

(E) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)

The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

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 (E)(1):

- A description of the State’s applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

E(1) RSA 103-H establishes a process for setting NCLB performance targets and requires that schools not meeting the targets are listed on the Department's Web site and reported to the Governor and Legislature. It further requires districts with schools in need of improvement to submit a corrective action plan. While RSA 193-H:5 explicitly prohibits the State from "taking control of the daily operations" of a school or district, the Department has been very successful in working cooperatively with districts.

Besides enforcing the Federal Title I sanctions, the NHDOE has the State authority to enforce sanctions on schools and districts. NH Law states: "on or before the one-year anniversary of being designated as a school or district in need of improvement, the Commissioner shall designate a progress review team to evaluate the implementation of the improvement plans and the progress towards state performance targets. The progress review team shall deliver a report to the state board." The progress review team will use the school's approved improvement plan as the basis for its review.

If the school is not making satisfactory progress in implementing its plan, the Commissioner shall issue a notice to the school and shall initiate a process for providing assistance. Upon the State Board's review of the progress review team's recommendation, the Commissioner shall work with the school to review its plan. If the School Board does not revise the improvement plan within 60 days or if the State Board does not approve the revised plan then the Commissioner shall submit to the State Board, in a timely manner, an improvement plan including methods for implementing. The State Board shall direct the school board to implement the plan.

This process allows NH schools and districts to work collaboratively on the development and implementation of improvement plans, but also provides authority for the Commissioner and State Board to direct the LEA if the plan is not revised or submitted appropriately. The NHDOE is also in the process of developing a plan to have an external consultant review NH State policy in an effort to create a plan for legislative changes that can promote and strengthen the State Plan.

Reform Plan Criteria

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (40 points)

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

(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and (5 points)

(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (35 points)

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 (E)(2) (please fill in table below):

- The State's historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

New Hampshire's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools Identification Process

The following provides details as to the information and process used by New Hampshire to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools for the Race to the Top application.

Definitions from New Hampshire's Rules for Public School Approval (NH RSA 189:25):

- A public school containing any of the grades kindergarten through 8 is classified as an elementary school.
- A public elementary school containing any combination of grades 4-8 may be classified as a public middle school, subject to meeting the rules applicable to all middle schools. (RSA 189:25)
- A public school or public academy containing any of the grades 9 through 12 is classified as a secondary, or high school, subject to meeting the rules applicable to all high schools.

Using the state definitions, and in accordance with the Race to the Top grant application guidance and definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools", New Hampshire developed two school lists:

1. Title I Schools in Need of Improvement. New Hampshire currently has 132 Title I schools designated in need of improvement. Of these, 127 are classified as either elementary or middle schools, and five are classified as high schools.
2. Title I-Eligible Schools. As only high schools are classified as secondary schools in New Hampshire, all Title I-eligible middle schools were excluded from consideration in this category. Of the current total of 89 high schools, 10 were excluded from consideration (five are Title I schools in need of improvement and are therefore included in that list, and an additional five are ineligible to receive Title I as they are not single attendance areas).

IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

Review of student achievement results. All available student achievement data for the "all students" group from New Hampshire's approved state assessment, the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), was reviewed for each school on the above-referenced lists.

Four years of NECAP data (2005-2008) was reviewed for elementary and middle schools, and

two years of NECAP data (2007 and 2008) was reviewed for high schools. As the raw student achievement data for the state's reading and mathematics assessments converts to a 100-point index score system, the index scores in each content area for the "all students" group were added together for each school in order to produce an annual combined score. The annual combined scores were then totaled (four years for elementary or middle schools and two years for high schools) to produce a cumulative achievement score for each school.

Selection of schools. For each list, schools were rank-ordered from lowest to highest on the basis of the cumulative achievement score. Schools at the top of each rank-ordered list were determined to be the state's persistently lowest-achieving. Seven elementary and/or middle schools (five percent of 132) from the Title I Schools in Need of Improvement list, and five high schools from the Title I Eligible list were selected. As some schools chose not to participate, the offer was extended to the next school on the ranked list.

No high school in New Hampshire met the selection criteria for low graduation rate (graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years).

As Title-I eligible middle schools were excluded from consideration, the school rankings based on cumulative achievement scores in the "all students" group were also used to determine if there would be substantive changes in the struggling school identification if New Hampshire had the ability to categorize middle schools as secondary schools. Upon review, the rank-ordered high schools had consistently lower cumulative index scores than the rank-ordered middle schools. Therefore, it is doubtful that any Title I-eligible middle school would have ranked among the lowest five or five percent, even if they had been included in the secondary school selection process.

