(D) Great Teachers and Leaders *(138 total points)*

State Reform Conditions Criteria

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

The extent to which the State has—

(i)   Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

(ii)   Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and

(iii)   A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(1)(i), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:
*   A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State's alternative routes (as described in the alternative route to certification definition in this notice).

Evidence for (D)(1)(ii), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:
*   A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State's alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:
    *   The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
    *   The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year.
    *   The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(D)(1)(i) *Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals.* New Hampshire has provided alternative certification routes to teachers and principals for over two decades. **RSA 186:11, X(a), Duties of State Board of Education** provides the statutory authority for the NH Department of Education to create the NH administrative rules providing the regulations for alternative routes to certification. There are five routes to certification in NH with three of these routes considered as alternative to traditional certification pathways.

D(1)(ii) NH regulation Part Ed. 505: Qualifying Methods for Obtaining a Teaching Credential delineates five alternative pathways to educator certification. The chart below identifies and describes each pathway.

Pathways to Certification	Description of Alternative Pathways
Alternative 1: Preparation through NH professional educator preparation programs	**Ed 505.01.** Completion of a professional educator preparation program at one of the public or private institutions of higher education in NH, including a practical/experience-based field practicum.
Alternative 2: Reciprocity	**Ed 505.02** NH accepts candidates from all states and the jurisdictions if the candidates graduated from an approved state program have been employed as a certified teacher for at least three years out of the last seven, or completed an alternative certification program.
Alternative 3 A, B, C: Non-traditional path demonstrated competencies	**Ed 505.03** There are three options to Alternative 3: **Alternative 3-A – Educators:** Requires a demonstration of teacher competencies through submission of a portfolio and interview with a board of examiners. Must have at least 3 months of full-time continuous experience as an educator in the area of endorsement. **Alternative 3-B – Educators:** A national level or regional certification such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) or American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE), which has been validated in the individual's endorsement area and achieved by passing a national or regional examination designed to assess the individual's skill in the area in which the individual seeks certification. **Alternative – 3-C – Administrators:** Superintendent of schools, principals or special education administrators can qualify for certification if the Bureau of Credentialing determines, using transcript analysis, that he or she meets specific requirements for that area of administration.
Alternative 4: Critical shortage areas, career and technical education and business administrator	**Ed 505.04** Completion of a professional development plan in a critical shortage teacher area, career and technical education and/or business administration; successful teaching under a mentor teacher; and recommendation for certification from the local Superintendent of Schools.
Alternative 5: Site-based certification plan	**Ed 505.05** Graduation from a four-year institution of higher education with a Bachelor's degree plus 30 credit hours in the discipline associated with the endorsement; one year successful teaching under a mentor teacher; completion of a professional development plan; and a recommendation from the local Superintendent of Schools.

In addition to the five alternative certification pathways, NH's Upper Valley Educator's Institute provides an alternative teacher preparation route for individuals with a strong academic background and career and life experiences through an intensive ten-month internship program.

(D)(1)(iii) *Areas of Teacher and Principal Shortage.* NH DOE conducts an annual survey of all Superintendent of Schools to determine critical shortage areas. Based on its 2009-10 analysis, the NHDOE identified critical shortage areas in special education, mathematics, science, family and consumer science, technology education, world languages, computer technology and English for speakers of other languages. (Appendix D-1 provides a complete list of specific critical shortage endorsement areas.)

Several NH initiatives exist to enhance teacher recruitment, preparation and retention in response to these critical shortage areas. For instance, NEA-NH and the NHDOE jointly sponsor a Future Educator Academy within New Hampshire high schools to encourage students to consider a teaching career. As part of the academy, the critical shortage areas are promoted as an area of demand with increased likelihood of employment upon graduation.

Granite State College's teacher preparation program has a primary focus on preparing special educators contributing to an increased pool of special education teachers. Granite State College serves a large number of non-traditional students, including Alternative 4 candidates, and ultimately transitions them to a traditional pre-service program completion.

In 2002, NH received a Transition to Teaching Grant from the USDOE which supported a statewide effort entitled Project A.C.R.O.S.S. (Alternative Certification Routes with On-going Support Systems) which matched 100 Alternative IV and V teacher certification candidates and provided these pairs with a two-year professional development support system. Through their involvement with Project A.C.R.O.S.S. alternative candidates received professional development focused on instruction and assessment strategies while their mentors enhanced their knowledge and skills as collaborative coaches. Mentors learned how to conduct planning and reflecting conversations, conduct coaching observations, gather classroom data and provide feedback to their alternative teacher candidate partner.

Reform Plan Criteria

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance *(58 points)*

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; *(5 points)*

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; *(15 points)*

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; *(10 points)* and

(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— *(28 points)*

    (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

    (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

    (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

    (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals,

activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages

D(2)(i) *Establish Clear Approaches to Student Growth.* New Hampshire is actively searching for support to develop a performance-based accountability system that will allow schools to demonstrate, using multiple measures, that they are helping students to achieve at high levels <u>and</u> facilitating their improvement. The Department is exploring a new model developed by the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA), which is based on work in Colorado and Massachusetts. In creating NH's model, NCIEA would use performance data from NH (e.g., NECAP data, other valid and reliable measures) to develop user-friendly reports and data "views" for school and district personnel and the general public. The Department's goal is to link this growth model to the state's accountability system, e.g., if a school or district meets proficiency goals for ELA and Math on the NECAP assessment, then they meet state accountability. If not, progress on a Growth Model utilizing NECAP data (based on a modified version of the Colorado Growth Model) would be applied. If the school or district meets their growth targets under this model, they would meet state accountability. If not, then a tertiary local growth model would be examined.

