NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

New Hampshire Ensuring Equitable Access for all Students to Excellent Educators

June 1, 2015

New Hampshire

Ensuring Equitable Access for all Students to Excellent Educators

Section 1: Introduction

The New Hampshire Department of Education (NH DOE) is pleased to submit the following plan to the U.S. Department of Education (USED) to address the long-term needs for improving equitable access to great teachers in New Hampshire. This plan responds to Education Secretary Arne Duncan's July 7, 2014, letter to SEAs, as augmented with additional guidance published on November 10, 2014. The New Hampshire plan complies with *(1) the requirement in Section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that each state's Title I, Part A plan include information on the specific steps that the SEA will take to ensure that students from low-income families, students of color, and students with special needs are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers, and the measures that the agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the agency with respect to such steps; and (2) the requirement in ESEA Section 1111(e)(2) that a state's plan be revised by the SEA, if necessary.*

This plan details our approach to achieving the objective of improving access to excellent educators for the state's most disadvantaged youth. New Hampshire is committed to improving student outcomes across the state by expanding access to excellent teachers for *all* students. The New Hampshire plan is a comprehensive, systemic, and on-going approach to strengthening and maintaining teacher effectiveness across the state, with an emphasis on our schools and classrooms with the greatest need. Even though New Hampshire has the lowest poverty rate for public school students in the nation (27 percent)[1], and the initial data from the 2011 Equity Profile for New Hampshire provided by the USED shows very little difference between high and low poverty schools and districts, we recognize that there may be areas of need within the state that require more targeted assistance to assure that all students have access to excellent educators.

New Hampshire is quite small and is comprised mainly of rural districts of limited size. However, there are two small urban districts in the state. Because of size disparities across districts, the quantitative data can mask issues and do not always paint a true picture of the needs within the state. For this reason, New Hampshire intends to use a blended dataset which will utilize both quantitative data currently available at the NH DOE and qualitative data that will be drawn from local districts and schools through a combination of focus group discussions and key informant interviews. It is our intent to create a complete and robust plan that is focused on providing the necessary supports to teachers and leaders so that we are confident that all students are being served by excellent educators. As such we are committed to using data to undergird the process of root cause analysis, as well as the development of meaningful, measurable strategies that will address any issues of equitable access that surface. This is truly an opportunity for the entire New Hampshire community to understand a systems-approach that analyzes, revises, and expands on current initiatives to assure that the focus remains on providing equitable access to excellent educators for all students in New Hampshire.

[1] Southern Education Foundation's research bulletin (January 2015)

Process:

To create this plan, a team of NH DOE personnel[2], coordinated by the Administrator for Educator Effectiveness, took the following steps:

1. Developed and began implementing a long-term strategy for engaging stakeholders by creating and convening an initial group of diverse educational professionals, parents and community stakeholders as the "Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Task Force" (henceforth known as the Task Force). The work of the Task Force has been based on the task force models set forth by the Commissioner of Education in the New Hampshire Task Forces on Effective Teaching Phase I and Phase II.

2. Reviewed data provided by USED and the NH DOE's Educator Information System (EIS) to identify initial equity gaps. More information about available data will be explained further in this plan.

3. Conducted root-cause analyses with stakeholders based on currently available data to identify the challenges that underlie equity gaps to identify and target strategies accordingly.

4. Developed an initial set of appropriate strategies to begin to address root causes.

Upcoming Next Steps:

5. The Task Force will continue to move forward in the development of the plan to determine the monitoring and reporting of progress of strategy implementation.

6. The NH DOE Internal Team (henceforth known as the Internal Team) has begun to identify existing mechanisms listed below through which it will communicate findings and gather additional information. These include: monthly regional meetings of superintendents of schools, monthly special education directors' meetings, monthly regional principals' meetings, monthly NHSAA (New Hampshire School Administrators Association) meetings, regular meetings on early childhood education through the NH SPARK(the governor's early childhood advisory group) and biannual conferences at NEA-NH. The Internal Team will also communicate plan information to educators and the public across the state through the NH DOE's monthly newsletter, *Key Messages*, as well as through social media and an online learning platform called the *New Hampshire Network*. In addition, the Internal Team will reach out to the Task Force for recommendations to continue outreach efforts to parents, community organizations and minority advocacy groups.

Scan of State-Level Policies, Initiatives, and Currently Available Data:

New Hampshire relies on local governance for many decisions about education across the state. In addition to laws and policies in place at the local level, New Hampshire has policies and initiatives that have been promulgated at the state level. The Task Force reviewed the rules and initiatives that the state has updated, revised and implemented over the last several years. These include, but are not limited to:

1. Updated Educator Information System, (EIS)
2. New Hampshire Networks
3. Professional Development Master Plan Rules (Ed 512)

[2] See appendix "A" for members of the planning committee

4. Teacher and Leader Preparation Program Approval Rules (Ed 600's)
5. New Hampshire Task Force on Effective Teaching: Phase I Report
6. The New Hampshire Task Force on Effective Teaching: Phase II Report
7. Relevant data from State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS)
8. Ed Facts data
9. English Speakers of Other Languages data collection (ESOL database)
10. Immigrant Count (Education Statistics System)

While use of data played a limited role in the New Hampshire State Equity Plan of 2010-2011, the NH DOE is clear that this plan must use data to help guide the state in addressing issues of equity. Areas in which data are not currently available to undergird the identification of gaps of equitable distribution of excellent educators to our students from low-income families and students of color will hold a component place of required next steps within the plan. This will be used to create the necessary data collection mechanisms so that analyses can be done and appropriate strategies developed moving forward. Further, and in contrast to the previous plan, this plan is being developed with input from a representative group of stakeholders. Though the previous plan lacked these two components, the state has learned a great deal from the research conducted in the previous plan and has begun to successfully address both the data needs identified and some of the equity and equity-related issues in the state. Steps taken by the NH DOE since the development of the 2010-2011 plan include:

- Improved data and reporting systems through the development and implementation of the Educator Information System (EIS);
- Increased educator capacity to analyze data through the SLDS grant supported data coaches;
- Significantly revised the teacher and leader preparation program approval process and rules to align with our credentialing rules. The new rules moved the NH DOE away from a compliance model to a continuous improvement model and serves to create a seamless pre-K to 20 education system.
- Professional development in research-based, comprehensive literacy instruction, assessment, and data driven decision-making to school teams in low performing schools to improve the literacy skills of all students (Response to Instruction, Multi-tiered Systems of Support).

Summary:

The goal of the Equity Plan is to bring together a diverse group of stakeholders and internal NH DOE staff to examine and address current equity issues in New Hampshire districts and schools. This plan serves as the foundation for evolving and continuing work. The Task Force will continue to develop and refine this plan, conduct on-going reviews of its implementation, analyze the success of strategies and make modifications in a systematic and ongoing basis as is necessary to ensure that all students have equitable access to excellent educators.

Section 2: Stakeholder Engagement

New Hampshire believes that a successful plan for "Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Teachers" should be developed by a representative group of stakeholders who have ownership in the plan, are knowledgeable of selected aspects of education in the state, and are committed to its implementation. As a result, in late October 2014, the Commissioner of Education requested that a Task Force be convened modeled after our Phase I and Phase II Educator Task Forces, which actively engaged a broad group of stakeholders in the development of the NH Model Educator Support and Evaluation System. All pertinent stakeholder groups are represented on the Task Force and the NH DOE has endeavored to ensure that all

geographic regions of the state are represented[3]. Invitees were asked to join the Task Force to actively engage in a review of state data summaries to discuss equity gaps, their root causes and potential ameliorating strategies.

To best serve the Task Force, the NH DOE convened an Internal Team consisting of NH DOE members and staff from the Northeast Comprehensive Center. Each meeting of the Internal Team advances the work of the larger group and serves to plot the course for future meetings. The initial meeting provided team members with the history of Educator Equity in New Hampshire, established a focus of the work based on the Commissioner's charge, and enabled the team to share information and updates from the USED.

The second planning meeting focused on reviewing the charge from the Commissioner, examined a potential action plan, and further clarified the role of the Internal Team. Team members were given a review of the Equity Educator profile and viewed a presentation outlining the required components of the plan. At the third planning meeting in January 2015, the Internal Team reviewed and defined key terms, identified next steps and began to identify *potential* key stakeholders for the first Task Force (Stakeholder) meeting in February. The following stakeholder groups were identified and invited to attend: Superintendents of Schools, teachers, NH-National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers-NH, Institute on Disabilities, SPARK New Hampshire Early Childhood, Carsey School at the University of New Hampshire, parents, Special Education Directors, State 504 Coordinator, DCYF/Juvenile Justice, State Board of Education, State School Boards Association, State Legislators, Higher Education, Dartmouth Children's Hospital Child Care Center, Office Of Migrant Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services. Individuals from the following offices or bureaus from the NH DOE were also invited: Bureau of Integrated Programs: Title I, II and III; Bureau of Special Education, Bureau of Credentialing, Bureau of Data Management, Division of Educational Improvement, Educator Effectiveness, and Career Technical Education.

A formal invitation[4] for the February 19, 2015 initial meeting of the Task Force was emailed to all stakeholders from the Administrator for Educator Effectiveness. This invitation outlined the expectations of the Educator Equity Report, as well as the Task Force, and emphasized the goal of conducting engaging and meaningful consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, including students, teachers, unions, non-profit teacher organizations, principals, district leaders, parents, civil rights groups, and other key stakeholders. Additionally, the specific goals of the introductory meeting were provided as well as the background on federal requirements and New Hampshire's current efforts on equity.

The Internal Team recognized the value of having the ongoing support of a core group of stakeholders in the process and acknowledged in the invitation that the initial stakeholder meeting would be the first of four monthly meetings to develop the Equity Plan. The invitation to stakeholders also acknowledged the importance of building and maintaining long-term relationships with professionals working in diverse aspects of education throughout the state and noted that the stakeholder team would continue to work together to ensure effective implementation of the plan. Through an ongoing review of pertinent data, the Equity Task Force will draft, refine, and revise the equity plan continuously to ensure that we meet the goal of *Equitable Access to Excellent Educators* for all children in New Hampshire.