E(2)(ii) *Supporting LEAs in Turning Around Their Lowest-Achieving Schools.* New Hampshire has developed a comprehensive statewide system of support (SSOS) that supports schools in turning around practices and performance through leveled improvement support. While the supports are in place, NH continues to study and refine the process to create a collaborative service delivery system that engages all NHDOE stakeholders to maximize resources to serve

schools in need of improvement. The table and diagram below represent key elements in the New Hampshire Statewide System of Support:

Level	Identification Processes	Differentiated Support
Level 4	Corrective action LEAs and schools in restructuring OR persistently lowest-achieving schools	Intensive support; NHDOE roundtables, district/school improvement teams, NHDOE liaisons, targeted content support, comprehensive needs assessment and monitoring tool, district/ support team and external partner
Level 3	Districts in need of improvement and schools in corrective action OR participating districts	Specific support; technical assistance for compulsory improvement planning, statewide DINI meetings, content coaching, leadership coaching, access to Web-based improvement tool, fiscal resources
Level 2	Districts and schools on the Watch List (missed AYP in either content area one year) OR participating districts	Focused support; targeted professional development, customized technical assistance, special education requirements, program audit tools, leadership support, data analysis support, regional support teams
Level 1	All districts and schools	Statewide general support for all schools/districts

The New Hampshire Statewide System of Support is organized by the levels of need and supports available. These range from supports available to all districts and schools (level 1), to intensive supports offered to schools and districts in corrective action and restructuring (level 4). The goal of the NHDOE is to make this tiered system of supports into a more fluid system with robust support available to the persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts. Currently, Regional Support Teams review the plans of districts and schools in need of improvement. Team members represent Bureau of Integrated Programs, which includes Title I and other NCLB Titles, Bureau of Accountability and School Improvement, Bureau of Special Education and other department bureaus that may have a connection to the identified areas for improvement.

In an effort to collaborate across the Department and target resources for districts and schools to improve student achievement, the NHDOE worked with the Education Alliance from Brown University and the New England Comprehensive Center to create a Department “round table” process. This roundtable process began in the fall of 2008 and has displayed success in expanding the knowledge throughout the NHDOE of the individual district’s program details, strengths and weaknesses. This process has broken down the isolation of individual program staff at the NHDOE, allowing for a collaborative support. The roundtables meet regularly as internal NHDOE teams, as well as externally, inviting district/school staff to participate in district/school improvement discussions and planning.

The NHDOE SSOS is the basic structure used to improve schools and districts and has included specific turnaround models/initiatives that have shown success. Some of these initiatives/models have included the following:

- ***Root Cause Analysis***—districts and schools were guided through a process in examining local data to identify areas of strength and weakness. Rich dialogue permeated this process and leads to the development of the School or District Improvement Plan. Each plan is unique, including customized professional development activities designed to improve instructional practice, create partnerships and ultimately improve student achievement.
- ***District In Need of Improvement (DINI) Meetings***—monthly meetings are held at the NHDOE, with all DINI Coordinators, providing technical assistance from the NHDOE

- ***Follow The Child Leadership*** Institute—held during the summer of 2007 with special priority given to schools and districts identified as in need of improvement. Over 22 Level 3 and 4 school districts attended the four-day conference with 10 member teams led by their superintendent of schools. The ***FTC Institute*** concluded with the development of literacy action plans by districts.
- ***Performance*** Tracker—a software program purchased for all districts in the state by the SEA in order to support gathering data to track growth in student achievement.
- ***Focused Monitoring***—a response to school and district improvement.
- ***Response to Intervention***—a means of monitoring implementation of services for students with disabilities.
- ***Literacy and Numeracy Projects***—supported by school improvement content coaches. Technical assistance is available by request and there are numerous state sponsored workshops through the Math Science Partnership Projects and other state initiatives.
- ***Title I, Part A 1003g – School Improvement Grants***—currently being revised based on new guidance, but previously focused on building the leadership capacity of principals and other instructional leaders within NHDOE’s lowest-achieving Title I schools. Projects focused on
 - Creating a standards-based system with assessments that monitor student progress and inform instruction;
 - Aligning instruction to standards and focusing teaching on moving students from where they are to where they need to be;
 - Strengthening instructional leadership;
 - Building professional learning communities;
 - Engaging parents and the community in a culture of collaboration;
 - Professional development providers as well as opportunities to share promising practices.

