide information about a formal plan to determine student growth. The narrative states that the NHDOE is building the capacity to link student achievement and growth data to teacher preparation programs with the intention of having a plan "up and running by spring 2011". No specific plan was detailed and no mention was made of how this data, if available, would be disaggregated by institution and reported to the public. No mention was made in the budget to support this effort.

(ii) The State plans to leverage policy, use teacher residency programs, its statewide network of P-20 partnerships and a sustained dialogue among P-20 educators and NHDOE personnel to expand preparation and educator credential options. The centerpiece of this effort is the creation of the teacher residency program. This program will be funded by the RTTT grant and will increase the amount of time pre-service teachers will spend in schools from one year (the last year of the preparation program) to four years (all four years of the preparation program). The performance measures indicate that by 2014 100% of teacher preparation programs in the State will participate and that 100% of principal preparation programs will be on board by the end of 2012. The plan as outlined, which includes an evaluation

component, policy foundation and input from key stakeholders does not provide evidence about how these key activities will be integrated to achieve the State's intended outcomes.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**10**
(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	3

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(5)

(i) The State's strategic plan includes goals targeted at pre-service, induction and mentoring processes as well as creating school structures to allow for common planning time and learning communities, developing formative and summative assessments, performance incentives and developing a leadership pipeline.

The State has in place a system of professional development processes that includes LEA developed plans and USDOE provided resources. Each LEA is required to submit a Professional Development Master Plan (PDMP) to the NHDOE (with updates every five years). The plan is developed and managed by an LEA professional development committee and is designed to be linked to the LEAs Technology and School Improvement Plans. The PDMP also integrates information about recertification and the Individual Professional Development Plans.

There is no evidence how the five year PDMP cycle and the 3 year cycle of certification and performance evaluation cycle link to teacher effectiveness and student growth. The extended period of time in each of these systems does not suggest that information is provided rapid time to impact the processes and practices that will inform teacher and principal effectiveness and student growth.

Based on the State's analysis of the effectiveness and impact of its professional development practices, the State will focus its efforts on the following priorities – assessment, data informed instructional practice, teacher effectiveness, leadership, high school redesign and STEM. Embedded in these priorities are the RTTT criteria for this aspect of the reform plan. The delivery of this content will be facilitated through five mechanisms – technology integration, innovation networks, NH induction and mentoring, leadership academies and content-based professional development. Generational learning preferences will be considered and teachers will be provided portal to "just in time" professional development, social networking and access to best practices. Coaches and a train the trainer model will be used to drive the professional development into the localized LEA and school setting. Regional Professional Development Centers and the web-based OPEN-NH for on-line courses are provided by the NHDOE.

It was not evident in the budget how funds will be delineated to fund and support the technology and human resources required to support the above mentioned strategies.

(ii) Although the State has demonstrated in this application a focus on research and analysis to inform practice, the narrative focuses only on measuring the impact of the innovation networks. An analysis of the comprehensive system to inform continuous improvement was not detailed in this section.

Total	138	61

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	**10**	**10**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(E)(1)

(i) The NHDOE has statutory right to intervene in schools and LEAs not meeting state performance targets according to New Hampshire law RSA 1093-H: School Performance and Accountability. The law also gives the State Board and the State Education Commissioner the right to withhold or direct federal funding.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**31**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	26

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(E)(2)

(i) The State has a process to identify its lowest achieving schools. The formula is based on four years of data and uses NECAP raw data for mathematics and English language arts converted into a 100 point index score system. The two scores are added together for a combined annual score. Based on the process and scoring system to identify schools, 7 elementary/middle schools from the Title I Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring List (5% of 132) and five high schools from the Title I eligible list were selected. The list of these schools was not provided.