D(2)(ii) *Design and Implement Evaluation Systems for Teachers and Principals.* High-quality educator evaluation systems are largely dependent upon having a clear definition of teacher and principle effectiveness; a well articulated set of standards that are agreed upon by involved stakeholders, e.g., teachers, administrators, teacher associations, school boards and SEAs; a differentiated process to evaluate educators at different stages of their careers and across various contexts; and multiple measures of educator effectiveness (Little, Goe, and Bell 2009). Additionally, it is vital to provide ongoing training and support for teachers, principals and their evaluators to ensure fidelity of program implementation and produce data that will be useful in improving practice.

New Hampshire seeks to create a comprehensive, high quality educator evaluation system over the next four years. Historically, teacher and principal evaluation systems in NH have been largely developed by individual LEAs utilizing different sets of standards and a variety of models. Within the last seven years, there has been much more consensus across NH LEAs and schools about what constitutes effective teaching with many adopting Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2009) or The Skillful Teacher framework (Saphier, Haley

and Gower; 2008). (See Appendix D 2 for descriptions of the Framework for Teaching and the Skillful Teacher framework).

Similarly, through its recent work with the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL), NH is working toward a common vision for effective leadership. Principals from Manchester schools, NH's largest urban and most diverse LEA, engaged in the NISL leadership academy where they developed leadership knowledge and skills around a common set of standards. This was met with great success in terms of the impact of principals' participation in the academy and student learning in their schools. Through its RttT initiative, NH will increase the number of principals, particularly from the lowest-performing schools and LEAs, participating in such leadership academies.

Additionally, through their participation in the Council of Chief State School Officers State Consortium on Education Leadership, NH SEA staff continue to collaborate with their counterparts from New England and around the country to examine ways to incorporate the Interstate School Leaders Consortium (ISLLC) policy standards, performance expectations and indicators for education leaders (CCSSO, 2008) into state certification and evaluation systems for education leaders. (See Appendix D-3 for a description of the ISLLC performance indicators.)

Defining Teacher Effectiveness. There is much agreement that teacher quality is the most important factor in student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). In recent history, the conversation about measuring teacher effectiveness has shifted from only examining teacher quality, as measured by certification, coursework and subject-matter education, to quality teaching which looks at the effectiveness of what teachers do on what students learn (Goe and Stickler, 2008). Measuring teacher effectiveness in terms of what students learn is often defined as student achievement on standardized assessments. There are several limitations to this singular view of measuring teacher effectiveness:
- Teachers are not exclusively responsible for students' learning;
- Consensus should drive research, not measurement innovations;
- Test scores are limited in the information they provide; and

- Learning is more than average achievement gains.

An expanded definition of teacher effectiveness includes the impact of what teachers do on what students learn and other key attributes. Effective teachers:

- Have high expectations;
- Contribute to positive academic, attitudinal and social outcomes;
- Use diverse resources to plan and structure engaging learning opportunities;
- Contribute to the development of classrooms and schools that value diversity and civic-mindedness; and
- Collaborate with other teachers, administrators, parents and education professionals to ensure student success (Little, Goe, and Bell, 2009).

Definition of leader effectiveness. Effective leadership is vital in creating professional learning communities that thrive, are adaptive to changing contexts and needs and where their members assume collective responsibility for the learning and achievement of all students (Fullan, 2007; Marzano, 2005). Traditionally, leadership standards for principals in NH have been largely defined by the state standards for principal certification. Through its work with the NISL leadership academy and the CCSSO ISLLC Consortium on Educator Leadership, NH is poised to create a set of performance standards for effective leaders as the foundation for its principal evaluation system. This represents a shift from defining and measuring principal effectiveness based on knowledge and successful coursework completion to performance.

Implementing teacher and principal evaluation systems. With these expanded definitions of teacher and principal effectiveness it is imperative to broaden the ways in which it is measured. NH will engage stakeholders in researching existing educator evaluation models (nationally and in-state) that are based on this broader definition of educator effectiveness and that include multiple measures of teacher and principal effectiveness. They will create models for both teacher and principal evaluation; pilot these models beginning with the Tier 1 – lowest-achieving LEAs and schools in Years one and two; research, evaluate and refine the pilot models; disseminate findings; and engage Tier 2 and Tier 3 LEAs and schools in implementing these evaluation systems in Years 3 and 4. LEAs and schools engaged in piloting and/or implementing these evaluation models will collaborate through the educator evaluation strand of the Teacher

Effectiveness and Leadership Innovation Networks to participate in professional development to support and train teachers, principals and their evaluators, share lessons learned, continue to refine their models and disseminate findings.

As part of its RttT proposal, the NH DOE will contract with an external partner to serve as Director of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness. This individual will take the lead on bringing together various stakeholders to form two distinct groups: one focused on teacher evaluation systems and one focused on principal evaluation systems. Each group will research and identify teacher and principal evaluation models, respectively, to serve as pilots for Tier 1 LEAs and schools in Year 1, which will expand to Tier 2 and 3 LEAs and schools in Years 2-4. These collaborative groups will include: NH NEA, NH AFT, NH School Administrators Association, NH Principals Association, NH State Board of Education, NH School Boards Association, representatives from NH colleges and universities, teachers, principals, community member at-large and NH SEA staff.

Each group will research and examine existing teacher evaluation systems and how various teacher and leader evaluation methods are being implemented in these systems. They will analyze evaluation methods including: value added models, classroom observation, principal evaluation, instructional artifacts, portfolio, teacher or principal self-report and student survey. (Appendix D-3 provides a brief summary of these methods, the research behind them and the strengths and cautions of each. Appendix D-4 is a matrix that identifies which method best serves various purposes for the evaluation of teacher effectiveness).