NHDOE Evidence of Improvement:

Over the last four years, every subgroup’s average growth has exceeded the average of their peers on the New England Common Assessment Program, with mixed results for limited English Section E Turning Around Low Achieving Schools.doc

proficient students (see Figure E-1 below). Initial evidence, supported by research, shows that strong and consistent leadership and a focus on instructional improvement have contributed to these outcomes (Fullan, 2003; Schmoker, 2006; Mass Insight, 2007; Institute of Education Sciences, 2008).

Figure E-1. Changes in Proficiency Levels in Mathematics and Reading

Special Population	Percentage Change in NH Statewide Assessment Results in Mathematics from 2005-2008			
	<i>Level 1</i>	<i>Level 2</i>	<i>Level 3</i>	<i>Level 4</i>
LEP	-3	+2	0	0
With IEP	-4	-2	+4	+2
SES	-4	-2	+3	+4
Title I	-7	-4	+6	+3
All NH Students	-1	-1	-1	+3

Special Population	Percentage Change in NH Statewide Assessment Results in Mathematics from 2005-2008			
	<i>Level 1</i>	<i>Level 2</i>	<i>Level 3</i>	<i>Level 4</i>
LEP	-6	0	+3	0
With IEP	-11	0	+9	+2
SES	-8	-4	+8	+4
Title I	-7	-7	+11	+4
All NH Students	+6	-3	-8	+6

Race and Ethnicity	Percentage Change in NH Statewide Assessment Results in Mathematics from 2005-2008			
	<i>Level 1</i>	<i>Level 2</i>	<i>Level 3</i>	<i>Level 4</i>
Asian	-3	-5	+3	+4
Black	-6	-6	+9	+1
Hispanic	-10	-2	+8	+3
White	-1	-1	-2	+3
All NH Students	-1	-1	-1	+3

Race and Ethnicity	Percentage Change in NH Statewide Assessment Results in Reading from 2005-2008			
	<i>Level 1</i>	<i>Level 2</i>	<i>Level 3</i>	<i>Level 4</i>
Asian	-3	-5	+3	+4
Black	-6	-4	+9	+1
Hispanic	-10	-2	+8	+3
White	-3	-5	+3	+5
All NH Students	+6	-3	-9	+6

In addition, the effectiveness of several practices (Focused Monitoring, Response to Intervention, data-analysis and planning roundtables with districts in need of improvement) have also been documented as contributors to these positive changes. The common components of these practices are: 1) analysis and use of qualitative and quantitative data in purposeful ways that impact positively on student learning; 2) decision-making teams consisting of administrators, teachers, parents and members who are experienced in data analysis; and 3) establishment of goals or targets, identification and implementation of effective strategies, assessment of their success and initiation of the cycle again (Anderson, 2003; Mass Insight, 2007).

New Hampshire is committed to accelerating the improvement progress by providing intensive support to a subset of its persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts, while expanding promising practices to which this narrowing of the achievement gap is attributed. NHDOE's identified Race to the Top's persistently lowest-achieving schools are in the fourth level of the NHDOE SSOS pyramid, participating districts are in the second and third level, and all schools are in level 1.

New Hampshire State, district and community leaders have met numerous times over the past year to discuss plans for statewide reform. The Race to the Top guidance provided a platform to broaden the conversation of reform efforts. NH has a great deal of local control, but during recent discussions, the silos have begun to break down between districts and stakeholders are joining together to develop shared initiatives and are willing to work with the NHDOE on statewide reforms.

NHDOE Turnaround and Improvement Support Plan

Under the State's proposed Race to the Top reform plan, 10 districts along with 12 of their persistently lowest-achieving schools will receive the most intensive support services. The Department and an external partner(s) will support districts as they turn around their lowest-achieving schools and, in the process, strengthen other schools throughout the district. In ongoing professional development activities, preference for additional spots will be given to teachers and leaders in these 10 districts first and then to those in other Title I schools and

districts. In that way, a critical mass of highly effective teachers and leaders will be built in Title 1 schools.

Each of the 10 districts has signed a Memorandum of Understanding that binds them to:

- Be matched with an external partner, whose focus will be on teaching, learning, assessing, leadership and coordination of the reform effort;
- Replace principals, who have led the school for two or more years;
- Participate as a team (principal, district leader and/or lead teacher) in an 18-month leadership academy, and build their own capacity by identifying future trainers;
- Participate in professional learning experiences focused on instruction and using Performance Plus data tools for decision making in classrooms and schools;
- Engage teachers in a three-year induction and mentoring program, with an emphasis on instruction, multiple measures of assessment, analyzing and using data in instructional decision making and collaborative improvement, and build district's capacity by training mentors;
- Participate in the development and piloting of state teacher and leader evaluation models, while implementing district's current model; and
- Pilot the expansion of the statewide longitudinal data system, including an early warning system for dropout prevention that is supported by funding from the National Governors Association.

