

New Hampshire
State Board of Education
Londergan Hall, Room 100F
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
Minutes of the February 13, 2020 Meeting

AGENDA ITEM I. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the State Board of Education was convened at 10:05 AM at the State Department of Education, 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH. Drew Cline presided as Chairman.

Members present: Drew Cline, Chairman, Cindy Chagnon, Helen Honorow, Ann Lane and Phil Nazzaro. Frank Edelblut, Commissioner of Education, and Christine Brennan, Deputy Commissioner of Education, were also in attendance. Sally Griffin and Kate Cassady had prior commitments and were not able to attend.

AGENDA ITEM II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ann Lane led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ITEM III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Kimberly Foster, Nashua, NH, former nurse and mother of two middle school students, addressed general rule Ed 306.18(b), which states elementary schools may count up to 30 minutes of recess per day as instruction time for pupils in kindergarten through grade 6. Ms. Foster recommends this rule be amended to include all grades, so that all schools may count up to 30 minutes of recess per day as instruction time for pupils in kindergarten through 12th grade. Documents are available through the CDC including Healthy Schools Physical Activity: Recess and a co-authored study with SHAPE entitled *Physical Activity During School: Providing Recess to All Students*. Access to fresh air, sunlight, physical activity, critical peer-to-peer support and cognitive reset from the rigor of academics would be a positive continuance from elementary school recess practice. Continuing civic mindedness begins in school communities, and recess for all grades would build safer school communities. Peer-to-peer connections especially in teenage years could thwart vaping, drug use, anxiety and depression. Given the positive endorphins and serotonin, outside time and real face time are more desirable than electronics and social media. Active learners are better learners, and recess could also counter obesity. Our middle and high school students have yet to tap their academic potential; for older students, recess could be a “smarter break,” making smarter students. For all of these reasons, Ms. Foster recommends the Board reconsider rule Ed 306.18(b).

AGENDA ITEM IV. PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS/UPDATES

A. New Hampshire Seal of Biliteracy

Cindi Hodgdon, German Teacher at ConVal High School, Peterborough, NH and Incoming Board President, New Hampshire Association of World Languages Teachers, and Jessica Paepow, ESOL Coordinator, Alvirne High School, Hudson, NH introduced themselves to the Board.

Ms. Paepow introduced the Seal of Biliteracy, an award given by a school district or state in recognition of a student who has studied and attained proficiency in two or more languages by high school graduation. The Seal of Biliteracy helps students recognize the value of academic success and see the tangible benefits of being bilingual. It was introduced in California in 2009, and is now present in 38 other states. Manchester, NH has given the award since 2016 with great success, allowing students to tap into cultural and linguistic assets and opening the door to inclusion for everybody.

Ms. Chagnon asked for clarification on what proficiency in two languages meant. Ms. Paepow explained that the field of biliteracy acknowledges proficiency in a native language and an additional world language.

Ms. Paepow continued that Vermont is considering adopting the Seal, while Maine, Massachusetts, and New York have already established it. New Hampshire (NH) is taking the lead from these states, and at the New England Teaching English to Speakers of Other Language (TESOL) Conference, NH advocates met with representatives from Vermont and Maine, who shared information that has helped create criteria for NH proficiency.

The Seal of Biliteracy could bridge an equity gap that is too large and has persisted for too long for both English language learners and students of world languages. It acknowledges mastery of languages, celebrates cultural and linguistic diversity, and teaches students to function in a global society. The vision is to prepare students to become global citizens, and mark the state's commitment to inclusive academic excellence while building upon the rich linguistic and cultural assets of NH communities. Students can demonstrate that they have 21st Century skills and are college and career ready.

Thirty-eight states have implemented the Seal of Biliteracy, 99,000 students earned the Seal in 2019, and 66 world languages have been celebrated. New Hampshire is approaching implementation through legislation, support from the State Board of Education and the Department. In Congress, bill H.R. 3119 has been introduced, which would award grants to States to establish the Seal of Biliteracy.