(ii) The state uses what appears to be a hybrid of the transformation model based on past successes and the requirements of the school intervention model to improve its lowest performing schools. This model includes the support of an external consultant and focuses on improving school leadership, assessment, data analysis, curriculum, instruction, professional development and high school redesign practices. The six LEAs, representing the 12 schools, have signed an MOU that binds them to choosing one of the intervention models and to follow criteria established by the NHDOE that provides minimum standards for involvement. Five of the six LEAs are identified in the budget. Of the five, three of the LEAs did not have a union leadership signature. Also, these five LEAs are small relative to others in the state (some of the LEAs have as few as three schools). The State is bringing the full force of its resources to bear on these schools. It does not appear, though, that the transformation plan accounts for differentiated strategies based on the size of the LEA and the schools and the investment necessary. When comparing the State's approach to the transformation model, it appears that the State's hybrid model incorporates most of the elements of this intervention model. It is noted that the State's reform model will be customized with input from the LEAs and will also be a blend of current and planned practices and processes while the State implements its proposed reform agenda. The State's transformational model also includes a program focused on strengthening school and LEA relationships with parents/guardians and community members.

Total	**50**	**41**

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**8**
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	3

(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(1)

(i)

The percentage of total revenues are substantially unchanged from 33.02% in FY08 to 33.14% in FY09.

(ii)

The State's funding formula is based on funding for all students and includes provisions to provide additional funding based on the percentage of free and reduced lunch students. Towns with a lower tax base receive additional funding to offset the lack of tax dollars. Additionally, the State requires LEAs to report how funds will be spent at the school level to unsure that the neediest students receive supplemental funding.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**17**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	5
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	4
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	5
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(2)

(i)

Although the Governor is expected to sign HB1495 in June to lift a ten year program enacted in 2003 that limits to 20 the total number of State Board initiated charter schools, the State currently has a cap on the number of charter schools. There is no limit for the number of charter schools at the local level.

(ii)

Information in the narrative indicates that there are requirements and processes in place to approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize and close charter schools. Until recently, charter schools have been held to the same accountability standards as the public schools including student achievement, responsible use of public funds, promoting student attainment of expected skills/knowledge and sustainability. The NHDOE conducted quarterly and annual reviews of its charter schools. Changes to the NH Charter School Law, RSA 194B impacts how often charter schools are to be monitored. The new legislation requires that all charter schools in NH be reviewed and evaluated once every five years rather than once every year. This change in monitoring appears to reduce the requirement for rigorous accountability. This creates an inconsistency with public school accountability, especially as it relates to the annual monitoring of student achievement. The information provided in Appendix F-1-1 indicates that 11 charter schools are operating and 1 application is being considered. No information about the number of charter applications that have been denied was provided. A copy of the charter school law was not provided in the appendix.

(iii)

Charter schools receive at least 80% of the district's average cost per pupil for the prior fiscal year. Charter eligible for grants must match state provided funding with private funds based on a state formula. Charter schools receive $5,450 per student in adequacy payments and receive additional funds based on student needs.

(iv)

The State does not provide funding for facilities for any charter schools.

(v)

The narrative indicates that the State allows LEAs to operate autonomous and innovative public schools. The State mentions that it is engaged in a multi-state consortium with plans to work together to implement a League of Innovative Schools to support career and college ready students. There is no mention in the narrative or evidence in the application of how the State works with LEAs to operate these innovative schools based on the RTTT criteria for open enrollment, increased accountability, flexibility to define instructional models and curriculum, staff selection, school operations and budget controls.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	**5**	**4**

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(3)

The State's student achievement decrease in proficiency in higher grades is evidence of the need for secondary school innovation. The focus of NHDOE policy driven innovations efforts are on improving high school processes to impact student achievement and graduation rates. Strategies being employed included a change to an outcomes-based proof of competence (rather than "seat time") and extended learning opportunities that allow for 16-18 years olds at risk of dropping out to engage in alternative pathways to graduation, to acquire college credit while in high school, provide virtual learning approaches for students in rural circumstances and the "when ready" graduation that allows students to matriculate to high education if appropriate for the learner. There is evidence provided in (A)(2)(iii) that these strategies are having a positive impact on stemming the drop out rate. The data provided indicates that the drop out rate has decreased from 14.4% in 2003-04 to 6.6% in 2008-09.