(D)(2)(iii) *Conduct Annual Evaluations of Teachers and Principals.* A specific set of criteria will guide each of these statewide groups as the research is conducted and, ultimately, be used to identify evaluation models to use in the initial pilot with Tier 1 schools. NH teacher and principal evaluation systems will include (but not be limited to) the following criteria:

- Include multiple measures of teacher and principal effectiveness;
- Link teacher and principal performance to student learning, achievement and growth;
- Include clearly articulated performance standards that allow for differentiation of contexts;

- Identify differentiated levels of performance for novice, experienced and master level educators; and
- Utilize teacher and leader evaluation as one indicator/measure in the selection of individuals to assume specific leadership roles, e.g., teacher leader, instructional coach, principal fellow.

NH seeks to develop teacher and principal evaluation models that are ongoing and provide for increasing levels of choice in how performance is measured relative to achievement of performance measures and levels of experience.

(D)(2)(iv) *Use Evaluations to Inform Decisions.* The development and implementation of effective teacher and principal evaluation models requires a robust professional development component to provide training and support to teachers, principals and those who evaluate them. For example, in year 1, Tier 1 pilot participants participate in a year-long professional learning community designed to increase knowledge and skill in several arenas.

Together, teachers and principals will:
- Deepen their knowledge of teacher effectiveness and teacher effectiveness standards;
- Enhance their knowledge of effective instructional practices and common formative assessments (as two key teacher effectiveness categories); and
- Learn about the supervision and evaluation process within the specific evaluation model selected and the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders.

Additionally, evaluators will:
- deepen their knowledge and skills around various supervision strategies, e.g., classroom walkthrough protocols, cognitive coaching, classroom data gathering;
- explore ways to link various incentives to the evaluation process including career ladder options;
- learn about policies and practices to support the use of evaluation data in making decisions about tenure and continued employment of those they supervise; and

- Enhance their understanding of professional development standards and effective professional development design as it relates to supporting those who they evaluate in acquiring requisite knowledge and skill.

What follows is an action plan which will guide NH's implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems.

New Hampshire's Plan for Developing Effective Teacher and Leader Evaluation Models

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Responsible Parties
First Year (2010-2011)			
Complete draft plan for development of models, including review of existing evaluation systems in NH and nationally	▪ Obtain feedback on the plan from key partners	ASAP	Commissioner, Director of Division of Program Support, and Coordinator for Teacher and Administrator Reform
Ensure effective project management	▪ Identify external consultant to facilitate subcommittee and keep project on track	Immediately after award	Coordinator for Teacher and Administrator Reform
Establish a statewide subcommittee of the Professional Standards Board and Council of Teacher Education with representation from teachers' unions, administrator unions, institutions of higher education and organizations that prepare teachers and leaders, and administrators and teachers from persistently lowest-performing schools and participating districts with a focus on evaluation	▪ Identify subcommittee members ▪ Develop clear charge, goals, and timeline for work ▪ Assess what strengths each individual brings to task and recruit a complementary skill set among members	January 2010 – ongoing	New Hampshire Department of Education's Division of Program Support (lead), with assistance from the Commissioner and the Division of Instruction
Analyze the teacher evaluation survey from the SFSF data collection to determine the types of evaluation systems already being used across the state	▪ Request a short response research brief from the REL to create a summary report	February 2010	Division of Program Support
Draft keys to effective evaluation	▪ Draft keys to effective evaluation ▪ Consult research on evaluation systems that have themselves been evaluated ▪ Obtain feedback on draft from teachers and school leaders in persistently lowest-	Keys to effective evaluation drafted; February – March 2010	Subcommittee of Professional Standards Board (PSB) and Council of Teacher Education and consultant; external partners and school staff

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Responsible Parties
	achieving and participating schools, the teachers' unions, administrators' union, and IHEs		
Gather and analyze research on: ▪ Teaching standards ▪ Leadership standards	▪ Draft career ladder standards (beginning educator, experienced educator, master teacher) ▪ Draft leadership standards for NH, or adopt/adapt national standards	January 2010 – December 2010	Subcommittee of PSB and Council of Teacher Education
Research different evaluation models; draft evaluation model for NH that includes data on student growth as a significant factor in evaluation of teachers and leaders	▪ Identify multiple measures to be used in evaluation ▪ Investigate models that include data on student growth as a significant factor, e.g., measures identified, individual vs. grade level vs. school ▪ Meet with district representatives who have already incorporated student performance components in their evaluation models ▪ Gather research on growth models, if NH's model is not determined ▪ Meet with data staff at the Department to ensure that specific data will be collected ▪ Draft models for NH	August 2010 – June 2011	Subcommittee of PSB and Council of Teacher Education, consultant
Second Year (2011-2012)			
Obtain feedback from field on proposed models	▪ Develop survey and accompanying letter or email ▪ Identify individual stakeholders and organizations in State with whom to share draft ▪ Use regularly scheduled meetings with groups to obtain feedback ▪ Analyze results	July and August 2011	Coordinator for Teacher/Leader Reform