Each entity in this intensive work has specific roles and responsibilities. The external partner will be responsible for keeping the school focused on student learning, setting annual targets, analyzing and using data on students daily and holding everyone – including themselves – accountable for turning the school around. The department will co-lead the district planning effort, identify and support the external partners, provide sharing and focused professional development among the partners and schools, e.g., the development of the evaluation models, and serve as an advocate, e.g., provide state-level data to inform practice.

The following graphic shows the shift that will occur within the NHDOE as a result of the Race to the Top resources and guidance. In the past the NHDOE has spent the majority of its time and Section E Turning Around Low Achieving Schools.doc

focus on providing general support to all schools (level 1 of the support structure), while trying to balance the demands of its neediest schools. There have been many efforts to target schools and districts with higher needs, but the recognized demands of these districts and schools has increased drastically over time due to the availability of improved data that has identified large achievement gaps, the increase in student achievement targets, the strong desire of educators to improve student learning experiences, coupled with the decrease of NHDOE staff resources. The Race to the Top funds would allow the NHDOE to focus on those with the greatest needs. While the current system can support our SSOS pyramid from the bottom up, Race to the Top funds would allow a focus that focuses on the top and downward. The opportunity would allow for a comprehensive, differentiated support structure for every student.

Figure E2. Work Plan for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Person Responsible
<i>First Year (2010-11)</i>			
Identification of schools and conditions of involvement	Analyze all statewide assessment data, rank schools by index, involve in development of application, invite to participate, sign Memorandum of Understanding.	Winter 2010	Title I and School Improvement staff
Successful turnaround	Recruit, interview and hire external partners; induct external partners into the initiative and the department's goals; match partners with schools and districts based on needs; sign reciprocal accountability clause (school, district and external partner are responsible for student achievement gains).	Spring/summer 2010	Division directors and staff
Share and build on successes	Establish and implement communication and sharing vehicles, e.g., regular meetings for external partners focused on using data and sharing to maximize learning; create consistent support team for each school co-lead by external partner and NHDOE.	Spring/summer 2010	Division directors and staff
Target resources to needs of schools and districts	Conduct needs assessment, identify appropriate turnaround model and develop action plan; draw on resources inside the department (e.g., introduction and use of specific instructional strategies, training on analyzing and using data to make instructional and programmatic decisions, literacy and numeracy plans, Picturing Writing and Image-Writing, Focused Monitoring, Response to Intervention, statewide Innovation Networks) and outside.	Fall 2010	External partner, NHDOE liaison
Focus on student achievement	Determine means to enable teachers to have common planning time; use time for study groups on instructional practices, analysis of data by subgroup on regular basis, lesson planning, structured classroom visitation with follow-up discussions on observations, etc.	Ongoing	External partner, NHDOE liaison
Recruiting, developing and retaining effective teachers	Teachers participate in induction/mentoring program to continue their development (first of three years); accompanying program for preparing experienced teachers to be mentors.	August-July	External organization selected via RFP
Recruiting, developing and retaining effective leaders	Teams from district and school (district leader, principal, and lead teacher) participate in leadership academy.	August 2010-February 2012	External organization selected via RFP
Catch students before they fall behind	Pilot statewide longitudinal data system to learn how its data can support classroom instruction and school-wide programmatic decisions, participate in training in data analysis and use, learn how	Ongoing	Bureau of Accountability, Bureau of Data Management