[3] See appendix "C" for a list of stakeholders

[4] See appendix "B" for copy of the invitation letter

It is important to note the NH DOE recognized an immediate tension between the June 1 timeline for submitting the equity report and the availability of necessary statewide data to calculate the required equity gaps which resulted in the need to build a suitable database to allow for the necessary calculations. This need, however, did not preclude the NH DOE from moving forward with early stakeholder engagement. As such, the initial gathering of stakeholders served to ground them in the historical context of USED's request for a revised equity plan and to inform them of the requirements of the current plan to be developed. Following this, stakeholders were provided an opportunity to examine a limited data set based on Title I Focus and Priority Schools that showed which students in poverty were being served by beginning educators. This allowed the stakeholders to work through a guided discussion about possible root causes for this data set. At subsequent stakeholder meetings members were able to engage with calculated equity gaps based on full state data drawn from the newly developed database. Stakeholders were engaged in making connections between the gaps for students in poverty and minority students being served by beginning educators, their root causes, and possible ameliorating strategies. An analysis of the data identified specific equity gaps within Manchester, one of the state's large urban districts. It was determined that going forward stakeholder groups appropriate to understanding the Manchester - specific context will first be presented with the actual equity gaps (which, have already been calculated) and will then be provided the opportunity to be guided through structured protocols to identify root causes and strategies (in that order). The exercise for *Equity Gap 1* (see page 15 below), described above, will be re-analyzed in light of insightful root causes and/or strategies that emerge from the engagements with this stakeholder group.

Further, with respect to *Equity Gap 1*, the NH DOE intends to pull a stratified, random sample (geography is a likely stratifying variable) of districts that are in the highest quartile of student poverty and undertake follow-up equity exercises with these districts. Stakeholder groups will be formed in each of the districts and will be presented with *Equity Gap 1*. They will not be provided with the root causes and strategies that were generated by the initial long term stakeholder group; rather, they will be guided through the structured protocols themselves to identify root causes and strategies. This work will allow the NH DOE to affirm or adjust previously identified root causes and strategies as well as to specifically address the needs of the identified districts. The analyses should provide the NH DOE with a broader view of statewide equity issues as they relate to student poverty. For a preliminary timeline of these stakeholder engagements, please see *Section Five, Table I.*

The following section summarizes the activities and notes from each meeting of the Equity Task Force:

Meeting 1: February 19, 2015

At the introductory meeting, the Task Force reviewed the USED guidelines for background and established an initial understanding of the work. The Task Force then began examining data for potential root causes. In addition, at the end of the meeting the stakeholders were asked, based on their initial knowledge of the task at hand, if there were other stakeholders who should be at the table.

To assure that the stakeholders understood their charge, each of our agendas included the following meeting purpose statement:

Meeting Purpose: To bring together a diverse group of stakeholders and internal DOE staff to serve as a Task Force who will examine the current equity issues in New Hampshire schools as part of the process to develop an Equitable Access to Excellent Educators by June 1, 2015 and; to serve in an ongoing capacity to periodically review the implementation and levels of success of strategies within the plan.

**Please note that after each meeting a follow up email was sent to all stakeholders with meeting notes. This kept all stakeholders regardless of whether they were able to attend a meeting informed on progress.*

Meeting 2: March 12, 2015[5]

At our March meeting, the Task Force received further summary data on poverty and beginning educators that was used to analyze root causes using the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL) template. The Task Force brainstormed possible challenges and strategies.

Meeting 3: April 9, 2015

The poverty root causes and challenges generated at our March meeting were used at the April 9, 2015 meeting. During this meeting, minority data were presented by a consultant from the Northeast Comprehensive Center and were given context by the State Director for Title III. The report provided a picture of minority students and their families in New Hampshire. Subsequently, the Task Force reviewed minority data for potential root causes. Root causes from the minority data were grouped by theme into overlapping areas with previous root causes identified in poverty data. Stakeholders were asked to identify the three themes that they believed were of highest priority to attend to first. These themes were used as the basis for brainstorming potential strategies for addressing gaps. Members were provided a protocol to guide them through generating potential strategies for addressing the themes. Strategies were grouped as New Hampshire –based strategies currently in place, nationally known best practices, research-based strategies that might be employed, and out-of-the-box, innovative strategies.

Due to inclement weather a number of our task force members were not able to attend this meeting. Follow-up correspondence was sent to solicit their feedback.

Meeting 4: May 7, 2015

At the May 7th Task Force meeting stakeholders had the opportunity to review the sections of the initial plan. Following this, stakeholders were engaged in an affinity mapping exercise to find commonalities and clusters among the various strategies identified at previous task force meetings. The Task Force then went through a strategy to identify priorities from among the clusters. During the last portion of the meeting, stakeholders were presented with a preliminary communication plan which will require further development. To this end, a communications meeting has already been scheduled for June 4, 2015. It is important to note that the preliminary communications plan includes four quarterly stakeholder engagement Task Force meetings.

Section 3: Equity Gap Exploration and Analysis

The NH DOE recognizes the challenges to and limitations of the data currently available to identify meaningful equity gaps to determine whether minority students and students in poverty are being disproportionately served by beginning teachers, out-of-field teachers, or, unqualified teachers. As will be evidenced in this section, The NH DOE is limited in the analyses it can currently perform. Importantly, one of the more notable findings from this exercise has been to identify the current limitations to the data and to begin to identify and plan for securing those data that will assist the NH DOE with identifying and resolving issues of equity in future. Therefore, the NH DOE will be forming an internal data team to address the data issues identified in this equity work.

[5] Please see appendix "D" for all meeting minutes

Limitations with the data, and the existing data themselves, result in the NH DOE's ability to compute interpretable equity gaps on only one of the variables of interest – beginning teachers. Currently the New Hampshire Department of Education does not have data on out of field teachers. Hence, this precludes the ability to examine equity gaps relative to out-of-field teachers. The NH DOE was unable to identify a suitable proxy for these data.

As a proxy for unqualified teachers, the NH DOE reviewed 2014-2015 High Quality Teacher (HQT) data. HQT data for New Hampshire are noted in the following two tables.

Table A

Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in New Hampshire Public Schools in 2015

Classes	Percent Taught by HQT
All	97.27
Elementary	97.76
Secondary	96.67

Table B

Percentage of Highly Qualified Teachers in the Highest and Lowest Quartiles When Ranked on Student Poverty Data in New Hampshire Public Schools in 2015

Level	Percent of Classes Taught by HQT in Highest Poverty Quartile	Percent of Classes Taught by HQT in Lowest Poverty Quartile
Elementary	97.02	97.95
Secondary	95.44	96.96

As can be seen from the data in these tables, the overwhelming majority (97.27 percent) of classes taught in New Hampshire are taught by teachers identified as HQT. When sorting student poverty from highest to lowest and then computing the percentage of classes taught by HQT in the highest quartile and the percentage of classes taught by HQT in the lowest quartile the results are very similar for both elementary and secondary schools. In fact, for elementary schools the percentage of classes taught by HQT teachers in the lowest poverty quartile is actually higher than the percentage of classes taught by teachers in the highest poverty quartile. This extremely high proportion of classes taught by HQT teachers and the concomitant lack of variability seriously reduces the possibility of examining unqualified teachers, using HQT as a proxy, from further analysis.

Definitions and Metrics

Key definitions central to the NH DOE's equity work include the following:

Beginning Educator:

Ed 504.01 Beginning Educator Certificate. The board shall, pursuant to RSA 186:11, X(a), issue a certificate to a beginning educator in accordance with the following:

(a) To qualify for a beginning educator credential, an individual shall have less than 3 years of teaching experience to include teaching experience at the elementary and secondary levels of education;

(b) An individual shall be granted a beginning educator credential upon:

(1) Meeting the qualifications for a credential specified in Ed 505; and

(2) Successfully completing the application process specified in Ed 508; and

(c) Beginning educator credentials shall be issued for 3 years; and renewed pursuant to Ed 509.

Out-of-field:

New Hampshire has an administrative rule that allows educators to teach outside their area of certification as a "minor assignment" or less than fifty percent of their weekly work time. In the areas of core content under NCLB, the educators must also be "highly qualified" in those content areas for each class taught outside the area of certification by meeting the content area requirements of subject area testing or college coursework.

Ed 306.15 Provision of Staff and Staff Qualifications.

(a) To carry out the educational program established by these rules and local school board policy, the local school board shall require that each school provides:

(1) The services of a certified principal, a certified library media specialist and a certified guidance counselor(s);

(2) For the hiring and training of educators certified under Ed 500 to teach classes and or courses in their certified content area;

(3) In each elementary school, the services of a reading specialist and library media specialist to facilitate the delivery of the language arts and reading program established in Ed 306.37(a);

(4) In each middle and high school, a library media specialist to support the instructional resources program and facility requirements of Ed 306.08; and

(5) Educators, including art, music, health, and physical education teachers, in accordance with class size requirements in Ed 306.17.

(b) The local school board shall require that in carrying out the school counseling program established by Ed 306.39:

(1) The counseling load in each elementary school shall not exceed the equivalent of one full-time certified school counselor per 500 students enrolled;

(2) The counseling load in each middle school and each high school shall not exceed the equivalent of one full time certified school counselor per 300 students enrolled;

(3) High schools with more than 4 school counselors shall provide a high school level certified director of school counseling to coordinate the implementation of the school counseling program plan and policy, unless (4) below applies; and

(4) District level certified directors of school counseling to coordinate k-12 implementation of the school counseling program plan and policy shall be provided in districts where the number of school counselors across all schools exceeds ten.

(c) The local school board shall require that each school with an enrollment of 500 or more students provides the services of an associate principal or 2 or more persons with administrative certification under Ed 506 who together act as a full-time equivalent to carry out administrative duties assigned by the superintendent in accordance with local school board policy.

(d) The local school board may provide for each school the services of additional staff to facilitate the use of the instructional resources described in Ed 306.08 and the technological resources needed to facilitate the information and communication technologies program described in Ed 306.42.

(e) Pursuant to RSA 189:24 and in accordance with Ed 500 and Ed 600, the local school board shall require that each professional staff member is certified for assignment by the department.

(f) In accordance with Ed 509, the local school board shall require that each professional staff member shall improve the content knowledge and teaching skills through participation in a local professional development plan.

(g) An educator with sufficient content knowledge as determined by the school principal may be given a minor assignment to teach in a program area in which he or she is not certified. A minor assignment shall be less than fifty percent of the individual's weekly work time and be reviewed on an annual basis to insure that the individual has the appropriate level of content knowledge.