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Responsible Parties
	▪ Revise draft ▪ Email revised draft to anyone who submitted comments		
Establish rulemaking for evaluation, e.g., linking professional development to evaluation, adopting annual evaluations	▪ Complete a review of laws and rules relating to teacher evaluation, continuing contracts, granting of EEC ▪ Begin rulemaking process	August 2011 – March 2012	Director, Division of Program Support, and State Board of Education
Build support across the state for the new plan	▪ Create a comprehensive plan for dissemination and outreach	January 2012 – March 2012	Commissioner's Office, Coordinator of Teacher Reform, Coordinator of Administrator Reform
Prepare for piloting models in persistently lowest-achieving and participating schools as well as involved districts statewide	▪ Develop plan for piloting year ▪ Identify size of and participants in pilot, e.g., persistently lowest-achieving and participating schools plus others, if warranted	March 2012 – June 2012	Coordinator for Teacher Reform, Coordinator for Administrator Reform
Develop training for school leaders and teachers	▪ Establish broad-based group with subcommittees that address different activities ▪ Develop training modules for leaders who will evaluate teachers and superintendents who will evaluate leaders ▪ Develop guidebook for new evaluation process ▪ Videotape effective teachers, or obtain commercially-developed videotapes ▪ Craft sessions in which to share new models, purpose, etc. with teachers and leaders	March 2012 – August 2013	Coordinator for Administrator Reform, Coordinator for Teacher Reform
Third Year (2012-2013)			
Prepare leaders to evaluate teachers and superintendents to evaluate leaders; ready teachers and leaders for new evaluation model	▪ Conduct professional learning for school leaders and superintendents ▪ Introduce teachers and leaders to new models, purpose, what they will get out of it	August 2012 – August 2013	Coordinator with assistance from NHASP, subcommittee members

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Responsible Parties
	▪ Identify leaders, who can be groomed to lead training in subsequent years		
Pilot models in persistently lowest-achieving and participating schools, and involved LEAs statewide	▪ Evaluate pilot implementation ▪ Conduct formative evaluations of implementation in pilot sites, e.g., surveys or telephone interviews of teacher and leader participants ▪ Coordinate peer evaluation, e.g., 360º model ▪ Analyze feedback from field; refine draft models	August 2012 – August 2013	Coordinator, external partners
Continue to build support for models across the state by implementing comprehensive dissemination and outreach plan	▪ Share models and findings at gatherings across state ▪ Publicize it through articles, newsletters, electronic mail	January – August 2013	Coordinator, participating leaders and teachers, NHASP, NHSAA
Plan for voluntary statewide implementation in fourth year	▪ Develop plan for expansion of pilot ▪ Identify additional districts interested in implementing model ▪ Co-design and conduct training with leaders interested in becoming trainers	January – June 2013	Coordinators with subcommittee members, interested leaders
Identify external evaluator	▪ Draft RFP, solicit bids ▪ Select external evaluator jointly identified by coordinators and P-16 Council's Research Group ▪ Design evaluation	March – June 2013	Coordinators with assistance from subcommittee members and P-16 Council's Research Group
Fourth Year (2013-2014)			
Implement evaluation models across the state	▪ Conduct training for school leaders and superintendents ▪ Introduce teachers and leaders to benefits of the model	August 2013 – August 2014	
Conduct summative evaluation of a sample of third- and fourth-year implementation sites, both the model and changes in	▪ Select sample districts ▪ Conduct evaluation ▪ Analyze data ▪ Share findings with sub-committee and on	August 2013 – August 2014	Coordinator, external evaluator

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Responsible Parties
student achievement	web site ▪ Refine draft models		
Continue to build support for models across state	▪ Share models and findings at gatherings and conferences across the state (subcommittee members, participating teachers and leaders, NHDOE staff); through information on NHDOE's, NEA's, AFT's and participating districts' Web sites	January 2013 – ongoing	Coordinator, subcommittee members, participating teachers and leaders

Performance Measures Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section II. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Criteria	**General goals to be provided at time of application:**	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).					
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	0				
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	0				
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:					
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	• Developing teachers and principals.	0				
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Compensating teachers and principals.	0				
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Promoting teachers and principals.	0				
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Retaining effective teachers and principals.	0				
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	• Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	0				
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	• Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	0				
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data] Targets will be set collaboratively by statewide groups described in text.						
General data to be provided at time of application:						

Total number of participating LEAs.	35	
Total number of principals in participating LEAs.	275	
Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.	5752	

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

Criterion	Data to be requested of grantees in the future:	
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.	
(D)(2)(iii)[1]	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.	

(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.		

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals *(25 points)*

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; *(15 points)* and

(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. *(10 points)*

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(3)(i):
- Definitions of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for the purposes of the State's Teacher Equity Plan.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

(D)(3)(i) *Plan for Equitable Distribution.* New Hampshire's Equity Plan has attempted to identify a significant difference in the distribution of experienced educators across high-poverty and high-minority schools compared to low-poverty and low-minority schools. NH's demographics include a 91.6% White, non-Hispanic population with the highest minority districts having 74-75% White, non-Hispanic enrollment. There are several schools within NH's two urban districts that contain only 41-53 % White, non Hispanic students. Although NH is a low-minority state, the percentage of minority students is rising rapidly due to continued immigration. NH continues to welcome refugees and minorities in the state and provides necessary support services to offer a quality of life though education. However, the transient movement of teachers in the state due to low salaries has contributed to the constant churning. District administrators continue to seek ways to improve compensation (sign-on bonuses with contiguous districts, etc.).

New Hampshire is in the early stages of developing its Educator Information System (EIS). The need for a robust data system to measure teacher and principal characteristics is critical to NH's ability to analyze the distribution of educators across the state. Based on a recent analysis using experience as a proxy, there were no clear discrepancies in the distribution of experienced educators as compared to beginning educators or alternative certification candidates across the state. In 2007, the REL-NEI did a fast response research project to look at the data in NH's equity plan. At that time the analysis of available data did not show inequity in the distribution of highly qualified teachers across the state. The EIS is now populated with one year of baseline data. As the EIS develops over ensuing years it will be possible to do a deeper analysis of turnover rates across the state as well as other markers for equitable distribution of teachers and administrators.