The State is also part of a multi-state regional collaboration to redefine 21st century secondary schools. The Collaboration is examining state and local policies, global best practices, assessment best practices, digital technology, competency based evidence and measures and evidence of workplace skills as part of its approach. Additionally, the State is examining innovative approaches to expand charter schools within the State.

There is evidence in the student achievement data of the need to address the State's persistent achievement gap across all grades. There is no evidence of a NHDOE strategy to employ innovative practices to address the unique needs of each of the subgroups to close the achievement gap.

Total	55	29

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) STEM was mentioned in the introductory remarks and mentioned throughout the narrative, as well being an item of focus in the professional development curriculum. There is an absence of information in the narrative about a rigorous course of study, integrating STEM throughout the curriculum and preparing students for more advanced study and STEM careers for underrepresented groups, women and girls. However, the budget allocates $2,375.000 for STEM related strategies including the implementation of model STEM programs in middle and high schools in a minimum of two LEAs; transforming an industrial arts program into a statewide, cutting edge pre-engineering program for grades 7, 8 and 9; partnership with New Hampshire public colleges to implement college level courses into 25 LEAs to encourage students into math and technical oriented careers; collaborate with New Hampshire public colleges to offer focused teacher training in Regional LEAs in science and finally, supporting the STEM professional development curriculum.		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		**Yes**

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Absolute Priority

The NHDOE reform agenda, built on efforts begun in 2004-05 by the State Board of Education, to hold LEAs accountable to school approval standards and graduation and completion standards, is consistent with New Hampshire's tradition of local control leavened by statewide transparency and accountability.

The NHDOE presents a focused and prioritized reform plan that weaves together the support of the State's LEAs who have committed and standards for those that are not committed to the reform agenda. The reform plans engages DOE resources, professional service providers, consortia and higher education partnerships to improve the lowest performing schools and to implement a foundation to improve student achievement and ensure all students are ready for college or a career.

Nearly 83% of the Total Direct Cost portion of the budget (32% of the total budget) is directed to contracting external resources. This suggests that the capacity to implement and sustain practices will reside outside the NHDOE. The transfer of knowledge to NHDOE and the LEAs was not explicitly described. With expertise residing outside the system the State appears to be only in a position to manage rather than lead the reform agenda. A concise organizational construct was not provided nor was it explained how the State will ensure a systemic, aligned and organized approach between the State, the external resources and the LEAs.

The State is focused on increasing attention on individual student as well as subgroup performance and focuses professional development resources and technology to illuminate data informed strategies to close the achievement gap. The reform agenda pays rigorous attention to implementation of common core standards, the design new summative and formative assessment linked to the standards and plans to increase the graduation rate. Less rigor and innovation is evident in the plan to create great teachers and leaders, particularly regarding the teacher and principal evaluation system. What is not evident in the application is the extent to which the local commitment from the labor union impacts this reform area. Performance management is an essential part of a comprehensive reform agenda. An effective strategy links teacher and principal behaviors and practices to student growth. Without rigor in the human capital processes it calls into question what the State will need to do to ensure a bridge between people practices

and student outcomes to create a comprehensive system of reform and innovation to achieve the aggressive goals set for this application.		
Total		0

Grand Total	**500**	**282**

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Hampshire Application #3500NH-6

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**47**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	30
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

This state has engaged in numerous and important reform activities including adoption of state standards and assessments along with a statewide achievement database. The present Race to the Top (RTTT) plan builds on these previous accomplishments and addresses efforts related to the enhancement of student achievement, high school graduation and college readiness. The state plans to develop and implement a new teacher and principal evaluation system that includes student achievement as a key element. In short, the state has generated a comprehensive plan aligned with RTTT goals.