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Person Responsible
	to develop and use formative assessments.		
Partner with parents and community	Establish regular communication lines with parents, e.g., email, Web site posting of assignments, phone; broker services from community organizations to meet students' and families' needs.	Ongoing	Parent Information Center, wraparound service providers
Ensure highly effective teachers in classrooms and schools	Principal or teacher participate in development and implementation of standards for highly effective teachers and leaders, e.g., making them part of the district's evaluation process.	August 2010-July 2011	Subcommittee of Professional Standards Board
Plan to ensure success	Summative evaluation of student and school data; celebrate successes, dig deeper into the data on challenges and refine practice for following year.	May-June	External partner, Bureau of Accountability, Bureau of Data Management
<i>Second Year (2011-12)</i>			
	Continue activities to meet goals in second, third and fourth year, with exception of additions described below.		
Share and build on successes	Develop resources that can be used across struggling schools; participate in statewide networks (Mentoring, Leadership Academy)	Ongoing	External partner, principals, teachers
Recruiting, developing and retaining effective teachers	Begin second mentor cohort; continue with first group of mentors and identify potential mentors and mentor trainers	August-July	External organization selected through RFP
Recruiting, developing and retaining effective leaders	Continue first cohort. Begin second cohort, co-lead by NH leaders, who will be observed by external organization and NHDOE.	August 2011-February 2012	External organization selected through RFP
Ensure highly effective teachers and leaders in classrooms and schools	Principal and teacher participate in development of statewide evaluation models for teachers and leaders; plan piloting phase.	August 2011-July 2012	Subcommittee of Professional Standards Board
<i>Third Year (2012-2013)</i>			
	Continue activities with exception of additions noted below.		
Share and build on successes	Make presentations, based on data, on progress toward goal, how achieved, what the data say at state meetings, professional organizations, etc.; participate in statewide networks (Mentoring, Leadership Academy).	Ongoing	External partner with school's principal, teachers, students
Mentoring	Begin third cohort, co-led with in-district mentor.	August 2012-July 2013	External organization with colleague
Effective leaders	Continue second cohort.	August 2012-	NHASP and NH school leaders

Goals	Activities	Timeline	Person Responsible
	Begin third cohort, co-led by NH leaders.	February 2013 August 2012- February 2014	
Highly effective teachers and leaders	Pilot statewide evaluation models for teachers and leaders; gather feedback through surveys, focus groups, interviews; refine model.	August 2012-July 2013	Subcommittee of Professional Standards Board
<i>Fourth Year (2013-14)</i>			
	Continue activities with exception of additions noted below		
Share and build on successes	Develop tools, processes and products to share with networks, educators; write a journal article as a school or team	August 2013-ongoing	Districts/schools
Mentoring	Begin fourth cohort co-led by in-district mentors.	August 2013-July 2014	In-district mentors
Leadership Academy	Complete third cohort. Begin fourth cohort co-led by NH leaders.	August 2013-February 2014 August 2013-February 2015	In-state trainers

Evidence

Approach Used	# of Schools Since SY2004-05	Results and Lessons Learned																								
Each school in improvement conducted a needs assessment, attended professional development and developed improvement plans based on the individual strengths and weaknesses of the school community	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>New SINIs</th> <th>Total SINIs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>67</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>5</td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>21</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>50</td> <td>136</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>49</td> <td>178</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>65</td> <td>233</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		New SINIs	Total SINIs	2003	0	6	2004	67	72	2005	5	77	2006	21	91	2007	50	136	2008	49	178	2009	65	233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of schools that exited School In Need of Improvement (SINI) status: 2003 3 schools exited SINI status 2004 1 school exited SINI status 2005 0 schools exited SINI status 2006 7 schools exited SINI status 2007 5 schools exited SINI status 2008 7 schools exited SINI status 2009 12 schools exited SINI status Schools aligned professional development with improvement plan goals
	New SINIs	Total SINIs																								
2003	0	6																								
2004	67	72																								
2005	5	77																								
2006	21	91																								
2007	50	136																								
2008	49	178																								
2009	65	233																								
Six schools in restructuring planning year during 2008-09 participated in a comprehensive web-based needs assessment program.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Restructuring planning year:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>6 schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>14 schools</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">Restructuring implementation year:</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>0 schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>2 schools</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Restructuring planning year:		2008	6 schools	2009	14 schools	Restructuring implementation year:		2008	0 schools	2009	2 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of schools that exited restructuring planning year status 2008-09 -- 4 schools Schools were able to complete a comprehensive needs assessment, determine strengths and weaknesses of the school, prioritize areas in need of improvement, create an action plan to address areas of weakness and track improvements and challenges with evidence. Even though four of the six schools exited SINI/restructuring planning status, all six chose to implement their action plans 												
Restructuring planning year:																										
2008	6 schools																									
2009	14 schools																									
Restructuring implementation year:																										
2008	0 schools																									
2009	2 schools																									
District In Need of Improvement meetings were held monthly	District data/not schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DINI Coordinators from each district gathered monthly with staff throughout the NH DOE to participate in professional development programs, provide updates across programs and share promising practices and improvement plans 																								

In the past, New Hampshire has not enforced bold reform of schools and districts; however, districts and schools are now working with NH DOE staff to implement drastic changes in specific schools, across districts and statewide. The Race to the Top grant has initiated many conversations regarding reform and as part of these planned reform efforts, NH will use resources to improve the tracking of school and district improvement efforts and their outcomes.

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current)	End of SY	End of SY	End of SY	End of SY
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.	12	0	0	2	3

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