Currently, New Hampshire has a data system (Performance Plus) that provides teachers and administrators with assessment results for each student. NH is beginning the process of collecting student course information (grades, assessment scores, yearly progress), which can be tied to individual educators.

At this time, NH has not initiated a statewide process for teacher evaluation and student growth. However, NH has the capacity to evaluate the distribution of effective and highly effective educators. The statewide longitudinal data system has the capacity for district administrators to view student performance and link it to individual teachers. However, NH is currently engaged in developing a mathematical model based on the Colorado system for calculating a grade level of student through a Nellie Mae Educational Foundation grant. Local administrators are able to look at educator performance over time using state assessment results and their locally developed analysis processes. NH facilitates this analysis with Performance Tracker, a data analysis tool that allows administrators to group classes according to students' needs and teachers' strengths. In more rural areas, it allows them to connect ELL students with teachers who have a positive track record with ELL students.

(D)(3)(ii) *Increase Number and Percentage of Effective Teachers in Critical Shortage Areas.* New Hampshire offers alternative certification for critical shortage areas that include math, science, career technical educator, world languages and special education to facilitate the development of the teaching force in these content areas.

NH's personnel policies and decisions in recruitment and compensation are made at the LEA level through collective bargaining agreements. Both NEA and AFT have local affiliates within the state.

Since NH is a relatively small state, statewide professional development is offered to all districts with targeted schools and districts given first priority in registration. In 2009, the Department conducted a math/science summer institute, created a Response to Intervention initiative and developed the State's RTI plan, and held sessions on the Professional Development Master Plan and recertification. For several years, the NHDOE offered the "My Voice" survey at no cost to schools and districts. Many schools used the survey results to assess their school climate and to address targeted professional development to address students' needs.

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Responsible Parties
Develop EIS to measure equitable distribution with additional data elements	Collect multiple years of data within the new system Conduct analyses of the distribution of educators across the state	2010 and ongoing	Division of Program Support
Develop a growth model to provide one measure of student achievement to be used in an educator evaluation system	Select a model and secure funding to customize it for NH Design and pilot growth model based on Colorado system supported by the Nellie Mae Education Foundation	2010 depending on funding source	Bureau of Accountability and the Division of Program Support

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i) *Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.*	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	n/a	90	92	94	96
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	n/a	92	94	96	98
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	n/a	10	8	6	4
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	n/a	8	6	4	2
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	n/a	90	92	94	96
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	n/a	95	97	98	99
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	n/a	5	4	3	2
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	n/a	4	3	2	1
New Hampshire does not currently have a system to measure the effectiveness of principals or a qualifying evaluation system as defined in this notice. The State has a plan to develop effective leadership standards by **2010,** and a qualifying evaluation plan by **2011**. Both will be piloted in the persistently lowest-achieving schools and implemented statewide one year later.					
General data to be provided at time of application:					

Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	62	
Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	13	
Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	1658	
Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	514	
Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	49	
Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	11	
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]		
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii) *Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.*	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	n/a	0	20	40	60
Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	n/a	0	20	40	60
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	n/a	0	20	40	60
Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	n/a	0	20	40	60
New Hampshire does not currently have a system to measure the effectiveness of teachers or a qualifying evaluation system as defined in this notice. The State has a plan to develop effective teaching standards by 2010**,** and a qualifying evaluation plan by 2011. Both will be piloted in the persistently lowest-achieving schools and implemented statewide one year later.					
General data to be provided at time of application:					
Total number of mathematics teachers.	902				
Total number of science teachers.	1008				
Total number of special education teachers.	2763				
Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs.	796				
Total for mathematics teachers includes those teaching at the middle and high school level. Total for science teachers includes general science, physical science, physics, chemistry, biology, and earth science. The total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs includes 624 who teach world languages and 172 who teach ESOL.					
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:					

Number of mathematics teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
Number of science teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
Number of special education teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
Number of teachers in language instruction educational programs in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	

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

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(D)(4)(i) *Improving the Effectiveness of Teacher and Principal Preparation Programs.* New Hampshire educators, including representatives from teacher preparation programs, teacher unions, school administrators, principals and the NHDOE has already formed a NH Educator Incentive and Achievement Consortium to study and develop a system of incentives for educators and school leaders based on increases in student growth. Simultaneously they propose to research incentives that are proven to positively impact student achievement while developing, in partnership with the NH State Accountability System, a growth model that includes multiple measures of growth in student achievement and educator effectiveness. The consortium members believe that incentives should be granted at the school and perhaps at the team levels but not an individual teacher level. While the growth model will measure individual educator performance, the incentives would be based on aggregated measures of educator effectiveness. The consortium proposes a rigorous and ongoing evaluation component for the system development that includes formative assessment and redesign as the program is piloted and implemented. The project would begin with the high need LEA's in the State, including many of the struggling schools identified in the participating districts of the Race to the Top application.

New Hampshire has already built the infrastructure to collect the information required to connect student achievement to teacher success. In fact, many schools are now having teachers improve their instruction by analyzing their students' success and needs as identified via assessment results. This system already includes an initial growth model that allows teachers to look not just at performance, but also student growth.

As part of the RttT grants, NH's pilot schools will be able to use the existing technology to analyze student growth for all their teachers and incorporate this type of assessment information into teacher evaluation systems. Additionally, the NH Legislature is working to expand state legislation and gain the public support to ensure all public schools in New Hampshire provide data to include the classes students are enrolled in for all teachers. This will position the State to expand the use of student outcomes for evaluation to all districts across the state.

Beyond the educator evaluation system, the use of student outcomes can also be expanded to evaluate and improve teacher preparation programs. The model and technology that has been developed at the state will enable linking the student outcomes back to in-state teacher preparation programs.