Some states implement the Seal at the elementary and middle school level and NH plans to start with graduating high school seniors. English must be one of the two languages. To measure proficiency, NH would use English SAT scores, which all juniors in the state take at no cost to them, where the minimum for proficiency is a score above 480. For commonly taught world languages—French, Spanish, German, Latin, and American Sign Language (ASL)—there are specific tests, including the AP World Languages exams and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) exams. If students are heritage learners for languages like Tagalog, which do not have an AP exam, there are portfolios and community groups to show proficiency. Students must achieve proficiency at the intermediate-high level, which is reciprocal throughout the country and can result in college credit in other states.

This year, Hawaii Senator Brian Schatz introduced the Biliteracy Education Seal and Teach (BEST) Act, which will authorize \$10 million towards grants to establish, improve and implement Seal of Biliteracy programs. Seal of Biliteracy advocates have met with Aaron Hughes at the NH Department of Education and have spoken to other state representatives across the country. They have met multiple times with Arthur Chou, the California-based national advocate for the Seal, and attended World Languages Day on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. They have also met with NH Senators Shaheen and Hassan, Congresswoman Kuster and their representatives to educate them about the Seal of Biliteracy. The committee has started a Facebook page so the public can follow their steps. And they have presented to NH principals, superintendents, the state conference of World Language Teachers and state conference of ESOL teachers. All audiences are excited and on board.

There are three different groups working through the committee. A number of schools are ready to pilot the program this year, and one group is working to insure consistency so that everyone is on the same page as to what proficiency means. There is a second group working with legislators, reaching out to specific school districts and collecting data on the types of exams, the languages students are testing in, and how many students are testing. The third group is working with community outreach to get businesses and community groups to support the award along with parents, particularly of heritage learners.

Ms. Lane asked if they have collaborated with New Hampshire's Diversity Council. Ms. Hodgdon replied that they have just received their contact information and reached out this week.

The committee's next steps include clarifying their purpose and rationale through the vision statement offered at the beginning of the presentation. They also need to determine world language standards. For English proficiency, ACCESS tests are taken by all ESOL students in NH, and a score of 4.5 would be required. The committee is looking to recruit more teachers and districts. They also need to make their standards consistent, and decide whether to focus on

legislation, a Board of Education proclamation, or specific school districts that may be able to pick up the program right away. The committee is working with NH Plymouth State, Keene, and UNH to find out if they can award college credit to students who receive the Seal. A student committee is designing the award. A pilot program is taking place in Hudson this spring, and the committee is again working to ensure consistency so that when a student from Berlin graduates with the Seal of Biliteracy, it means the same thing as it does for a student from Nashua.

The committee is seeking an official endorsement for the Seal of Biliteracy from the NH State Board of Education. Commissioner Edelblut presented the committee with a letter of support this morning, and the Commissioner noted that the governor also endorses the project.

Ms. Honorow asked for clarification about the awarding of college credit. Ms. Hodgdon compared the program to achieving certain scores on AP World Languages exams, and to Project Running Start, both of which may result in college credit. Ms. Honorow emphasized that colleges may do that, but different schools handle credits differently, and it should be clear to students and parents that the credit may not be awarded towards their major.

Ms. Chagnon recommended that when the committee refers to AP exams, they should also acknowledge International Baccalaureate (IB). Ms. Chagnon then asked for clarification about whether the Seal of Biliteracy would be a requirement of all students. Ms. Paepfow explained that candidates for the Seal would be students willing to learn a world language, along with ESL students. Commissioner Edelblut reiterated that it would be an optional program.

Ms. Hodgdon introduced Aaron Hughes, Title III Director for the ESSA program that supports English language learners and immigrant children and youth. Mr. Hughes offered to answer any of the Board's questions, and referred to an RSA in the Ed laws, 189:19, the English required statute. This statute grants the State Board of Education the authority for districts to pursue bilingual education programs. The Seal of Biliteracy is not a full curriculum in bilingual education, but the committee is asking the Board's permission, particularly in regards to Hudson's pilot program, to pave the way for other districts.