Source. #5546, eff 7-1-93; ss by #6366, eff 10-30-96, EXPIRED: 10-30-04

New. #8206, INTERIM, eff 11-18-04, EXPIRED: 5-17-05

New. #8354, eff 7-1-05; amd by #10047, eff 12-17-11; ss by #10556, eff 3-27-14

Unqualified Teacher:

- Unqualified teacher is one who does not meet the highly qualified criteria for the state of New Hampshire
- Or is not certified in the their content area
- Or does not have field approval if appropriate (Ed. 306.15(g))

Effective Teacher:

Effective teachers focus relentlessly on the achievements of their learners. They are also deeply committed to the success of all learners. Research has shown that teacher knowledge and skills in key areas-the learner and learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibilities -contribute, in varying degrees, to student growth and achievement. The following "foundations of effective teaching" provide guidance for educators in the pursuit of academic growth and excellence for each learner.

The Learner and Learning

Effective teachers:

- Set and maintain high expectations for learning and achievement for all learners;
- Engage all students as active learners;
- Create an environment of mutual respect and caring; and
- Engage students in collaborative learning.

Content Knowledge

Effective teachers:

- Demonstrate extensive knowledge of content, standards and competencies, and connect them to relevant local and global issues;
- Model and encourage, innovation, creativity, critical thinking, and inquiry processes; and
- Communicate their expertise and skills through authentic, accessible, and meaningful learning opportunities aligned to the content, standards and competencies for all learners.

Instruction

Effective Teachers:

- Facilitate personalized learning through intentional, flexible, and research-based strategies;
- Incorporate multiple forms of assessment to evaluate student learning and adapt instruction accordingly; and
- Integrate technology as a tool for education and assessment.

Professional Responsibility

Effective teachers:

- Contribute collaboratively to their school's academic progress and culture of growth;
- Engage in learning communities and their own professional growth
- Uphold professional and ethical standards of practice; and
- Engage parents and the community as partners to support learner success.

Work Study Practices

Effective teachers:

- Demonstrate persistence in their efforts to promote growth and success;
- Exhibit passion and intellectual curiosity; and
- Believe in the potential of all students as learners and contributors to learning communities.

Student in poverty:

This is defined as students who are in free and reduced lunch programs.

Minority student:

This is defined as belonging to any racial and/or ethnic group other than white/non-Hispanic.

It is important to note that although we have included the state-adopted definition of effective teacher, we will not be examining teacher effectiveness and its relationship to student poverty and minority students in this report. Reasons for this decision are as follows:

- First, the generation of teacher effectiveness data is in its nascent stages in our state.
- Second, New Hampshire has an extremely long and rich history of local control. As a result, districts have significant latitude in determining their effectiveness rating scales. Due to these circumstances, the NH DOE is interested in allowing systems to mature and stabilize for a few years (the actual time frame is currently being determined) before analyzing these data as they relate to issues of equity.

We have included the definitions to provide the reader with our definition of effectiveness as it will likely be a topic of conversation within our stakeholder groups and with our districts going forward as we address issues of equity in the state.

Exploration of the Data

As described previously, the NH DOE immediately recognized issues with the data currently available to undertake this work. These challenges, when conjoined with the small, rural nature of many of the state's districts and schools, could result in misleading interpretations of the data. In an attempt to alleviate this possibility, at least with respect to the relationships between poverty and beginning teachers and minority and beginning teachers, we examined data over a three year period to determine whether the data were relatively stable. Results of these analyses, for both schools and districts are presented in the following two tables.

Table C

Comparing Highest and Lowest Quartiles of Beginning Educators When Districts and Schools Are Ranked From Highest to Lowest Based on Student Poverty for Years 2015, 2014, and 2013

Year	Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Highest Quartile		Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Lowest Quartile	
	District	School	District	School
2015	16.67	17.05	10.99	11.84
2014	15.45	14.83	10.50	9.84
2013	14.55	13.29	7.93	7.87

Table D

Comparing Highest and Lowest Quartiles of Beginning Educators When Districts and Schools Are Ranked From Highest to Lowest Based on Student Minority for Years 2015, 2014, and 2013

Year	Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Highest Quartile		Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Lowest Quartile	
	District	School	District	School
2015	12.19	12.32	18.14	16.44
2014	10.13	10.96	16.22	13.30
2013	9.19	8.41	14.52	12.31

As can be seen from the figures in both the poverty and minority student tables, the general pattern of relationships is consistent from year-to-year and between districts and schools within any given year.

Following these analyses, the Task Force examined the general relationship between poverty data and beginning teachers and between minority student data and beginning teachers in New Hampshire schools for the year 2015 (The Task Force looked at 2015 exclusively given the consistency in the data across the three years that were initially examined). Correlation coefficients were computed to provide a general snapshot of the statewide relationship within New Hampshire schools of the extent to which the relationship between students in poverty and beginning teachers and between minority students and beginning teachers co-vary. The correlation between the percentage of school students in poverty and the percentage of beginning teachers in those schools in 2015 is 0.19. Thus, as an overall statewide phenomenon, the relationship is not very strong. This finding is entirely consistent with student poverty results recently reported in the Southern Education Foundation's research bulletin (January 2015) indicating that among all states New Hampshire has the lowest level of student poverty (27 percent).

The correlation coefficient between the percentage of minority students in New Hampshire schools and the percentage of beginning teachers in those schools is -.11. This is an inverse, negative relationship, indicating that, overall, minority students are more often than not being taught by experienced teachers. This finding is consistent with the data in *Table D* above, which indicates in each of the three years under analysis, schools and districts with the lowest percentages of minority students (lowest quartile) have a higher percentage of beginning teachers than do schools with the highest percentages of minority students (highest quartile).

The findings with respect to the relationship between minority students and beginning teachers suggest that minority students are not currently being disproportionately taught by beginning teachers. In fact, the opposite appears to be true. Thus, for purposes of this report, we will focus the analyses on other equity gaps.

Equity Gap Analysis

Limitations with the data, particularly as related to out-of-field and unqualified teachers, and the inverse relationship between minority students and beginning teacher percentages suggest that at this time the only relationship that should be subject to analysis is that between student poverty and

beginning teacher. These data, presented at both the district and school levels for the years 2013, 2014, and 2015, were previously exhibited in *Table C*. The equity gaps derived from *Table C* are as follows.

Table E

Equity Gaps From Comparing Highest and Lowest Quartiles of Beginning Educators When Districts and Schools Are Ranked From Highest to Lowest Based on Student Poverty for Years 2015, 2014, and 2013 (N=40 for Districts in Each Quartile and N = 111 for Schools in Each Quartile)

Year	Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Highest Quartile		Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Lowest Quartile		Equity Gaps	
	District	School	District	School	District	School
2015	16.67	17.05	10.99	11.84	5.68	5.21
2014	15.45	14.83	10.50	9.84	4.95	4.99
2013	14.55	13.29	7.93	7.87	6.62	5.42

Statistical tests of significance were computed to determine whether the equity gaps are significant. Results from the ensuing t-tests, designed to measure the difference in mean percentage of beginning teachers in the highest and lowest quartiles sorted by poverty and computed as two-tailed tests at alpha=.05, are identified in *Table F* below.

Table F

Results of Tests of Significance on Equity Gaps for 2013, 2014, and 2015 District and School Data

Year	Equity Gaps		P-Value		Significant (Yes or No)	
	District	School	District	School	District	School
2015	5.68	5.21	.007	.000	Yes	Yes
2014	4.95	4.99	.036	.000	Yes	Yes
2013	6.62	5.42	.000	.000	Yes	Yes

Although, as previously noted, the overall correlation coefficient at the school level between student poverty and percentage of beginning teachers in 2015 was 0.19 the above table provides us with a sharper distinction between the extent to which students in poverty are being taught by beginning teachers when we look at the contrast between the highest and lowest quartiles of beginning teachers when districts and schools are sorted and ranked by their poverty data. In all instances for both school and district the results are statistically significant when contrasting the mean percentage of beginning teachers at the highest and lowest quartile levels in the state. Thus, it appears that when ranked on poverty, students in the highest quartile of schools and districts over the years in question appear to be served by a larger percentage of beginning teachers than do students in the lowest quartile and that these differences are statistically meaningful.

In addition to the analyses performed at the state level, the NH DOE determined that it would be extremely worthwhile to explore issues of equity within the Manchester School District. This district

is somewhat of an anomaly in the state. It is the largest district in the state and can reasonably be described as a small, urban district. Manchester exhibits the same type of challenging characteristics of other small, urban districts.

Data availability for Manchester reflects that which has previously been described for the state. Thus, we were not able to perform analyses with respect to out-of-field teachers and unqualified teachers. We were, however, able to determine the relationships between minority students and beginning teachers and between students in poverty and beginning teachers in this district.

Manchester has 22 schools. For purposes of creating quartiles for the analyses, we included five schools in the highest quartile and five schools in the lowest quartile. These were generated via two separate rank orderings of Manchester schools. The first rank ordering exercise sorted on minority data whereby the schools were ranked from highest to lowest based on their percentage of minority students. The second rank ordering exercise was done in similar fashion using poverty data as the sorting vehicle. The resulting set of percentages of beginning teachers in the highest and lowest quartiles were then compared for both of the variables of interest. Due to the small number of schools in the quartiles, a Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test of significance, the non-parametric analogue to the t-test, was performed to determine whether the differences between the highest and lowest quartiles were statistically significant. These were two-tailed tests conducted at alpha = .05 and were performed on both the poverty and the minority data. Results are noted below in *Table G* (equity gaps are not presented here as the difference between the two quartile means - this is a result of using the non-parametric Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test, which does not determine statistical significance by examining the relationships between means).

Table G

Statistical Results of Highest – Lowest Quartile Comparisons of Beginning Teachers for Manchester Schools Based on Rank Orderings of 2015 Minority and Poverty Student Data

Data Source	U-value	Critical value of U at $p \leq .05$	Significant (Yes or No)
Minority data	0.5	2	Yes
Poverty data	0.5	2	Yes

As can be seen in *Table G*, there exist statistically significant equity gaps for both minority students and students in poverty in the Manchester School District. Said differently, a minority student or a student in poverty attending a Manchester school in the highest quartile of ranking on either of these variables has a better chance of being taught by a beginning teacher than if they were in the lowest quartile of schools.

The Manchester analysis prompted us to also examine possible equity gaps in the state's next largest district, Nashua. These are the only two districts in the state that have in excess of 10,000 students. Manchester has approximately 14,400 students and Nashua has approximately 11,400 students. Additionally, Manchester serves 24 percent of the minority students in the state and Nashua serves 18 percent of the minority students in the state. Together, 42 percent of the state's minority students are in these two districts.

The limited data issues described previously also hold for the Nashua School District. Thus, we were able to examine equity from the perspective of beginning teachers only. We performed the exact same set of analyses that were performed for Manchester. Although Nashua has 18 schools, highest and lowest quartiles were created using five schools in each. Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests were performed and the results are shown in *Table H* below.