Additionally, legislation is also being brought forward that will connect early childhood, K-12 and postsecondary student data. By linking student and postsecondary program information, over time the State will be able to see if specific college course work translates to success in student achievement. For example, the State can see if certain educator preparation program data or success in initial math or science courses in college correlate to success in teaching as based upon student outcomes. Of course there are many internal and external factors that can also impact a teacher's ability to manifest student growth, but NHDOE will begin to have a complete data system to gain some insights into early predictors.

NH is creating both the technological and analytical capacity to link student achievement and growth data to both educators and their preparation while building the stakeholder support to conduct system wide evaluation and implementation of the conditions correlated with increasing student achievement.

New Hampshire's data warehouse will contain a public reporting feature that will support making information on pre-service evaluation available to the public.This transparency may help to drive ongoing improvements in our educator preparation systems.

(D)(4)(ii) *Expand Preparation and Credentialing Options and Programs.* New Hampshire's higher education community is at the table with the NHDOE and other stakeholders and partners to explore education reform. There are ongoing discussions and planning efforts around the formation of NH's Research Group, the application for NH's Teacher Quality Partnership Grant, the potential application for the Teacher Incentive Fund grant and the Race to the Top proposal. The meetings that are being conducted around the state in response to the various stimulus grant opportunities are stirring interest in reform efforts and providing an impetus for stakeholders to get together and engage in critical conversations.

New Hampshire has a history of supporting alternative pathways to teaching. The Professional Standards Board is preparing new rules to strengthen the mentoring standards for the mentoring component of the alternative certification process.

New England has an active Troops to Teachers program. New Hampshire's TTT program director is very committed to recruitment and is visible at a variety of statewide events.

There is strong interest from multiple partners to strengthen induction and mentoring programs and to increase the time spent in field experiences as part of the educator preparation programs.

Goals	Activities	Timelines	Responsible Parties
Develop a qualifying evaluation model	Secure funding Select and purchase a growth model to link student outcomes to individual educators and teams of educators	2011-2012	Divisions of Instruction and Program Support
Populate the data warehouse with the required data elements	Collect course and class information from districts	2012-2013	Districts and the Division of Program Support
Link student achievement to educator preparation programs	Develop the linkage within the educator information system; determine the number of years of data that are needed to draw conclusions	2013-2014	Division of Program Support

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0				
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0				
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]					
General data to be provided at time of application:					
Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State.	15				
Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State.	7				
Total number of teachers in the State.	15,763				
Total number of principals in the State.	434				
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]					
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:					
Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.					
Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.					

Number of principal credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.	
Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.	

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

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

(i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

(D)(5)(i) *Providing Effective, Data-Informed Professional Development.* New Hampshire will build upon its existing professional development initiatives and policies to develop a robust and comprehensive, statewide professional development system for NH teachers and principals participating in NH's Race to the Top initiatives beginning with induction and continuing throughout their careers. There are four components to NH's emerging professional development system which blend policy and practice: NH Innovation Networks, NH Mentoring and Induction Network for New Teachers (NH MINNT), the NH Leadership Academy (NHLA), NH educator professional development plans and NH school district master plans. NH MINNT and NHLA are two signature initiatives of NH's Race to the Top plan and will exist within the Teacher Effectiveness and Leadership Innovation Networks respectively. Turnaround Consortium members will be required to participate in NH MINNT and NHLA. In addition, Turnaround Consortium members, participating LEAs and other districts across the state will participate in one or more of the NH Innovation Networks.

New Hampshire Innovation Networks.

Six priority areas have been identified around which NH Innovation Networks will be developed. The priority areas are: standards and assessment, STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), teacher effectiveness, leadership, high school transformation and Board Exam/Move on When Ready. The professional development system that NH will develop will include specific professional development content within each Innovation Network area and a common professional development focus that will cut across all areas. Within each Innovation Network area participants will engage in regularly scheduled in person and online communities, workshops, institutes and online courses. The specific professional development content focus for each Innovation Network will vary and there will be several professional development content areas that cut across all Innovation Networks. Figure 1: Professional Development Matrix for NH Innovation Networks outlines the professional development content for these networks.

Figure 1: Professional Development Matrix for New Hampshire Innovation Networks

Standards and Assessment Network	STEM Network	Teacher Effectiveness Network	Leadership Network	High School Transformation Network	Board Exam/ Move On When Ready Network
Content focus: *Data management systems *Performance-based assessments *Criterion referenced assessments *Growth models *Performance-based teacher evaluation systems that link to student learning and achievement	*Content focus:* *Integration of pre-engineering curriculum into existing math and science curriculum *Science, math, engineering and technology content courses and institutes *Teacher leadership in STEM	*Content focus:* *Mentoring and induction for new teachers (NH MINNT) *Teacher performance standards *Instructional coaching *Career ladders *Teacher preparation *Teacher evaluation systems that link to student learning and achievement *Teacher leadership *Teacher improvement for struggling teachers	*Content focus:* *NH Leadership Academy (NHLA) *Mentoring and induction for new administrators *Teacher evaluation systems that link to student learning and achievement *Building effective school cultures *Leadership Effectiveness *Conditions for school/district transformation *Leadership evaluation systems that link to student learning and achievement	*Content focus:* *International Baccalaureate Programs *Extended learning Opportunities *Non-traditional high school settings *Virtual high school *Competency-based Assessments *Dropout prevention *Early warning indicator systems	*Content focus:* *Personalized learning pathways *Performance plus *International Baccalaureate programs *STEM *Teacher evaluation systems that link to student achievement

Professional Development Content That Cuts Across All Innovation Networks

- Common core standards
- Formative assessment
- Effective instructional strategies
- Instructional rigor for high levels of cognitive demand

- Data gathering, analysis and use
- Technology integration and use
- Personalized learning
- Curriculum

The NH Innovation Networks will commence in the fall of 2010 with the first cohort consisting predominately of the Tier 1 LEAs and schools.