The state has made important efforts to secure Local Education Agency (LEA) commitments that ensure a statewide effort. However, only 51% of LEAs are indicated as participating. This participation level does include some 60% of all state students, and 70% of students identified as in poverty. It was successful in obtaining MOU sign-off from 100% of superintendents in participating LEAS, 93% of LEA board chairs, and 56% of LEA teacher leader representatives. These sign-offs are an important indicator of statewide support and potential impact, however some issues may lead to reduced impact:

- The MOU allows LEAs to submit a final plan aligned with the state's RTTT plan within 90 days--this leaves some concern for LEA plan quality and final statewide impact effects should those plans not be approved or require modification/negotiation.
- Some 54% of teacher leaders did not sign-off on the MOU-- this leaves the possibility of lessened support by teachers statewide.
- 30% of the students identified as in poverty are not in the participating LEAs, mitigating effects on a significant number of these students in this state.

The state describes three levels of engagement with LEAs that are dependent on the "needs" of the LEA and a logic that efforts would be focused on the most "needy" then scaled to the entire state. This seems reasonable and could be effective. Student outcome goals are articulated for achievement, achievement gap reduction, high school graduation and college attendance but they do not seem ambitious, particulary with regard to achievment gap reductions for underrepresented groups. The lack of setting such goals seems problematic for overall implementation and evaluation of the RTTT efforts.

Overall, the state plan as articulated in this proposal builds on present efforts in an important way but could be weakened by issues related to statewide impact and lack of setting student outcome goals.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**22**

(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	14
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The capacity for the state to implement the proposed plan is supported by a re-organized Department of Education that aligns directly with RTTT elements. The Departments will form work teams that are meant to implement the RTTT plan in supporting LEAs. The Education Commissioner will oversee its efforts and coordinate with other ongoing Department of Education activities. An RTTT Project Director will be employed to ensure day to day operations in operations and financial domains. RTTT resources are intended to be used to provide system level developmental support that would allow the antecedents of the RTTT products to be sustained once RTTT funds are expended. When examining the budget that will be used to implement the plan, some 33% of the requested budget will be for contracted services and therefore places a great deal of burden on the quality of those services. Although this may not be overly problematic, no effort to describe quality assurances in the outsourcing endeavor is available in the proposal. The budget calls for hiring of 12 new Department employees to implement the plan. These employees will take responsibility for supporting participating LEAs with regard to standards development, assessment development and training related to the utilization of new data and evaluation systems. Such hiring will significantly enhance the capacity to implement the proposed plan, but may place a burden on the Department when the RTTT funds are expended. The state does indicate that state resources will be repurposed and utilized to support the RTTT plan.

Since a statewide impact requires support of teachers and principals, the absence of substantial support on the MOUs by teachers is relevant here in assessing support of the plan by these stakeholders, although teachers and principals as stakeholders were involved in the plan development process. Overall, other stakeholders in higher education, businesses, related professional associations, etc, affirm their support in positive letters.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**22**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state is making progress in all reform areas of importance in the RTTT request-for-proposal (rfp)--starting in the late 1990's with adopting standards, utilizing statewide assessments including a growth model and has updated its teacher certification rules along with initiating efforts to turnaround its lowest achieving schools.

New Hampshire has a record of solid student achievement enhancement. It has made improvements in student achievement, overall, on NAEP and state level student assessments.

There has been no substantial decrease in achievement gaps. The high school graduation rate has increased but gaps exist particularly for African Americans.

Overall, progress at the implementation level of reform is evident, with some positive indicators of progress in student performance.

Total	**125**	**91**

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	**40**	**40**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New Hampshire is actively participating in several key state consortia related to high standards development. Those consortia include the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) and Common Core--this participation provides evidence of the state working with over half of the states working on standards development.