Table H

Statistical Results of Highest – Lowest Quartile Comparisons of Beginning Teachers for Nashua Schools Based on Rank Orderings of 2015 Minority and Poverty Student Data

Data Source	U-value	Critical value of U at $p \leq .05$	Significant (Yes or No)
Minority data	8.5	2	No
Poverty data	10	2	No

In contrast to the findings in Manchester, data in Nashua do not appear to reveal equity gaps for either minority students or students in poverty with respect to their being served by beginning teachers.

Section 4: Strategies for Eliminating Equity Gaps

The NH DOE and the Task Force recognize that eliminating equity gaps is complex work that involves innovations and development over time. To that end, a Theory of Action has been developed.

New Hampshire's Theory of Action:

If New Hampshire develops a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to talent management that is implemented and monitored over time, then New Hampshire school districts will be better able to recruit, develop and retain effective educators so that all students will have equitable access to excellent teachers and leaders so that student will develop the skills to achieve their highest potential in school and in life.

Root Cause Analysis

Using the protocol provided by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, the Task Force engaged in multiple discussions of the summary data to determine root causes. As a result of these discussions, three equity gaps have been initially identified as priority areas for consideration and planning.

Equity Gap 1: In the state a statistically significant higher average of beginning teachers is serving students in the highest poverty quartile of districts and schools compared to the average number of beginning teachers serving students in the lowest poverty quartile of districts and schools.

Equity Gap 2: In the Manchester School District, a statistically significant higher average of beginning teachers is serving students in the highest poverty quartile of districts and schools compared to the average number of beginning teachers serving students in the lowest poverty quartile of districts and schools.

Equity Gap 3: In the Manchester School District, a statistically significant higher average of beginning teachers is serving the highest quartile of minority students in districts and schools compared to the average number of beginning teachers serving the lowest quartile of minority students in districts and schools.

Based on these equity gaps, the Task Force developed a list of possible root causes for further exploration. Of these root causes, seven emerged as common across the two problems.

Possible Root Causes:

- Culture of low expectations (at a community level)
- Inequitable funding (at the local level)
- Drivers (reasons) behind open positions
- Better teacher preparation/better communication with teacher preparation programs
- Greater scrutiny/more prescriptive teaching (potential additional assessments)
- Location/enrollment/budget
- Culture of respect (with school and within community)

Of these possible root causes, three emerged as the highest priority: culture of respect within school and community, culture of low expectations, better teacher preparation/better communication with teacher preparation.

Possible strategies to address the root causes were generated from three perspectives: New Hampshire-based strategies, nationally-recognized strategies, and innovative additional strategies. The language is recorded as written by the stakeholders, with italics inserted (in this section only) to clarify meaning where necessary.

Culture of Low Expectations:

New Hampshire-Based Strategies

- Professional Development culturally responsive for teaching and leadership;
- 1,000 mentors program in Manchester *(specific program)*
- ELO's (Extended Learning Opportunities) for more students focusing on strengths, interests show they can be more
- Parent volunteer programs that involve parents talking about their vocations and getting them involved.
- City Year volunteers in urban schools
- InTASC New Hampshire Standards
- New Teacher induction program
- Family engagement
- Understanding students and families

- Parent supports (systems)
- Everybody can learn, strong vision
- BRING IT within Derryfield School *(specific program)*
- Parent Education Programs
- "Coffee with the principal" kinds of parent engagement opportunities
- Parent/teacher associations/Special Education parent groups
- New Hampshire Focus and Priority school model partnering with SERESC and Harvard Project *(specific program)*
- RENEW project to raise aspirations and self-awareness of students *(specific program)*
- Performance evaluations/standards
- 21st century community-based after/pre-school programs

Nationally-recognized strategies

- Community Schools
- Steps for respect and of culture of low expectations
- PBIS through National Center for Learning Disabilities
- Restorative Justice, students and teachers working together
- West Virginia University Program that has free summer school for poor under-achieving students with real academic potential
- National Principal/Leader Standards
- Data Wise-processes for gathering and examining student data
- Kagan and Lahey's Immunity to Change work

Innovative Strategies

- Making sure that kids and parents are fed and have health care
- Statewide examination of all of the things that affect student achievement-perhaps through John Hattie's lenses school (21 percent; other 60 percent)
- Student Voice
- Student-Centered Learning
- More project-based internships for HS students.

Culture of Respect within School and Community:

New Hampshire-Based Strategies

- Nashua North show respect for all immigrant students by flags of their country of origin in the long front hall of the schools
- National teacher leadership;/mentoring
- Successful professional learning communities
- NHASCD
- PBIS
- RTI
- Engaged site leadership
- Educator support (mentoring, feedback, PLC's etc.)

- Safe Schools Project (Rochester, Laconia, Concord)
- Project Aware
- NH Community Senate composed of students, teachers, parents, SB members and administrators, that deals with student issues
- Teach respect for everyone-students, teachers and administrators from 1st grade on
- Student voice
- Dover School District Elementary Schools UDL Academy
- Respect for All Teacher Leaders
- UDL Academy with CAST
- Restorative Circles (See Irv)
- Teacher preparation
- Institutes of Higher Education Network
- Bring It Manchester *(specific program)*
- Leadership support Meetings/School Leadership Team
- Multi-Tiered system of Support: behavioral and academic instruction
- Responsive Classroom Training (for students-carry over to staff?)
- ELA/Math Specialists/Coaches
- Collaboration, PLC's
- Professional learning for administrators to changes culture
- PBIS and teacher level
- Teacher mentors

Nationally-recognized strategies

- National Institute of School Leaders, Principal Leadership
- Personalized learning schools
- State funded mentor and induction programs, required and funded
- Leadership Training Rockville, Md.
- SWIFT Development sites Leader in Me Programs
- Whole Child, Wellness schools
- PBIS Positive behavior intervention strategies
- PLC's (Professional Learning Communities)
- Appreciative Inquiry
- ASCD
- Teacher Leaders
- Mentorships
- Faculty support system framework
- Culture, diversity training
- RETLL CMA, CVA
- CEEDAR

Innovative strategies

- CEEDAR grant
- Pre-K-20 partnerships

- Retention strategies, incentives
- Mentoring leadership\Training to support new leaders
- Develop ways to recognize staff strengths
- Extensive professional development for educators Safe Schools Healthy Kids grant model for every school district
- Statewide forums on education co-sponsored by a myriad number of groups interested in education and respect
- Induction and mentoring system standards for quality plus funding mechanism
- Allow student feedback/surveys to be part of teacher evaluations

Better Teacher Preparation/Better Communication with Teacher Preparation

New Hampshire-based strategies

- 2 yr. teacher mentor models/mini observations based on Kim Marshall
- NH Vocational Rehabilitation Teacher Internship Program for NH special education teachers
- Using Danielson frameworks for student teacher evaluation/observation
- Grant to colleges from DOE, i.e.; transition work grant to PSU
- CEEDAR grant
- ASCD
- Reenergizing teacher preparation program/value of being a teacher
- Tech Ed Camps
- Career technical education
- NH Higher Education Network for teacher preparation
- IHE Networks performance assessment
- SNHU's competency-based programs in preparation
- Institute of Higher Education Networks sharing data across programs
- School districts/buildings providing feedback/information to higher education
- Competency-based teacher certification coursework/programs
- Culturally relevant pedagogy coursework
- Collaboration of teacher preparation programs
- Joint Meetings with/IHE network, Council for Teacher Education Professional Standards Board and Prek-12 educators
- More time in classrooms during teacher preparation
- Longer in-service residency programs
- Pinkerton Academy is planning several semesters of Teacher Prep classes for their HS students at vocational center
- Experience in multiple grades, schools, districts
- Getting teacher preparation students into real classrooms earl and often
- St. Anselm Intern Program of diversity

Nationally recognized strategies

- National Teacher Board Certification
- CCSSO
- Longer internships (than 12-14) weeks
- NEA
- Increased coursework beyond content of best practices
- Cultural awareness

- High Standards for acceptance into preparation programs
- Considered, thoughtful/intentional analysis of the teacher pipeline (Starting at middle school)
- Certification for transition coordinator George Washington University
- West Virginia University students can only qualify and be accepted into teacher preparation (5 yr. degree) after 2 yrs. of liberal arts basics and fairly high GPA

Innovative Strategies

- Clear, fluid certification paths
- Communication with IHE
- Alignment of certification and teacher preparation programs
- More rigorous STEM education for elementary education students
- Supervisors of students teachers are teachers in the building where groups of student teachers intern
- More focus on special education requirements
- Create transition certification for special education
- Create AmeriCorps for teachers

As noted previously, at the May 7th Meeting stakeholders were asked to engage in an affinity mapping exercise to consolidate and cluster similar strategies. The newly identified themes were used to further organize the strategies related to the three root causes for Equity Gap 1. We then refined and prioritized the strategies to identify those having high impact and within the department's capacity to readily implement. The following chart displays the consolidation of the strategies as they directly relate to each of the root causes. As we move forward further information will be collected and added to Chart 1 below. The general approach used to identify root causes and their associated strategies will be repeated with the Manchester School district for Equity Gaps 2 and 3. For Equity Gap 1 this approach will be used with the additional districts identified in Section 2.