Commissioner Edelblut suggested that there would be a firmer discussion as the project evolves when the committee is able to bring more information before the Board. Helen Honorow asked what permission Hudson was asking of the Board. Commissioner Edelblut clarified that they were not making any specific request for permission at this point in time. Mr. Hughes quoted RSA 189:19: "Education programs in the field of bilingual education shall be permitted under the provisions of this section with the approval of the Board of Education and a local school district."

Chairman Cline clarified for the Board that there is nothing preventing any school district from awarding the Seal right now. What the committee is asking of the Board is to advocate and be a champion of the program. Ms. Hodgdon and Ms. Paepflow stated that eventually they would like to bring legislation to ensure consistency across the state, but Commissioner Edelblut added that they will not know what consistency looks like until after data is gathered from the pilot programs. Commissioner Edelblut reiterated that the purpose of this presentation was to inform the Board as the program develops.

AGENDA ITEM V. COUNCIL for TEACHER EDUCATION (CTE)

A. Southern New Hampshire University (SNHU) – Substantive Change Request

Laura Stoneking, NHDOE, Administrator, Bureau of Educator Preparation and Higher Education, began by introducing Mary Ford from SNHU, requesting acceptance for five of their secondary programs with substantive change.

SNHU currently offers five secondary certification programs at the undergraduate level: Middle Level Science, Middle Level Math, Secondary Math, Secondary Social Studies and Secondary English Language Arts. SNHU is requesting a substantive change to move all of those certification programs to the graduate level so that students can focus their entire undergraduate preparation on the content for which they intend to teach. When they get to the graduate level, they will have 44 weeks of in-field experience working with students beginning with four weeks in the summer of their first term. They will be in schools from the first day of school in September to the last day of school in June. They will follow up with four more weeks in the second summer.

Ms. Lane asked for an example of an undergraduate course of study that would lead to graduate level teacher training. Ms. Ford explained that currently in the undergraduate program for teacher preparation, 30 to 36 credits are focused on pedagogy. If the certification program is moved to the graduate level, undergraduates can use those credits to study the content they intend to teach instead of working on pedagogy.

Ms. Chagnon asked whether this change would mean that in the future if a student enrolls in the education program at SNHU, it will be a five-year program that will result in a Master's degree rather than an undergraduate degree. Ms. Ford stated that SNHU's program is not a five-year program because the clinical M.Ed is a 16-month program; however, the plan for these five secondary certification programs is that students will complete the full program to receive their Master's degree.

Ms. Honorow asked whether, for example, an aspiring secondary math teacher would have to get their undergraduate in math education. Ms. Ford said

the degree might be in Liberal Arts with a Math major, but they will not be automatically accepted into the Master's program. Ms. Honorow asked whether this means SNHU will no longer offer an undergraduate degree with a major in math and secondary education. Ms. Ford clarified that currently an undergraduate in the Middle School Math certification program would take a Liberal Arts course of study with a Math major and 30 to 36 credits in pedagogy, 24 of those credits in a full year of student teaching. With the proposed changes, there would no longer be the full year of student teaching for undergraduates: student teaching will take place at the graduate level.

Ms. Honorow acknowledged that this change may make sense from a pedagogical standpoint, but asked how it would affect the availability of teachers in critical shortage areas. Ms. Ford explained that very small numbers of students are enrolled in these programs, with enrollments down across the country by an average of 28%. Because the numbers are so small, it is harder to give these students the support they need, so by moving it to the graduate model, SNHU's goal is to foster a cohort model. Ms. Honorow asked whether requiring students to get a Master's degree before they can be employed will help enrollment numbers. Ms. Stoneking answered that there is trend of higher success rates with the full year internship versus a part year internship, and students who complete the full year internship tend to stay employed and are more successful.

Ms. Lane stated that an entry level teacher who has not taught before and arrives with a graduate degree presumably will not be paid more than someone who has been teaching for ten years and may go back to school for their graduate degree. Ms. Lane expressed concern that the Board would be putting a burden on school districts that do not have the capacity to hire someone with an advanced degree as an entry level teacher, especially if there is a shortage. Ms. Ford said SNHU feels their students will be better prepared, so that they will stay in the field longer. SNHU also wants to ensure students can pass Praxis exams.