New Hampshire Mentoring and Induction Network for New Teachers (NH MINNT). The NH Department of Education will contract with a lead partner to design and implement a four-year NH Mentoring and Induction Network for New Teachers (NH MINNT). The external partner will serve as a member, lead facilitator and lead partner for the NH MINNT statewide collaborative; design and implement the NH MINNT mentoring and induction academy and online professional learning components; design and implement the capacity building effort through an intensive gradual release capacity building – *trainer of trainers* – strategy; oversee the online mentoring component; and lead the effort to develop a series of videos to be used for ongoing professional development for NH MINNT.

During the initial meeting, this group will identify all of the mentoring induction efforts being conducted within New Hampshire and create a statewide map of these activities. It will review specific needs of particular educator groups with regard to mentoring and induction to ensure that the NH MINNT model is effective in both differentiating for specific needs while maintaining fidelity to common core principles of professional learning in all mentoring and induction efforts. Educator groups who will require specific supports within the mentoring and induction context include new educators in the following areas:

- Elementary level
- Secondary level (middle and high school) within specific academic areas (e.g., mathematics, science, literacy/ELA)
- Pre-service teacher candidates
- Special education
- Guidance counselors/school psychologists
- ELL
- Alternative IV and V teacher certification candidates

The NH MINNT statewide collaborative will also work closely and align efforts with other statewide providers supporting the mentoring, induction and leadership development of New Hampshire administrators. For example, during the implementation phase of this project a

statewide mentoring and induction academy will occur each year bringing together teams from school districts across the state. Building and district administrators will also be part of these learning teams. As such, the content of their professional learning will include leadership knowledge and skills necessary for effective, on-going implementation of mentoring and induction. This will require an intentional collaboration between the NH MINNT providers and providers of leadership professional development for administrators.

The NH MINNT model will roll out over a four-year period with the goal at the end of the four years to have a self-sustaining model including a statewide infrastructure for ongoing delivery of mentoring and induction professional development for all NH educators.

During Year 1, the NH MINNT statewide collaborative will be established and convened. This group will advise on the selection of 15 – 20 schools/districts teams of up to 10 people per team (150 – 200 participants) to participate in the Year 1 NH MINNT mentoring and induction academy. This five-day, residential summer academy will utilize a "real world" learning approach that provides teams with a customized, multi-day learning design in an academy setting where they learn new content while doing real work and have protected time to work as a team to create implementation plans for their unique settings.

In Year 2, cohort I will continue to participate in year two of the academy and be joined by cohort II (an additional 15-20 school/district teams of 150-200 participants). In Year 3, the first-year cohort will participate in the on-line components and site-based coaching and professional development only. A third cohort of 15-20 school/district teams will join the second cohort in the third year of the academy with a fourth cohort joining the third cohort in year four.

Leadership Academy. The NH DOE will let an RFP to select an organization that provides an intensive professional development experience for leaders that focuses on instructional improvement. It will search for an organization with a proven track record in using data to inform instructional and programmatic decisions, increasing student achievement faster than similar organizations, and narrowing the achievement gap. The program will be job-embedded and cohort-based with a focus on areas that have proven to be critical to successful school

leadership: strategic thinking, instructional leadership, building a culture of learning, using data to focus on results and to identify the most effective practices and building collaborative teams. On-line assistance, interactive classroom time and action research projects will support and provide real-life applications.

Each cohort will consist of teams of two or three individuals from each school—a principal, a district leader, and one other school leader. They will be grouped into two cohorts of 18-20 participants, one in the northern part of the state and one in the south. In addition, six educators – chosen based on evidence of their positive impact on student achievement and previous experiences working with adults – will be invited to become future trainers. They will participate in the leadership academy and meet after each unit with NH DOE staff, the external partners, and the consultants to debrief the challenges of facilitation and attend a facilitator institute. They will be observed and evaluated during their first few trainings by the organization's master consultants and NHDOE staff.

Technology Integration for Professional Learning. The New Hampshire Educator On-line Network (NHEON) will be significantly expanded to ensure a rich integration and use of technology into the statewide professional development system. Specifically, NHEON will expand to include several online courses using open source platforms such as Moodle; use of social networking sites such as Linked-In and Facebook; use of Teacher Tube to house video examples of effective teaching, assessment of teacher and student learning, mentoring, coaching and leadership practices; and collaborative work spaces such as Wiggio. Additionally, New Hampshire's professional development system will utilize other technologies such as Skype (another open source software product) to conduct mentoring and coaching conversations through web cam connections and platforms such as Horizon Wimba and WebEX to host statewide webinars with national and regional experts and in-state educational leaders.

Content Based Professional Development

The lead external partner will work with NH organizations and institutions to ensure that teachers and leaders involved in Innovation Networks, NH MINNT and NHSLA have access to professional development focused on specific academic content and/or effective instruction for

specific populations of learners. For example, in support of New Hampshire's S.T.E.M. (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) initiatives, the lead external partner will work with entities such as the Leitzel Center and the University of New Hampshire and the IMPACT Center at Plymouth State University to integrate STEM related programs offered to new teachers and their mentors into the NH MINNT statewide structure. Similarly, the lead external partner will work with other partners such as SERESC and the Institute for Disabilities at the University of New Hampshire to integrate professional development focused on working with special needs students into the NH MINNT structure.