Chart 1

EQUITY GAP 1						
In the state a statistically significant higher average of beginning teachers is serving students in the highest poverty quartile of districts and schools compared to the average number of beginning teachers serving students in the lowest poverty quartile of districts and schools.						
Root Causes						
1. Culture of respect within school and community 2. Culture of low expectation 3. Better teacher preparation/Better communication with teacher preparation programs						
Strategies Action Plan						
Root Cause 1: Culture of respect within school and community						
Strategies	**Rationale** (Why this strategy?)	**Expected Outcomes**	**Action Steps**	**Person(s) Responsible/ Resources Needed**	**Timeline/ Benchmarks**	**Evidence/ Measures of Success**
EG1 RC 1.1: PBIS						

EG 1 RC 1.2: RTI						
EG1 RC 1.3: SWIFT						
EG1 RC 1.4: CEEDAR						
EG1 RC 1.5 UDL						
Root Cause 2: Culture of low expectations						
Strategies	**Rationale** (Why this strategy?)	**Expected Outcomes**	**Action Steps**	**Person(s) Responsible/ Resources Needed**	**Timeline/ Benchmarks**	**Evidence/ Measures of Success**
EG RC 2.1: Parent Engagement System						
EG1 RC 2.2: Use John Hattie's lens to examine statewide things that affect student achievement						
EG1 RC 2.3: Student Centered Learning						
EG1 RC 2.4: Culturally responsive professional development for teachers and leadership						
EG1 RC 2.5: West Virginia University program – free summer school						

program for under achieving poverty students showing high academic potential						
Root Cause 3: Better teacher preparation/Better communication with teacher preparation programs						
Strategies	**Rationale** (Why this strategy?)	**Expected Outcomes**	**Action Steps**	**Person(s) Responsible/ Resources Needed**	**Timeline/ Benchmarks**	**Evidence/ Measures of Success**
EG1 RC 3.1: Teacher Certification						
EG1 RC 3.2: Teacher Education Program Standards and Curriculum						
EG1 RC 3.3: Assessment of Teacher Candidates						
EQUITY GAP 2						
In the Manchester School District, a statistically significant higher average of beginning teachers is serving students in the highest poverty quartile of districts and schools compared to the average number of beginning teachers serving students in the lowest poverty quartile of districts and schools.						
Root Causes						
Strategies Action Plan						
Root Cause 1:						
Strategies	**Rationale** (Why this strategy?)	**Expected Outcomes**	**Action Steps**	**Person(s) Responsible/ Resources Needed**	**Timeline/ Benchmarks**	**Evidence/ Measures of Success**
EG2 RC 1.1:						
EG2 RC 1.2:						
EG 2 RC 1.3:						

EQUITY GAP 3						
In the Manchester School District, a statistically significant higher average of beginning teachers is serving the highest quartile of minority students in districts and schools compared to the average number of beginning teachers serving students the lowest poverty quartile of minority students in districts and schools.						
Root causes						
Strategies Action Plan						
Root Cause 1:						
Strategies	**Rationale** (Why this theme strategy?)	**Expected Outcomes**	**Action Steps**	**Person(s) Responsible/ Resources Needed**	**Timeline/ Benchmarks**	**Evidence/ Measures of Success**
EG3 RC 3.1:						
EG3 RC 3.2:						
EG RC 3.3:						

Section 5: On-going Monitoring of Plan and Support to Districts

New Hampshire is committed to ensuring the long-term success of ensuring equitable access for all students to excellent educators. We will do so by using available fiscal resources, as well as working to access additional funding through foundations and grants. These will be used to provide on-going support and technical assistance to our districts that are indicated in our data as being in the highest quartile for having the largest percentages of students from low-income families and minority students who are being disproportionally served by beginning, out-of-field or unqualified educators. At the same time we will develop feedback loops to support these districts. We will also review applicable research and will share relevant studies with our Task Force and with local school districts to provide them information and support. The NH DOE will seek to engage school districts and their communities in relevant dialogue that helps to clarify the specific contexts of each unique setting that may influence current gap status as well serve to understand the potential levers for change and improvement that are best suited to each location. Upon development and implementation of appropriate strategies, well defined benchmarking procedures utilizing rubric based tools will occur in regular and ongoing fashion to determine the progress being made in addressing equity issues. This information will be shared with the involved schools and districts and a continued collaborative discourse will allow for ongoing improvements to occur. In addition, the NH DOE will be making use of the communication venues it already has in place as mentioned in the introduction. In addition additional opportunities for communication will be discussed with the stakeholders beginning with the meeting already scheduled for June 4, 2015.

As described in *Section 2*, the NH DOE intends to pull a stratified, random sample of districts for further exploration of *Equity Gap 1*. A preliminary timeline for this work is presented below in *Table I*.

Table I

Preliminary Timetable for Stakeholder Engagement with a Stratified, Random Sample of High Poverty New Hampshire School Districts

Date	Task	Responsible Entity
July, 2015	Generate stratified random sample	NH DOE Internal Data Team
August, 2015	Contact implicated districts and confirm participation (replace disinterested districts as necessary)	NH DOE Internal Equity Team
September, 2015	Prepare materials and conduct training of facilitators for district stakeholder meetings	NH DOE Internal Equity Team
October, 2015-February, 2016	Conduct stakeholder meetings	NH DOE Internal Equity Team

Appendices

Appendix A	Initial Department of Education Planning Committee Members
Appendix B	Email Invitation to potential stakeholders
Appendix C	List of initial potential stakeholders
Appendix D	Stakeholder Task Force meeting notes
Appendix E	Data tables

Appendix A

NH DOE	Educator Equity Plan Committee Members
Ginny Clifford	Administrator Bureau of Credentialing
Lisa Danley	Administrator Career Technical Education
Mary Earick	Administrator Integrated Programs
Judy Fillion	Division Director for Program Support
Ashley Frame	Consultant Title II
Heather Gage	Chief of Staff, Division Director for Educational Improvement
Ira Glick	Northeast Comprehensive Center
Irene Koffink	Administrator Data Management
Mary Lane	Special Education Consultant (NH Access Accessible materials) NHAIM
Paul Leather	Deputy Commissioner
Scott Mantie	Administrator Assessment and Accountability
Andrea Reade	Northeast Comprehensive Center
Andrea Somoza-Norton	Consultant Title III
Karen Soule	Administrator Educator Effectiveness
Santina Thibedeau	Administrator Special Education

Appendix B

You are invited to attend

The New Hampshire Department of Education

Introductory Task Force Meeting for Developing
the Equitable Distribution of Excellent Educators Plan
February 19, 2015
3:30-6:30 pm
(Snacks Provided)

NH DOE Room 15

Please R.S.V.P to *Karen Soule* by *February 18, 2015*
to allow us to plan for adequate copies of materials and snacks.

In July, Secretary Duncan announced the Excellent Educators for All Initiative. As part of the initiative, consistent with section 1111(b) (8) (C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), each State educational agency must submit to the U.S. Department of Education a State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators that ensures "poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers." The State Plan is due on June 1, 2015.

As part of the plan development States are to conduct meaningful consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, including students, teachers, unions, non-profit teacher organizations, principals, district leaders, parents, civil rights groups, and other key stakeholders. Obtaining meaningful input from stakeholders is vital to creating high-quality plans and for setting the stage for successful implementation of those plans. As such, I would like to invite you to participate in the development of the New Hampshire State Plan.

Our introductory meeting will be held on February 19, 2015 from 3:30-6:30 pm and we will begin by reviewing the requirements of the plan and sharing the department's efforts to date on the work. We will then begin actively engaging in the review of our state data to determine root causes of any areas of concern that the data reveal. Recognizing the value of ongoing support of a core group of stakeholders this will be the first of four monthly meetings designed to move us through the process of plan development. The New Hampshire Department of Education sees the importance of building and maintaining long term relationships with professionals working in diverse aspects of education throughout the state and this core team will compromise our Equity Task Force. This task force will continue to work with the Department to ensure effective implementation of the plan through ongoing review of benchmarking data that will help us refine and revise the plan in the years going forward to ensure that our goal of Equitable Access to Excellent Educators for all or children in New Hampshire is met.

Future meeting dates for the Equity Task Force are as follows:

March 12, 2015 3:30 -6:30 pm – NH DOE
April 9, 2015 3:30 – 6:30 pm – NH DOE
May 7, 2015, 3:30 – 6:30 pm – NH DOE

The New Hampshire Dept. of Education Equity Planning Committee looks forward to working with you and seeing you on the 19th. Please do not hesitate to contact Karen Soule if you have any questions.
Please R.S.V.P to *Karen Soule* by *February 18, 2015* to allow us to plan for adequate copies of materials and snacks.

Best regards,

Karen Soule
Lead Educator Effectiveness
NH Dept. of Education (271-6813)

Appendix C

NH Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Stakeholders Task Force Members

Irv Richardson
NH-NEA

Laura Hainey
American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

Mary Ford
Dean Granite State College

Audrey Rodgers
Southern NH University co-chair NH Institutions of Higher Education Network

Carl Ladd
Supt of Schools Northern NH – Professional Standards Board

Cindy Chagnon
State Board of Education

Mary Heath
State Legislator member of House Education Committee

Chris Blackstone
Groveton Asst. Principal (northern NH)

Tina Greco
504 State Coordinator NH DOE

Michele Munson
Supt. of Schools Southwestern NH

Dr. Ethel Gaides
Asst. Supt. of Schools (Title I) Lakes Region NH

Amy Parece-Grogan
Dept. of Health and Human Services
Office of Minority Health and Refugee Affairs

Lucy Canotas
Teacher Bakersville School (priority, inner city school) Central NH

Michelle Lewis
Director Parent Information Center

Barrett Christina
New Hampshire School Boards Association

Bob Belmont
Director of Student Services – Concord School District

Laura Milliken
SPARK NH Governor's Task Force on Early Childhood

Susan Frankel
Northeast Comprehensive Center

Alysse Coffey
Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center Childcare Center program director, Early Childhood Education serves minority and low income children and families

Kim Demers
St. Anselm's college (background in urban education)

Beth Mattingly
Director of Research on Vulnerable Families
Carsey School University of New Hampshire

Angela Keefe
Division children Youth and Families
Juvenile Justice System

*Please also note that the NH DOE Planning Committee also were invited to attend the task force meetings.

Appendix D

Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Initial Stakeholders Task Force

Meeting Minutes
February 19, 2015

Attendance:

Jennifer Kiley	DOE-Career Development Bureau
Cindy Chagnon	State Board of Education
Ashley Frame	DOE, Title II
Michele Munson	Supt. SAU #71
Andrea Somoza-Norton	DOE, Title III
Laura Hainey	AFT
Bob Belmont	Concord School District
Audrey Rogers	SNHU (Southern NH Univ.)
Irene Koffink	DOE, Data Management
Amy Parece-Grogan	OMARA
Lucy Canotas	Teacher
Irv Richardson	NEA-NH
Ginny Clifford	DOE Bureau of Credentialing
Mary T. Lane	DOE-Special Education Bureau
Alysse Coffey	NHMC-CCC
Karen Soule	DOE-Educator Effectiveness
Ira Glick	Northeast Comprehensive Center
Andrea Reade	Northeast Comprehensive Center

Invited but unable to attend:

Carl Ladd	Supt of Schools SAU 58
Chris Blackstone	Asst. Principal
Christine Boston	Special Education Director Dover
Mary Heath	State Legislator
Ethel Gaides	Asst. Supt. Pemi-Baker
Barrett Christina	NH School Boards Association'
Mary Ford	Granite State
Kim Demers	St. Anselm's
Tina Grecco	504 State Coordinator

Meeting Purpose: To bring together a diverse group of stakeholders and internal DoE staff to serve as a task force that will examine the current equity issues in NH schools as part of the process to develop an Equitable Access to Excellent Educators plan by June 1, 2015 and to serve in an ongoing capacity to periodically review the implementation and levels of success of strategies within the plan.