Ms. Chagnon said that she has heard anecdotally that schools are sometimes hesitant to turn over classrooms to student teachers for a long period of time given the competition between Rivier, UNH and SNHU. She asked whether SNHU has had any difficulty with this as they increase their internship period. Ms. Ford explained this is not a problem because of SNHU's professional development school model where they work closely with school districts. Currently, SNHU places from six to nine student teachers in Manchester schools, and works with the cooperating teachers and political practitioners to support them. They are very involved in the day to day operations of the school and provide extensive supervision, as well as transportation, which is unique.

Chairman Cline asked to clarify for the Board that the certification programs under discussion are concentrations, not majors, and asked what the major would be for a student who wants this concentration. Ms. Ford explained that a concentration is fewer credits than a major, and a student's major should be in the

content area. For example, for the English Language Arts certification, a student's major would be English. Currently, in the undergraduate program, there is a concentration in the certification program as opposed to a major because there is not enough room in the undergraduate degree for a full major.

Chairman Cline asked whether a student could, for example, major in Physics and get a concentration in the Social Studies certification program. Ms. Ford said that Physics major would probably need additional coursework to meet Social Studies benchmarks, and would not be able to achieve that in 120 credits. However, students do not need to major in Education.

Ms. Lane asked whether any student at SNHU after 2021 would be able to graduate with a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Education. Ms. Ford responded that they would teach out the programs for current students, but at the secondary certification level, a BA in Education would not be available after the changes. However, SNHU will still offer BAs in Elementary Education, Special Education, and Early Childhood Education.

Chairman Cline stated that he is not opposed to SNHU doing what they think is best; however, he expressed concern about the costs, not just to school districts but to students. A graduate degree is quite a bit more expensive than an undergraduate degree. Ms. Ford countered that current students in SNHU's clinical M.Ed program in the Manchester school district receive a scholarship stipend of \$1,000 per month for ten months—a \$10,000 scholarship stipend in total to support their graduate work and to offset the cost. Chairman Cline explained that he hopes there is a competitive marketplace for these degrees so that UNH can offer one thing, Rivier can offer something else, some students can get bachelor's degrees and others graduate degrees, and every student can make the choice that is best for them.

Chairman Cline said the presentation was concerning because it implied that to teach 5th grade Social Studies or English, one would need an advanced degree. New Hampshire has districts that have been in critical shortage indefinitely. Chairman Cline does not want the Board to facilitate escalating costs of education to future teachers, and costs to the school district to the point that they will not be able to find teachers to fill those jobs. If other universities in the state move in this direction, advanced degrees will be required to teach elementary and middle school, which is a real problem for the state.

Ms. Stoneking offered to provide the expiry dates for each of the institutions at next month's Board meeting, and whether each institution offers a Bachelor's, Master's, licensure or Ed Specialist program. Ms. Ford also offered to come back to speak to the Board about Project Aspire at SNHU, which specifically addresses Chairman Cline's concerns. Phil Nazzaro stated that there is no reason not to allow the marketplace to have different models, and the idea of having teachers with

more content knowledge seems like a very good thing. Ms. Ford also said that it is a wonderful program for career changers.

Ms. Stoneking added that a conversation has started within CTE about the amount of programs and whether there is flooding in one area while there are shortages in others. For example, there is a high number of graduating elementary education students that are licensed each year, in part because that is also one of the most offered programs in NH. CTE is now looking at what could be done differently when there are thousands of elementary education teachers and not enough positions for them, while there are shortages in other content areas.