The state has begun the process of adoption of the Common Core standards and will formally adopt the standards by August 2, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state is also working collaboratively with other states in developing high quality assessments. This includes consortia efforts with NECAP, SMARTER, Board Exam Systems, and, participation in a consortium led by the United Sates Education Department (USED) with 33 states.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**20**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state as a solid history in articulating standards and related assessment systems and moving those to implementation at LEAs and schools though targeted professional development. Some of these same efforts will be the base for transitioning LEAs and schools to the use of new standards and assessments. The timeline for implementing the training is ambitious but achievable given past efforts by this state. Of special note is the effort to address professional development using existing regional centers and working with professional associations, like the teacher and administrative association, to implement professional development. The regional centers already have the infrastructure available to move forward with this new training with established positive relationships with LEAs and on going efforts with them. These centers and LEAs will reach out to the local professional organizations to tap the professional expertise that can be utilized for training of teachers and principals. This is a potential plus since it utilizes local expertise that are familiar with local circumstances. The implementation plan and related professional development support goals are clear, significant to the reform effort and achievable.

Total	**70**	**70**

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**16**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state indicates it has in place eight of the twelve data elements articulated in the America COMPETES Act. Other elements are under construction but not presently up and running.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	**5**	**3**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state plan for the data system is quite comprehensive and will attempt to reach a wide set of audiences --the plan will makes use of the understanding that the system must be accessible to a wide array of audiences. Little specifics are provided, particularly as they relate to access to non-digitized information and information to audience whose primary language is not English.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**18**
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A specific plan is described that will provide comprehensive educator access to a wide array of data. The access to student level performance data by teacher/classroom, school and LEA will allow expanded use of the data system. When in place, the system will provide a variety of ways in which LEAs, schools and teachers can utilize student performance assessments. Specifically, the system can provide up to date information of student performance and be linked with potential intervention strategies. In addition, there will be specific and designated efforts in the Department through RTTT funding to provide support for training on data access and use by educators--some of this is already in place and RTTT funds will assist in expediting these activities. LEAs have agreed to participate in Regional Centers where support can be tailored to specific needs. Access to the data by researchers and evaluators will be enhanced with a specific web portal--specific MOU's will allow researchers and evaluators to independent have access to the system.

Total	**47**	**37**

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**10**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	5
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	1
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Legal provision for alternative routes to teacher training are available in New Hampshire but not evident that this is the case for principals.

These alternatives are not presently utilized to any substantive degree--less than 6% of educators are generated from those alternatives.

The state takes an aggressive role in identifying teacher shortages with a yearly survey and monitoring of teacher preparation data. However, the state does not indicate any specific efforts that would lead to addressing the shortages identified though those efforts.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**27**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	5
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	12

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's present data system does not make use of the student growth model for all grades. Plans articulated in the RTTT proposal call for development, pilot testing and final implementation of the updated student assessment system by 2014 that does include a student growth model.

There is no present educator evaluation system in this state, although some districts are using systems of their own. These district evaluation efforts have primarily been designed on the Danielson Framework. This tool does incorporate at least 50% of the evaluation on student performance. A state task force to develop professional standards for the new system will be convened immediately after funding for RTTT is determined in 2010—this task force will guide the development of the system over a three year period with piloting to begin with the selected 12 LEAs that are the lowest achieving in the state. The task force will include participation of teachers and principals. Although the plan is reasonable, full scale-up operation of the system will not be in place until near the end of RTTT funding, and, the development of the system as well as its piloting will need to remain strictly on schedule to meet the implementation goal of 2014.

The state indicates that yearly evaluations will be utilized for various purposes including retention and full credentialing of non-tenured teachers and yearly evaluation of principals. Tenured teachers will be reviewed yearly, with a summative evaluation every three years. But details are not available with regard to the scope for which the evaluations will be utilized for compensation, promotion, or removal. Overall, the state plan for a robust educator evaluator system leading to educator effectiveness addresses most key aspects of the RTTT criteria, but details are unavailable for other elements.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**12**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	7
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

With the new educator evaluation system in place, the state will "search" for gaps relative to equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals in high-poverty and high-minority schools throughout the state. Some strategies for doing so were sketched out in the proposal but no specifics with regard to that "searching" were made available in the proposal.