I. Welcome to stakeholder members and introduction to US Department of Education request and plan requirements and where we are in the process
   a. Presented by Karen Soule
   b. Please see attached PowerPoint

II. Examining Data for Root Cause Analysis
   a. Presented by Andrea Reade
   b. Stakeholders were broken into small groups and asked to brainstorm reasons why there was a gap between students from low-income families as designated by free and reduced lunch data serviced by beginning eductaors in highest quartile versus lowest quartile in NH focus and priority school settings.
   c. Groups were provided with statistics regarding enrollment, percentages of beginning and experienced educators, and free and reduced lunch recipients in different schools to compare and analyze the number of beginning educators to free and reduced lunch recipients for potential relationships between highest poverty in priority and focus schools and lowest poverty in priority and focus schools in relation to the percent of beginning Educators Credential.
   d. Groups reported out their findings
   e. Final wrap up and discussed next steps

*Next meeting date Thursday March 12th 3:30-6:30 at the NH Dept. of Education

NH State Plan for Equitable Access to Excellent Educators
Stakeholder Task Force Meeting
March 12, 2015
Small Group Notes

Group 1 Notes

Challenge Statements:

1. In high poverty schools there is lower education attainment status of parents, who, in turn, have lower paying jobs.
2. There are more beginning teachers in higher poverty districts because the district can't support them financially (lack of PD funds at the district and fewer resources in general)
3. Teachers like to teacher in lower poverty districts because of educationally supportive parents and educationally motivated students.
4. The number of open positions in each district or school influences how many beginning teachers will be hired.
5. There could be a perception among beginning teachers that students living in poverty might have less background knowledge and might be more difficult to teach.

Root Analysis for Challenge Statements:

For #1

- Parents don't think that education is the answer for what their kids need.
- Because of economic changes, parents are realizing that they can't depend on jobs not requiring a high school diploma.
- Families supporting blue collar jobs are disappearing.
- The jobs are going overseas.
- The hard goods that result are less expensive to buy, generating an unsustainable purchasing culture.

- This is a generational issue.
- The expectations of parents continue to be low.

For #2

- As a beginning teacher, you might not appreciate/recognize the importance of a district support system ties to district funds
- They are busy surviving financially and professionally
- Because they don't know what they need and they don't have mentoring.
- Because there is not enough experience (cultural memory) in the district.
- Because teachers move or retire.
- Because they are unhappy with the climate of the district.
- Because there isn't enough support in the district.
- Because there isn't enough support in the district.
- Because there aren't enough funds.
- Because there are inefficient/inequitable tax systems. (property tax, etc.)\

For #3

- Because they receive the educational opportunities to improve their practice.
- Because the parents demand that the schools remain top quality.
- Because the better the school, the better the real estate values
- Because more people want to live there.
- Because they want their children to go to good schools.
- Because they want them to have satisfying careers.
- Because they are interested in their futures.
- Because they are aware of the current economic realities around them.
- Because they are invested citizens/aware and involved.

For #4

- When teachers become experienced, they move on to other districts.
- Because they are unhappy, lacking support, with low salaries.
- Because they are drawn to a better paying job with better benefits.

For #5

- Because teacher prep programs are heavily theoretical and not practical enough.
- Because their student teacher experiences/internships are not sufficient.
- Because the focus is on content or not long enough or not realistic enough.
- Because there aren't enough partnerships between schools and higher education/teacher prep programs.
- Because of location, fears about testing implications, economic realities, and structure/population of teacher preparation programs.

Group 2 Notes:

Group 2 generated the following challenges in the data:

1. In the schools with the higher percentage of beginning new teachers students may have a less stable school climate as a result of ongoing changes in staff
2. New teachers require a lower salary
3. Teacher pay is better in the more affluent districts
4. Student transience may play a role in the different averages
5. The quality of mentoring systems and teacher leadership opportunities may play a role in the different averages

Preliminary root cause analyses for each of the challenges are as follows:

1. In the schools with the higher percentage of beginning new teachers students may have a less stable school climate as a result of ongoing changes in staff
    - Loss of institutional knowledge
    - Educators leave and take what they know
    - Move to jobs with less stress and more money
    - Burnout
    - Loss of teacher agency
2. New teachers require a lower salary
    - Issues of district funding
    - How are districts/town boards allocating money
    - Do teachers select one district over another based on salary
3. Teacher pay is better in the more affluent districts
    - Larger tax base
    - More affluence
4. Student transience may play a role in the different averages
    - Places stress and demands on teachers
    - Additional pressures/constraints placed on teachers
    - Standardized tests and their use may play a role
    - Teachers are under "surveillance" and observed more closely in lower performing districts
5. The quality of mentoring systems and teacher leadership opportunities may play a role in the different averages
    - May need more money for mentoring
    - Funding issue and time issue for mentoring

Group 3 Notes:

The group generated the following challenge statement:

Beginning educators are impacted by enrollment, location and budgets. We then took each of these three challenges and asked the why questions.

ENROLLMENT

- Section 8 housing
- Political concerns
- Charter schools
- Private schools
- Redistricting
- Recession
- Employment
- Subgroups
- Transportation
- Home schooling
- School Choice
- Class size/standards
- Transfers out/high poverty
- Budget
- Change in population
- Social changes
- Transiency
- School/district
- Homeless
- AREA agreements
- Increase/decrease in enrollment based on percent
- percent and size of school
- Number of schools
- District size
- Location
- Refugee population
- Retirement
- Retirement age

DISTRICT/SCHOOL BUDGET

- New teacher, not veteran cost less
- Pay scale
- Who enticing
- Housing
- Money for mentoring
- Local support of school/district
- Professional development
- Class size
- Enrollment

- Beginning educators leave profession
- More opportunities for a second job ie:21st century program
- Leadership
- Loan forgiveness comes from budget hiring beginning educators
- Support services
- Lack of safety net "minimum"
- Condition of building
- School climate
- Cycle of teacher turnover
- Seniority
- Retirement
- Collective bargaining agreement
- Location
- District resources to pursue other funding
- Transportation
- Homeless
- Benefits
- Special Programs i.e.: special education E
- Specialists/ coaches
- Budget committee
- Program development and support (IE high tech schools)
- Lack of jobs in area
- Lack of understanding of budget
- Inequitable state support for schools
- Low overall adequacy funding
- School boards
- Equitable funding in and across district schools
- Differences in Elem. Middle High school

LOCATION

- Budget
- Limited applicants
- Variety and quality of applicant6s
- Transportation
- Demography
- Industry located in district, i.e.: paper mill, hospitals colleges, high tech)
- Jobs I area phasing in or out, growth
- State geography, population centers
- Size based on location
- Urban vs. rural locations
- Community housing (Section 8)
- Transportation
- No social life
- Age

- Technology access/21st century learning
- Lack of support services i.e.: community health, mental health
- Migrants
- Vicinity of colleges/universities
- Location of family ties
- Connection of educator to community
- Location near colleges, for partnerships, linkages, PD
- STEM
- Small community, large community

NH State Plan for Equitable Access to Excellent Educators
Stakeholder Task Force Meeting
March 12, 2015
3:30-6:30 pm
Meeting Notes

Meeting Purpose: To bring together a diverse group of stakeholders and internal DOE staff to serve as a Task Force who will examine the current equity issues in NH schools as part of the process to develop an Equitable Access to Excellent Educators by June 1, 2015 and; to serve in an ongoing capacity to periodically review the implementation and levels of success of strategies within the plan.

Attendance:

Cris Blackstone	Groveton High School/SAU 58
Carl Ladd	Supt. of Schools SAU 58
Tina Greco	DOE 504 Coordinator/Vocational Rehabilitation
Beth Mattingly	Carsey Institute UNH/Parent
Ashley Frame	DOE Title II
Bob Belmont	SAU #8 Concord
Michelle Munson	SAU #71
Angela Keef	DCYF/JJ
Laura Hainey	AFT-NH
Irene Koffink	DOE Data Management
Ginny Clifford	Dept of Education Bureau of Credentialing
Lucy Canotas	Teacher, Manchester
Kelly Demers	St. Anselm's College
Karen Soule	DOE Educator Effectiveness
Andrea Reade	NCC
Ira Glick	NCC
Alysse Coffey	NHMC-CC

Invited unable to attend:

Christine Boston	Special Education Director Dover
Mary Heath	State Legislator
Ethel Gaides	Asst. Supt. of Schools SAU 48
Joanne Malloy	Institute on Disabilities
Mary Ford	Granite State College
Irv Richardson	NH-NEA
Audrey Rogers	SNHU
Lisa Danley	DOE/Career Technical
Amy Parece-Grogan	OMHRA
Cindy Chagnon	NH State Board of Education
Barrett Christina	NH School Boards Association
Andrea Somoza-Norton	NH Dept of Education Title III
Mary T. Lane	NH Dept of Education Special Education Bureau

Welcome and Review of Current Status of Work

Karen Soule began by welcoming new members to the task force and asked each member to introduce themselves and who they represented. She then reviewed the work that the Dept. of Education Planning team had completed since our last meeting. As part of this work NH has reached out the EASN (Equitable Access Support Center) who will be supporting the New Hampshire efforts through resources and coaching. She also once again shared with the task force that the Equity Report in June is only the very first step in the on-going process of ensuring equitable access to excellent educators in NH and that it is important to realize that we will begin by using the USED requirements as the foundation for the development of our on-going process.

Setting the Stage for Data Exploration

As the federal requirements include looking at beginning educators and poverty data the planning team looked at what data was available looking for any relationships between high poverty districts and the percentage of beginning teachers in those districts compared the percentage of beginning teachers in low poverty districts. A summary of the data was shared with the task force by Ira Glick. Ginny Clifford explained that a data set was provided by the NH Department of Education to the Northeast Comprehensive Center under a Memorandum of Agreement for the purposes of this project.

Data Display and Explanation of Data Summary

Ira Glick provided an overview of the data the stakeholders would be reviewing during the meeting. He introduced this section of the agenda by explaining the data the Department has available to it to explore issues related to equity. Subsequently, he explained the data contained in a table the stakeholders would be using to examine potential issues of equity. The table was created by rank ordering, highest to lowest, the percentage of students each of New Hampshire's school districts has in its respective free and reduced lunch program. Once sorted, an average of the percentage of beginning teachers in the highest quartile

and the lowest quartiles for the years 2015, 2014, and 2013 was computed and placed in the table so that in each of the years a comparison could be explored between the averages in the highest and lowest quartiles. Stakeholders would also be able to explore trends over time for each of these quartiles if they so wished. Two data tables were created. The second table addressed the area of district minority numbers; however, this table was not subject to review during this meeting.