Chairman Cline asked how long this change has been in the pipeline. Ms. Ford explained that SNHU did a yearlong self-study of all of their secondary certification programs, and then made a recommendation to the School of Education Curriculum Committee. It then had to go before the SNHU university-wide curriculum committee, and then approved by the president. After its approval at SNHU, within a month, SNHU went to CTE.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Ann Lane, that the State Board of Education grant substantive change of the approval of five secondary SNHU educator preparation programs from the Bachelor's level to a Clinical Master's level: Ed 612.05 English Language Arts for grades 5 to 12; ED 612.17 Mathematics for grades 5 through 8, ME conversion; Ed 612.18 Secondary Mathematics for grades 7 to 12, ME conversion; ED 612.22 Middle Level Science for grades 5 to 8, ME conversion; ED612.28 Social studies for grades 5 to 12, ME conversion.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

B. University of New Hampshire (UNH) – Program Review – Recommendation(s) for Approval

Ms. Stoneking introduced Paula Salvio, Department Chair of Education at UNH, Joe Onosko, Division Director of Educator Preparation at UNH, and Nick Marks from Granite State College, one of two co-chairs for the full UNH review of 13 programs. Of those 13 programs, the review team made a recommendation for full approval for seven years, and a recommendation of conditional approval for two years for Music Education and General Special Education, both at the Bachelor's level.

Ms. Lane asked about the value of suggestions and recommendations that address unmet standards, and what the process is for following up and/or monitoring them. Nick Marks answered that the report recommends annual

reporting to ensure progress is being made. The review team did not feel that any of the recommendations were at a level that would necessarily be detrimental to UNH's program approval, so the recommendations were made as suggestions for UNH to look at institutionally—facilities upgrades, better relationships with cooperating teachers and districts, supporting teacher candidates and partnerships. The recommendations were a means of providing feedback to the institution with the understanding that some of those things take time. Facilities upgrades do not happen overnight, but it behooves the institution to know that this recommendation is being carried forward as part of the approval process.

Ms. Lane stated that she was concerned that the Education Department suffers with deteriorating facilities and/or over-scheduled staff, with fewer courses offered in subject areas. Ms. Honorow interjected that the report also contained information about a student who could not finish their program because they could not access the building where their class was being held. Ms. Honorow further asserted that if a student cannot access their education, that problem needs to be addressed right away.

Joe Onosko answered that that was an isolated instance that does not pertain to Morrill Hall, where there is handicap access. However, UNH will be sure that such an event does not happen again. Morrill Hall is one of the oldest buildings on campus and second in line for building renovations, so Mr. Onosko and Ms. Salvio appreciated this recommendation and expect it to help as they negotiate with UNH on future renovations. Ms. Salvio also stated that Dean Michele Dillon is supportive of the renovations, and plans to use the report to launch a capital campaign. Ms. Stoneking responded that the student Ms. Honorow referred to was eventually able to complete their degree.

Ms. Chagnon referred to the Special Education findings, where it was reported that current students, alumni and teachers said they needed more training in Individual Education Plans (IEPs) development, Special Ed law, and supporting students with behavioral challenges. Ms. Chagnon asked how UNH plans to improve dramatically on these basic things. Mr. Onosko responded that UNH would submit an updated document within six months clarifying how these issues would be resolved. The department heads of Special Ed and Music Education have been working on revisions since November.

Ms. Chagnon expressed concern that there would not be enough money for facility renovations based on reports in the media about budget cuts at UNH. Ms. Salvio reminded the Board that work is being done right now to address the problems in the two programs that are under a two-year approval. As soon as UNH received the report, they engaged in addressing those issues through a self-study in Special Ed, and with Professor DeTurk in Music Education.

Ms. Chagnon asked if she was correct in her reading of the report that every voice major would have to be a band director. Ms. Salvio responded that Music

Education majors needed more experience in Special Ed. The reviewer of the Music Education program had a background in diversity and music education and believed it was important to integrate those perspectives into the curriculum, so Professor DeTurk is now working on that. Mr. Onosko described Music Education as “a brutal major” and nearly 120 credits, with Professor DeTurk responsible for students from day one of freshman year to satisfy state standards. Unfortunately, Professor DeTurk is retiring after 31 years, but will not leave until the problems in the program have been addressed.