(D)(5)(ii) *Measure, Evaluate and Continue to Improve Effectiveness.* Several measures of effectiveness of the Innovation Networks, NH MINNT and NHLA will be gathered over this four-year period to continually improve and revise each professional development component to ensure impact on student achievement. These measures will include: written evaluations/participant feedback from professional development sessions, on-site observations, classroom and school walk throughs, pre- and post-assessments of teacher and leader content knowledge, analysis of teacher and leader performance based on performance-based teacher and leader evaluation data, analysis of NECAP scores for cohorts of teachers and leaders disaggregated by school, student work samples, student aspiration data (i.e., My Voice Survey), student attendance data and school/district audit of organizational effectiveness.

Teachers and leaders who participate in NH MINNT and NHLA will develop electronic portfolios that track their work and performance based on the NH teacher and leader performance standards. Educator portfolios will include tracking of professional development activities, evidence of performance using a four-point rubric measuring development of teacher or leader effectiveness across identified teacher performance standards, samples of student work and samples of teacher or leader work.

Plans for the leadership academy and the three-year mentoring program follow.

Plan for Leadership Training

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Person Responsible
	Year 1 (2010-2011)		
Prepare training for principals and determine vehicles to ensure a common focus and coordinated effort among providers in schools	NHDOE and external partner(s) meet with designated provider to share information about each school/participant, tailor training, establish communication procedures to ensure that all efforts in schools are focused and coordinated, and refine plan for the year.

Establish schedule, content, and locations for training for 18 months. Recommended that two-day training move from school to school over the 18 months. | June 2010 | NHDOE – coordinator |
| Identify two cohorts of 20-25 participants and 7 potential trainers (one north and one south) | In this order, identify principals from persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts, additional team members, other principals in that district, key folks who could become trainers, principals (and/or teams) from other Title 1 schools.

Send information about training and calendar to participants. | July-August 2010 | NHDOE |
Conduct monthly two-day trainings with online follow-up support	Training sessions on variety of topics.	August or September through August	Provider; coordination provided by external partner and NHDOE
Coordination of program with other efforts in school, assess effectiveness, make adjustments	Convene monthly meeting of external partner, NHDOE and provider in conjunction with training days; focus on coordination, assessment and adjustments.	Monthly	External partner, NHDOE and provider
Begin train-the-trainers program	Establish criteria for selection of trainers, select and invite potential trainers with information about program and schedule of trainings and potential role in later years, and conduct training.	August 2010-January 2012	Provider; coordination by external partner and NHDOE
Evaluate training's impact on participants and student achievement	Collect and analyze data from evaluation forms after each training; gather baseline data on student achievement and other critical indicators.

Refine training with provider. | August (pre-data) – January (post-data, NECAP) | NHDOE and schools |
Identify trainers for the third and fourth cohort of principals and teams	With provider, NHDOE identifies those individuals in the train-the-trainers program that are qualified and ready to begin providing training to next two cohorts.	Throughout year, with decision in late spring	Provider and NHDOE
	Year 2 (2111-2012)		
Conclude training of cohort 1 and 2 and train-the-trainers program	Training sessions on variety of topics.	August – January 2011	Provider; coordination provided by external partner and NHDOE

Evaluate training's impact on school culture/climate and student achievement	Develop, administer and analyze final evaluation from participants, surveys of teachers in buildings and student achievement data (latter will be an ongoing process to track progress over time).	Ongoing	External partner and NHDOE
Identify two cohorts of 20-25 participants and 5 potential trainers (one north and one south)	In this order, identify principals from persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts, additional team members, other principals in that district, key folks who could become trainers, principals (and/or teams) from other Title 1 schools. Communicate information about training and calendar to participants.	June 2011	NHDOE
Conduct training monthly two-day trainings with online follow-up support	Training sessions on variety of topics.	August 2011 – January 2013	NH trainers, with support in first three months from external partner; coordinated by external partner and NHDOE
Assure coordination of program with other efforts in school, assess effectiveness, make adjustments	Convene monthly meeting of external partner, NHDOE, and provider in conjunction with training days; focus on coordination, assessment and adjustments.	Monthly	External partner, NHDOE, and provider
Assess quality of training provided by newly-minted trainers	Provider and NHDOE attend first three trainers of new trainers to provide support, ensure fidelity of program, and, if necessary, remove trainer and substitute another.	August – October	Provider and NHDOE
Begin train-the-trainers program in conjunction with leadership training	Establish criteria for selection of trainers, select and invite potential trainers with information about program and schedule of trainings and potential role in later years, and conduct training.	August – January 2011	Provider and NHDOE
Begin coaching program with cohorts 3 and 4	Trainers, facilitators or coaches will be matched with new principals.	August – January 2012	Trainer/facilitator/coaches; coordinated by external partner and NHDOE
Establish a NH trainers' work/support group	Convene trainers to ensure they have enough support; answer questions; problem solve challenges.	Quarterly (more frequently in beginning)	NHDOE and external partner(s)
Evaluate training's impact on participants and student achievement	Collect and analyze data from evaluation forms after each training; gather baseline data on student achievement and other critical indicators. Refine training with provider.	August (pre-data) – January (post-data, NECAP)	NHDOE and schools
Continue to evaluate training's impact on school climate/culture and student achievement	Administer and analyze final evaluation from participants, surveys of teachers in buildings and student achievement data	Ongoing	NHDOE, external partner and schools
Years 3-4 will be similar to previous ones, but with summative data collected in last year.			

Performance Measures Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Number of leaders, who complete training, and are rated highly-effective based on highly-effective leader standards through 2012; by evaluation 2013					
Increase in student achievement by certain percentage in schools with trained leaders					