Explanation of Protocol for Data Review

Andrea Reade of the Northeast Comprehensive Center explained to the group the next task of conducting a root cause analysis on the data set relating to poverty and beginning educators that Ira Glick had just presented. She reminded the group of the steps in the process they had used at the last meeting to conduct a root cause and then broke the larger group into 3 smaller working groups. Smaller groups were facilitated by Ashley Frame, Karen Soule and Ira Glick. Andrea visited each group multiple times during the process to check in and provide clarification/support as needed. The protocol used is listed below:

1. Ask participants to reflect on possible equitable-access challenges represented in the data.

2. Ask participants to silently brainstorm a list of such challenges, and write them on post-it-notes – one idea/per note. (Explain that brainstorming is idea generating – no true "right answer" here.)

3. Have participants each share out ONE of their brainstormed ideas and write it on a chart paper.

4. Choose ONE of the challenges identified and begin brainstorming for root causes—that is, the reasons why this problematic equity outcome may have occurred. Chart the first potential explanation for the problematic equity outcome; ask the group "why" they think that might be. Write down the first possible reason shared (even if you don't know for sure). Keep asking "why" of the group and charting the responses until you seem to have exhausted the possible causes for the identified problem. (Keep separate charts for each challenge area.)

5. Repeat the process – until all challenge areas have been exhausted.

Small Group Root Cause Analysis

Each task force member was a assigned to a facilitated work group using a set root cause analysis. The small group notes are attached.

Identifying Root Cause Themes

The small working groups returned to work as a large group and Andrea Reade facilitated a sharing out discussion of each group's work. She elicited from the group suggestions for common themes that they heard emerging from all of the small group discussions and charted for use in the upcoming strategy discussion.

The following initial themes emerged from reflection on small group root cause discussions:

- Culture of low expectations (high expectations)
- Inequitable funding impacts climate
- What are the drivers behind open positions
- Better teacher preparation (diversity of experiences)

- Better communication with teacher prep
- Greater scrutiny/more prescriptive teaching (potential additional assessments)
- Location/enrollment/budget
- Culture of respect (within school/within community)

Wrap up and next steps

As time was running short Andrea thanked everyone for coming, reminded them of our next meeting date and shared that the planning team would be reviewing all of the information generated in preparation for our next meeting scheduled for **Thursday April 9th from 3:30 to 6:30 at the NH Dept. of Education.**

Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Initial Stakeholders Task Force Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2015

Attendance:

Cindy Chagnon	State Board of Education
Ashley Frame	DOE Title II
Andrea Somoza-Norton	DOE Title III
Bob Belmont	Concord School District
Audrey Rogers	SNHU (Southern NH Univ.)
Amy Parece-Grogan	OMARA
Lucy Canotas	Teacher
Irv Richardson	NEA-NH
Ginny Clifford	DOE Credentialing
Mary T. Lane	DOE Special Education
Alysse Coffey	NHMC-CCC
Ira Glick	Northeast Comprehensive Center
Andrea Reade	Northeast Comprehensive Center
Tina Grecco	DOE 504 coordinator
Mary Heath	State Legislator

Invited but unable to attend:

Carl Ladd	Supt of Schools SAU 58
Chris Blackstone	Asst. Principal
Ethel Gaides	Asst. Supt. Pemi-Baker
Barrett Christina	NH School Boards Association'
Mary Ford	Granite State
Kim Demers	St. Anselm's

Due to inclement weather a number of stakeholders were unable to attend. Absentee members were sent a follow up email asking for their input.

Meeting Purpose: To bring together a diverse group of stakeholders and internal DoE staff to serve as a task force that will examine the current equity issues in NH schools as part of the process to develop an

Equitable Access to Excellent Educators plan by June 1, 2015 and to serve in an ongoing capacity to periodically review the implementation and levels of success of strategies within the plan.

Andrea Reade welcomed the group, reminded them of upcoming meetings and reviewed the agenda. Ginny Clifford oriented the group to the Equity Plan requirements from the US Education Department.

Ira Glick presented a review of the Poverty Data. The first table represented a rank order of counties from highest to lowest based on percent of students in free and reduced lunch. The second table compares the highest and lowest quartiles of beginning educators when districts and schools are ranked from highest to lowest based on student poverty for years 2015, 2014, 2013. The third table represented the average BEC percent from highest to lowest by county for 2015. The fourth table represented the average percent BEC comparing districts with highest to lowest student enrollment for 2015. The fifth table represented the rank order of counties from highest to lowest based on the average percentage of minority students in 2015. The sixth table represented the rank order of counties from highest to lowest based on the median percentage of minority students in 2015. The seventh table represented a comparison of the highest and lowest quartiles of beginning educators when districts are ranked from highest to lowest based on student minority for years 2015, 2014, and 2013. The eighth table represented a comparison of the highest and lowest quartiles of beginning educators when districts are ranked from highest to lowest based on student minority for years 2015, 2014, and 2013.

Andrea Somoza-Norton presented a clearer picture of minority populations in the state. Her first chart was of the 2014-2015 New Hampshire enrollments of minority students. The second chart represented the intersections of English Learners, Free and Reduced, and Minority students. Andrea Somoza-Norton discussed refugee resettlements across the states, regions and the countries of origin of refugees and English Learners. Her last chart demonstrated the top 5 languages spoken by English Learners in the state.

Andrea Reade led the group in a "group think" about the fifth table, which represented the average percent BEC from highest to lowest based on the average percentage of minority students in 2015.

The large group broke into three smaller groups to discuss the minority/BEC data. The small teams came up with questions that they would like to know the answers to/questions that the data tables brought up.

All of the participants placed stickers on the root cause themes that were the highest priority.

1. Culture of low expectations got 6 votes
2. Inequitable funding got 4 votes
3. Drivers Behind Open Positions got 5 votes
4. Better Teacher Preparation/Better Communication with Teacher Prep got 9 votes
5. Greater scrutiny/more prescriptive teaching (potential additional assessments) got 1 votes.
6. Location/enrollment/budget got 3 votes
7. Culture of respect (with school and within community) got 11 votes.

Of the items stickered, the highest-rated root cause was "Climate and culture of respect." Each participant was then charged with identifying on sticky notes strategies that work to engender this "climate and culture of respect." These strategies were grouped into New Hampshire-based strategies, nationally known strategies, and Out-of-the-Box (innovative) strategies.

Andrea Reade let the large group know that the planning team would analyze and consolidate the results of the strategy generation exercise and that they would distribute it.

The meeting ended at 6:22.

Reminder: Next Meeting Thursday May 7, 2015 (3:30-6:30) at the Dept. of Education, Rm. 15.

Possible strategies notes from April 9, 2015 Meeting

Culture of Low Expectations

New Hampshire-Based Strategies

- Prof. Development culturally responsive for t4eaching and leadership;
- 1000 mentors program in Manchester
- ELO's for more students (Extended learning Opportunities) focusing on strengths, interests show they can be more
- Parent volunteer programs that involve parents talking about their vocations and getting them involved.
- City Year volunteers in urban schools
- InTASC NH Standards
- New Teacher induction pro9gramFamily engagement
- Understanding students and families
- Parent supports (systems)
- Everybody can learn, strong vision
- BRING IT within Derryfield School
- Parent Education Programs
- "Coffee with the principal kinds of parent engagement opportunities
- Parent/teacher associations/Special Education parent groups
- NH Focus and Priority school model partnering with SERESC and Harvrad Project
- RENEW project to raise aspirations and self-awareness of students
- Performance evaluations/standards
- 21st century community-based after/pre school programs

Nationally known strategies

- Community Schools
- Steps for resp3ect and of Cal on low expectations
- PBIS through National Center for Learning Disabilities
- Restorative Justice, students and teachers working together
- WVU Program that has free summer school for poor under-achieving students with real academic potential
- National Principal/Leader Standards
- Date Wide-processes for gathering and examining student data
- Kagan and Lahey's Immunity to Change work

Innovative Strategies

- Making sure that kids and parents are fed and have health care
- Statewide examination of all of the things that affect student achievement-perhaps through John Hattie's lenses School 21 percent other 60 percent
- Student Voice
- Student-Centered Learning
- More project-based internships for HS students.

Culture of Respect

New Hampshire-based Strategies

- Nashua North show respect for all immigrant students by flags of their country of origin in the long front hall of the schools
- National teacher leadership;/mentoring
- Successful professional learning communities
- NHASCD
- PBIS
- RTI
- Engaged site leadership
- Educator support (mentoring, feedback, PLC's etc.
- Safe Schools Project (Rochester, Laconia, Concord)
- Project Aware
- NH Community Senate composed of students, teachers, parents, SB members and administrators, that deals with student issues
- Teach respect for everyone-students, teachers and administrators from 1st grade on
- Student voice
- Dover School District Elementary Schools UDL Academy
- Respect for All Teacher Leaders
- UDL Academy with CAST
- Restorative Circles (See Irv)
- Teacher preparation
- IHE Network
- Bring It Manchester
- Leadership support Meetings/School Leadership Team
- Multi-Tiered system of Support: behavioral and academic instruction
- Responsive Classroom Training (for students-carry over to staff?)
- ELA/Math Specialists/Coaches
- Collaboration, PLC's
- Professional learning for administrators to changes culture
- PBIS and teacher level
- Teacher mentors

Nationally Known strategies

- NISL, Principal Leadership
- Personalized learning schools
- State funded mentor and induction programs, required and funded
- Leadership Training Rockville, Md.