Ms. Honorow expressed deep concern about the unmet standards in the report. She referred to page three of the report, where the unmet standards list included: “develop a research-based, responsive and timely curriculum to improve learning opportunities and achievement for pre-K through 12 learners; the institution shall have a system in place to identify and provide for the facilities, technology and curricular materials necessary to insure that an individual who completes the PEPP can demonstrate the competencies in the certification standards for the certification sought by the candidate; the institution shall have a system in place to insure that all facilities, materials and equipment of the institution prepare educators and shall conform to applicable state and federal health and safety regulations.” These unmet standards did not describe a particular program, but Ms. Honorow considered them to go to the heart of UNH’s programs. Mr. Onosko asked Ms. Honorow to be more specific about her concerns, because he considers the scope of criticism larger than warranted.

Ms. Stoneking explained that the recommendations are common threads that came up through the individual reports. The two co-chairs took those and revised them several times because some of the recommendations were out of the scope of the report. Both the facilities and technology access were areas where the review team felt there was a lack of alignment throughout the programs with those particular standards.

Mr. Onosko explained that one area of concern was that the UNH supervisors and cooperating teachers working with interns do not sufficiently understand the 610s and 612s. However, they are part of the IHE network’s TCAP testing, which covers all of the 610s except two, so they implicitly knew, but UNH is already working on doing a better job of educating cooperating teachers and supervisors about the specific 610 standards.

Ms. Honorow suggested moving on from the unmet facilities standards and directed the Board’s attention to page 6 of the report. Ms. Stoneking responded that these issues are similar to what Mr. Onosko had just referenced, in other words, site-based placements. UNH has a system that is well aligned and well-articulated for the five-year program, with a full internship for a year. However, that same system did not exist for the Bachelor’s candidates and so the recommendation was made to have the same system or a similar system in place, so that there is a common expectation of where interns will be placed.

Ms. Honorow asked what would be addressed in the annual report if the program is approved. Mr. Onosko answered that UNH would address every unmet standard in the report. Mr. Onosko also stated that he assumed there was a mechanism to discontinue the second year approval after reviewing the annual report, and/or to delimit or retract the seven-year approval. Ms. Honorow stated that she did not know whether this was the case.

Ms. Honorow directed the Board's attention to the review of the Special Education program beginning on page 18 of the report, where staffing shortages are cited many times. Ms. Salvio responded that this is a serious problem and the Dean and Provost have been made aware that the Education Department needs tenure lines to fill these positions. The Education Department has had several retirements and they have only one fulltime faculty member. Jan Nisbet, the former Research Provost, has also rejoined the faculty, and along with Mr. Onosko, a committee is designing a Special Ed program to address critical needs in the state. UNH is developing a four-year undergraduate elementary certification program with an additional certification in ESOL or Special Ed to try to save students roughly \$40,000. The Special Ed certification would be available for both the new four-year program and the existing five-year program.

Ms. Honorow reiterated that students, alumni and cooperating teachers all identified three areas of need: IEP development, Special Education law, and supporting students with behavior challenges. Ms. Honorow stated that she would not want to approve a program where students graduating with a degree in Special Education did not know how to do an IEP. Mr. Onosko stated that the program head does address Special Ed law, but deferred to Mr. Marks in assessing how severely the program may be lacking. Mr. Marks responded that the review team felt that with additional faculty support, the program could be shored up effectively and quickly, with courses brought in to a necessary level of relevance. Mr. Onosko added that those elements could be added to the internship, and that Special Ed courses would be shored up around IEP development as well.

Ms. Honorow referred to page 29, which states that "The syllabi reflected the standards addressed, but needed updating to align with current instruction and current needs of students. Students and alumni reported specialized instruction to children as required under IDEA and state law seemed weaker under section 6(i), systematic instruction to teach accuracy, fluency and comprehension in content area and written language." Ms. Honorow said these problems appear to be endemic. Because the syllabi may not reflect what is actually happening in the program, she asked for specific ways to verify that the problems are being addressed. In addition, she emphasized that students and cooperating teachers have stated that they think instruction needs to happen prior to the internship, not during. Mr. Onosko responded that UNH was shoring up both coursework and the year-long internship.