The state indicates it will attempt to address the broader issue of inequitable distribution of effective educators in hard to staff areas by using differential pay such as stipends and bonuses to attract teachers to where they might be needed most and by using enhanced efforts with the Future Teachers of America, secondary students indicating an interest in teaching, to bolster recruitment of teachers. These incentives/bonus plans and the expanded efforts with Future Teachers were not described in detail.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**6**

(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	3
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	3

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state will rely heavily on the implementation of the data systems to provide key data that links teachers to student performance and teacher preparation entities. The plan calls for that linkage, but no specifics as to when or how that linkage will be completed or how the data will be reported or lead to expanding effective programs. Description of linkages to principal preparation programs was not evident in the proposal.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**13**
(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state will utilize the educator evaluation system that it proposes to identify needed areas of educator support and enlist entities such Regional Centers along with LEA efforts to provide support to educators. This proposed effort can be useful in providing effective support to educators. However, the concern remains that the system will not be fully engaged until late in this grant period and only so if there are not delays in the developmental and pilot testing of the system.

The state will track individual participation in the support efforts and will identify effective educators that can assist in the delivery of support. The evaluation plan calls for collection of various artifacts related to the implementation of these supports. However, it remains unclear how all these artifacts will be directly linked for purposes of continuous improvement.

Total	**138**	**68**

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	**10**	**10**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state, through legislative approved action and related education regulation, has direct authority to intervene in the turnaround of low achieving schools.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**40**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has identified 12 persistently lowest achieving schools that it will work with using the student performance data base that is in place. Although utilization of the growth model would be more precise--the one the state has proposed developing--the present system is robust enough to identify these lowest performing schools.

The state plans to augment the utilization of a New Hampshire developed turnaround methodology similar to one articulated in the RTTT rfp . The state has demonstrated some success in turning around low

achieving schools with this model. The model utilizes a partnership between the New Hampshire Department of Education and external partners to focuses efforts on professional development, data system implementation, focused monitoring, leadership development and other related school improvement elements. After funding of RTTT, the state would work with the 12 identified schools to develop specific plans suited to each schools circumstances and implement a plan within 90 days. A timetable for turnaround is provided that seems reasonable. Overall, the state is building on a template of success and is addressing key elements critical to turning around low achieving schools.

Total	50	50

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The proportion of state funding dedicated to education rose significantly in budget years 2008-2009.

New Hampshire includes in its state funding formula for LEAs a set of adjustments related to equity.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**26**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	5
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	5
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New Hampshire law presently limits charter school establishment by the state school board but has no restrictions on establishment of local charters. This is somewhat confusing and may or maynot lead to "caps" on charter schools.

The state has a comprehensive system for the approval and qualitative evaluation of charter schools. It holds charter scools accountable in the same way it does all schools and provides for a substantive 5-year review each five years.

The state has a direct set of funding mechanism for charters, however charter school are provided only 80% of per pupil funding provided to other state, public schools.

The state does not provide funding for any charter school facilities.

LEAs are provided the authority that enables LEAs to develop and operate "innovative" schools--a New England partnership including this state has begun to plan for such schools in the participating states.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	**5**	**5**

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) This state has been engaged in numerous reform activities in addition to efforts related to standards implementation, student assessment systems, charter schools and related RTTT indicated reforms. For example, it has led the effort to augment student learning through expanded opportunity to learn, early college going programs and students garnering college credits in the K-12 system. These efforts can be attributed to New Hampshire overall enhancement of student academic performance.		
Total	55	41

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	**15**	**0**
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The state has not provided any comprehensive description in the proposal of expanded efforts in its RTTT plan related to establishing a more rigorous course of study in STEM, or preparing more students for STEM careers with any emphases on women and underrepresented students.		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		**Yes**
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Overall, this state is building on a platform of reform that extends over the last decade. Its RTTT plan calls for enhanced student data systems development, an educator evaluation system and support of reform activities that could be of significance statewide. The plan does lack substantive support by some sectors of educators and its data systems will not be fully scaled until 2014. Even so, with the plan fully in place, it could be effective in significantly improving teaching and learning in the state.		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	357