- SWIFT Development sites Leader in Me Programs
- Whole Child, Wellness schools
- PBIS Positive behavior intervention strategies
- PLC's (Professional Learning Communities
- Appreciative Inquiry
- ASCD
- Teacher Leaders
- Mentorships
- Faculty support system framework
- Culture, diversity training
- RETLL CMA, CVA
- CEEDAR

Innovation (Be the change you want to happen)

- CEEDAR grant
- Pre-k-20 partnerships
- Retention strategies, incentives
- Mentoring leadership\Training to support new leaders
- Develop ways to recognize staff strengths
- Extensive PD for educators Safe Schools Healthy Kids grant model for every school district
- Statewide forums on education co-sponsored by a myriad number of groups interested in education and respect
- Induction and mentoring system standards for quality plus funding mechanism
- Allow student feedback/surveys to be part of teacher evaluations

Better Teacher Preparation, Diversity of Experiences/Better Communication with Teacher Preparation

New Hampshire-Based Strategies

- 2 yr. teacher mentor models/mini observations based on Kim Marshall
- NHVR Teacher Internship Program for NH special Education teachers
- Using Danielson frameworks for student teacher evaluation/observation
- Grant to colleges from DOE ire: transition work grant to PSU
- CEEDAR grant
- ASCD
- Reenergizing teacher preparation program'/value of being a teacher
- Tech Ed Camps
- CTE
- NH Higher Education Network for teacher preparation
- IHE Networks performance assessment
- SNHU's competency-based programs in preparation
- IHE Networks sharing data across programs
- School districts/buildings providing feedback/information to higher education
- Competency-based teacher certification coursework/programs
- Culturally relevant pedagogy coursework
- Collaboration of Teacher preparation programs

- Joint Meetings with/IHE network, Council for teacher Education Professional Standards Board and Prek-12 educators
- More time in classrooms during teacher preparation
- Longer in-service residency programs
- Pinkerton Academy is planning several semesters of Teacher Prep classes for their HS students at vocational center
- Experience in multiple grades, schools, districts
- Getting teacher preparation students into real classrooms earl and often
- St. Anselm Intern Program of diversity

Nationally known strategies

- National Teacher Certification
- CCSSO
- Longer internships (than 12-14) weeks
- NEA
- Increased coursework beyond content of best practices
- Cultural awareness
- High Standards for acceptance into preparation programs
- Considered, thoughtful/intentional analysis of the teacher pipeline (Starting at middle school)
- Certification for transition coordinator George Washington Univ.
- WVU Students can only qualify and be accepted into teacher preparation (5 yr. degree) after 2 yrs. of liberal arts basics and fairly high GPA

Innovative Strategies

- Clear, fluid certification paths
- Communication with IHE
- Alignment of certification and teacher preparation programs
- More rigorous STEM education for elementary education students
- Supervisors of students teachers are teachers in the building where groups of student teachers intern
- More focus on special education requirements
- Create transition certifcation for special education
- Create Americorps for teachers

Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Stakeholders Task Force Meeting
Meeting Minutes
May 7, 2015

Meeting Purpose: To bring together a diverse group of stakeholders and internal DoE staff to serve as a task force that will examine the current equity issues in NH schools as part of the process to develop an Equitable Access to Excellent Educators plan by June 1, 2015 and to serve in an ongoing capacity to periodically review the implementation and levels of success of strategies within the plan.

Attendance:

Andrea Somoza-Norton	DOE Title III
Bob Belmont	Concord School District
Irene Koffink	DOE Data Management
Lucy Canotas	Teacher
Irv Richardson	NEA-NH
Ginny Clifford	DOE Credentialing
Mary T. Lane	DOE Special Education
Alysse Coffey	NHMC-CCC
Karen Soule	DOE Educator Effectiveness
Ira Glick	Northeast Comprehensive Center
Ethel Gaides	Asst. Supt. Pemi-Baker
Mary Ford	Granite State

Invited but unable to attend:

Carl Ladd	Supt of Schools SAU 58
Chris Blackstone	Asst. Principal
Mary Heath	State Legislator
Barrett Christina	NH School Boards Association'
Kim Demers	St. Anselm's
Tina Grecco	DOE 504 State Coordinator
Audrey Rogers	SNHU (Southern NH Univ.)
Amy Parece-Grogan	OMARA
Michele Munson	Supt. SAU #71
Ashley Frame	DOE, Title II
Laura Hainey	AFT
Cindy Chagnon	State Board of Education
Jo Anne Malloy	Institute on Disabilities

1. The meeting began with an overview of the agenda and a welcome and introduction of Sally Kingston from the Equitable Access Support Network who is coaching NH on its equity work. Task Force members in attendance introduced themselves and identified the organization they represented.
2. Karen Soule then reviewed a draft of the "NH Ensuring Equitable Access for All Students to Excellent Teachers" plan sharing that this was an initial draft report. The report includes input from Equity Plan Reviewers and from the Equitable Access Support Network. An overview of each of the sections of the report was provided and included:

   Section 1 Introduction

   The NH equity story including the background leading up to the present was summarized.

Section 2 Stakeholder Engagement

An explanation of how stakeholders have and continue to be actively engaged in the process was provided.

Section 3 Equity Gap Exploration and Analysis

A summary of the computed and statistically significant equity gaps was provided and a brief explanation of how they were computed was also provided. A brief overview of the requirement for computing gaps for beginning teachers, out of field teachers and unqualified teachers as they relate to minority students and students in poverty was explained.

Section 4 Strategies for Eliminating Equity Gaps

In addition to an initial overview, stakeholders actively participated in an affinity mapping exercise to find commonalities and clusters among the various strategies identified at previous Task Force meetings. The Task Force then went through a strategy to identify priorities from among the clusters. (Notes from these exercises are included in these minutes.) This activity was led by Sally Kingston.

Section 5 On-Going monitoring and Support

It was shared that this section is a work in progress and that the continued and ongoing input of the stakeholders is crucial with further discussion to occur as the Task Force reviews next steps.

3. Next steps

- An overview of the NH Plan will be provided to the State Board of Education on May 21st .It will be explained that this is just the first step in our work as we move forward with ensuring equitable access for all students.

- A meeting of the Internal DOE Planning Team will be held by the end of June to review next steps based on equity data for all three equity gaps and to develop plans for moving forward.

- An initial meeting to develop a communication plan will be held on June 4, 2015 at the NH DOE. All stakeholders will be invited to participate in the development of the plan. As part of the communication plan, we discussed developing an initial executive summary or summary bullet points.

- Going forward, quarterly meetings of the Stakeholders Task Force will be held to provide support and monitor progress of the plan.

- Monthly updates as needed will be provided to Stakeholder Task Force members by the NH DOE Internal Planning Team.

- Task Force members were asked to recommend additional members for the Stakeholder Task Force.

- Karen Soule will contact Task Force members who were not in attendance to ask if they would continue to represent their organization and also to ask if they could recommend other organizations or individuals that would make a positive contribution to the NH Stakeholders Task Force.

Appendix E

NORTHEAST COMPREHENSIVE CENTER

Review Poverty Data

Table A

Rank Order of Counties from Highest to Lowest Based on percent of Students in Free and Reduced Lunch

County	Number of Districts	%FR	Median FR
Coos	11	47.65	51.1
Carroll	9	38.68	42.5
Cheshire	14	36.11	33.95
Grafton	26	34.9	39.4
Belknap	10	33.8	35.15
Sullivan	10	31.23	31.85
Strafford	9	31	31.6
Merrimack	16	29.16	26.7
Hillsborough	22	18.36	14.85
Rockingham	36	15.08	14.5

State average of students on free and reduced lunch = 28.39 percent

State median of students on free and reduced lunch = 26.8 percent

NORTHEAST COMPREHENSIVE CENTER

Table B

Comparing Highest and Lowest Quartiles of Beginning Educators When Districts and Schools Are Ranked From Highest to Lowest Based on Student Poverty For Years 2015, 2014, and 2013

Year	Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Highest Quartile		Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Lowest Quartile	
	District	School	District	School
2015	16.67	17.05	10.99	11.84
2014	15.45	14.83	10.50	9.84
2013	14.55	13.29	7.93	7.87

NORTHEAST COMPREHENSIVE CENTER

General Background Data

Table C

Average BEC percent from Highest to Lowest by County for 2015

County	Number of Districts	Number of Teachers	Ave. BEC%	Var	SD	Median%
Sullivan	10	496	21.52	277.42	16.66	17.6
Coos	11	570	18.09	265.1	16.28	15.4
Cheshire	14	1,349	17.46	111.55	10.56	15.05
Grafton	26	1,312	15.48	57.09	7.56	14
Strafford	9	1,343	14.4	27.23	5.22	15
Belknap	10	1,074	13.93	15.54	3.94	13.45
Merrimack	16	1,655	13.53	64.2	8.01	10.2
Hillsborough	22	4,593	13.35	34.52	5.88	13.15
Rockingham	36	4,210	11.28	60.31	7.77	9.7
Carroll	9	584	10.14	87.16	9.34	6.7

Average BEC percent for state = 14.36

Median BEC percent for state = 13.25

Table D

Average percent BEC Comparing Districts with Highest to Lowest Student Enrollment for 2015

District Size	Number of Districts	Average %BEC
Greater than 3,000 students	15	11.67%
Fewer than 100 students	23	20.41%

Average BEC percent for State = 14.36

NORTHEAST COMPREHENSIVE CENTER

Minority Student Data

Table E

Rank Order of Counties from Highest to Lowest Based on the Average Percentage of Minority Students in 2015

County	Number of Districts	Ave. % Minority	Median%	Number of Minority Students	Ave. %BEC
Hillsborough	22	10	8	12,159	13.35
Strafford	9	10	9	1,834	14.40
Rockingham	36	8	7	3,939	11.28
Grafton	26	7	6	935	15.48
Merrimack	16	7	7	1,754	13.53
Belknap	10	6	6	653	13.93
Cheshire	14	6	6	837	17.46
Sullivan	10	5	3	247	21.52
Carroll	9	4	3	226	10.14
Coos	11	4	4	242	18.09

Total number of minority students in state = 22,826

Manchester serves 24 percent of all minority students in the state

Nashua serves 18 percent of all minority students in the state

Together, Manchester and Nashua serve 42 percent of all minority students in the state

Table F

Rank Order of Counties from Highest to Lowest Based on the Median Percentage of Minority Students in 2015

County	Number of Districts	Ave. % Minority	Median%
Strafford	9	10	9
Hillsborough	22	10	8
Rockingham	36	8	7
Merrimack	16	7	7
Grafton	26	7	6
Belknap	10	6	6
Cheshire	14	6	6
Coos	11	4	4
Sullivan	10	5	3
Carroll	9	4	3

Table G

Comparing Highest and Lowest Quartiles of Beginning Educators When Districts Are Ranked From Highest to Lowest Based on Student Minority for Years 2015, 2014 and 2013

Year	Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Highest Quartile	Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Lowest Quartile
2015	12.19	18.14
2014	10.13	16.22
2013	9.19	14.52

Table H

Comparing Highest and Lowest Quartiles of Beginning Educators When Districts and Schools Are Ranked From Highest to Lowest Based on Student Minority for Years 2015, 2014, and 2013

Year	Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Highest Quartile		Average Percentage of Beginning Teachers in Lowest Quartile	
	District	School	District	School
2015	12.19	12.32	18.14	16.44
2014	10.13	10.96	16.22	13.30
2013	9.19	8.41	14.52	12.31