Ms. Salvio stated that she has been working systematically with the Special Ed faculty member since the report came out to get his syllabus organized. She has also been working with the Dean and Jan Nisbet. Ms. Salvio offered to provide evidence of these discussions to the Board. Ms. Honorow replied that evidence of conversations is one thing, evidence of practice is another. Ms. Salvio said the most important thing would be to show the progress that has emerged from the discussions, and Mr. Onosko said that the changes will be in place at the start of the fall semester.

Chairman Cline asked about the shortage of faculty, how long it has been an issue and whether incoming students are made aware that there is only one faculty member in Special Ed. Mr. Onosko answered that UNH hires adjuncts. As recently as seven or eight years ago, the Education Department had 26 faculty members, but is now down to 13. Enrollments at the College of Liberal Arts have dropped 20% and the entire College is competing for tenure lines. As the faculty has shrunk, so has enrollment. When Mr. Onosko arrived in 1989, there were typically 210 students in the fifth year internship, but now there are about 60. Ms. Salvio stated that the adjunct faculty in Special Ed have PhDs and are some of the finest educators in the state, including Stephen Lichtenstein. UNH has an adjunct corps that meets twice a semester and a Critical Friends Group to look over student work. However, the trend nationally is to bring in adjuncts and not offer tenure lines. Chairman Cline responded that this is not a problem as long as adjuncts are properly on boarded and trained. Ms. Chagnon asked how UNH supports their adjuncts given how often adjunct faculty are not provided office space. Ms. Salvio replied that their adjuncts have office space and mailboxes.

Ms. Honorow directed the Board's attention to page 20 and the review of the Early Childhood Special Education Program, where students and cooperating teachers reported that candidates need more direct instruction in regard to standardized assessment, disability deliberations and determinations, processes, procedure, laws, and writing of IEPs. Ms. Honorow expressed concern that such a program could be recommended for a seven-year approval rather than conditional approval. Ms. Stoneking responded that this program was integrated on site at the laboratory school, so the environment and oversight are different than traditional coursework, interns, and clinical studies. Ms. Honorow reiterated her question about why the program would be approved rather than conditionally approved. Ms. Stoneking deferred to the Board's judgment.

Ms. Honorow continued to the suggestions section, where it is stated that trauma and adverse childhood experiences are not part of the curriculum and students did not have experience with those issues. Ms. Salvio responded that UNH began developing a certificate in trauma-informed pedagogy last spring which is federally funded. They applied for a grant and received it, and students now entering the program are having their tuition paid for. Ms. Honorow asked whether that instruction is becoming part of the undergraduate major. Ms. Salvio affirmed that it is, and the instruction is being directed by Dr. Mary Schuh at the

Institute on Disability. Mr. Onosko added that UNH will have room for 60 students to receive free tuition and receive the trauma-informed training.

Ms. Honorow asked if this would be addressed in the annual report. Ms. Salvio answered yes, and explained that Dr. Schuh and Dr. Nisbet have been working with her to locate federal funding to support some of these areas of need in the absence of tenure lines. Mr. Onosko said that the Education Department has received seven federal grants over the last ten years totaling \$5.7 million, which has gone directly to either tuition or room and board for students.

Ms. Lane asked whether the trauma-informed training was available at a professional development level, considering what is happening with regard to trauma and exposure to the opioid epidemic. Ms. Salvio answered that the training is available at the professional development level, and that students will be in a position once they have completed the program to provide professional development within their communities to their colleagues. It is important that UNH students become resources within their buildings rather than having districts purchase packages to do the work that UNH students can do.

Ms. Chagnon asked whether UNH will address the unmet standards at the same time as they develop new programs including the secondary education certification with an emphasis on Special Ed and ESOL. Ms. Salvio stated that the committee is looking at two elementary dual certification programs to meet critical needs—Special Ed Elementary and Bilingual Education Elementary. Mr. Onosko is talking with the History Department to offer a special section for elementary educators, and is planning to do the same with the biological and physical sciences. UNH is trying to create a more robust program where renaissance men and women at the elementary level are not afraid of subject areas, and create a more systematic targeted strike at student understanding that translate directly into the K-6 curriculum. Ms. Salvio added that elementary teachers are the most sophisticated interdisciplinary thinkers because they need to teach across disciplines. UNH has also been in conversation with universities across the country that are doing this very well, for example Syracuse University.

Ms. Stoneking directed the Board's attention to page 12 of the report, where the Early Childhood Education program received a rating of 4. Because this program is a model program, and the Early Childhood Special Education program would be interwoven with it, the review team anticipates that the Early Childhood Special Education program would be in line with a similar rating. This explains why the program was rated 3 and recommended for full approval. Ms. Honorow stated that the evidence did not reflect that this was true, and that this was the source of her concern—that students should not graduate with the deficiencies noted in the Special Ed program.

Chairman Cline stated that the Board could approve the entire slate for two-year conditional approval, or to pull out a couple of programs that the Board has

no issues with and allow those the full seven-year approval. Chairman Cline suggested it would be appropriate to have concerns across all programs and encourage UNH to come back to the Board with an update, rather than leaving the Board with the uncertainty of a seven-year approval where they may not be updated for several years. Phil Nazzaro suggested going program by program to decide which programs may be exemplar for seven-year approval, in the interest of saving UNH and CTE resources.

Mr. Nazzaro raised a general concern about the consistency of ratings in the report and the lack of clarity. The report contains an appendix that states the difference in ratings, but Mr. Nazzaro expressed that as a rater he would not find that very helpful. For example, the Early Childhood Special Education program is rated a 3, and yet students cannot do IEPs, which should be baseline criteria. Mr. Nazzaro suggested there may be a more robust rubric, and that a four-point scale does not offer a lot of space or help with standardization for the reviewee or reviewer.

Mr. Marks responded that this conversation occurred during the UNH visit and meetings with the review team. The reviewers had questions on what distinguished those jumps as they were evaluating the programs, and what emphasis conversations with students, alumni and cooperating teachers should have in the scores. In many cases, the syllabi matched up to the standards, but in conversations it became clear the standards were not being met. However, it was not universal, and the opinions of particular students might have stood out. The review team tried to reflect in the report that it is not necessarily universal across all students, hence the recommendations, but it was definitely a challenge. Chairman Cline stated that this is consistent with what the Board has seen in the past. The process is heavily weighted to inputs like curriculum, textbooks and syllabi, but when students and staff are interviewed, the Board finds problems. The subjectivity that Mr. Nazzaro pointed out is common and the red flags are being raised at the output end, not the input end, so that is something to think about in trying to improve the process.

Mr. Onosko stated that innovator reliability would be a critically important area in the next ten years, and suggested that somebody from the DOE should attend consistently these evaluations and start creating a handbook or scoring manual to clarify the rating system. He suggested the legislature should get involved, and to complete quality reviews, and noted that the DOE would need more support.

Ms. Salvio stated that these problems also speak to the limits of the rubric because with a rubric she is unable to engage deeply with the document. Chairman Cline agreed and related that at other schools the reviewers, faculty and administration are overly focused on the rubric, which is sometimes as much as eight years old and can stifle new programs and innovations. Chairman Cline stated that the Board needed to have a long conversation about this in the future

and that the current system results in too much paperwork that does not necessarily correlate with outputs.

Ms. Honorow stated that the information coming out of the report from students, alumni and cooperating teachers should help the programs see these deficiencies. Ms. Stoneking responded that this was where UNH could transition from the inputs of standards to addressing unmet standards and putting them into practice. For the review team, the most beneficial conversations were with students, alumni and faculty. Chairman Cline added that the syllabi can look great and check a box, but you have to find out if it is being taught well.

Ms. Honorow directed the Board's attention to the School Principal Program on page 38 of the report. Ms. Honorow expressed concern that the program was not able to display or demonstrate continuous improvement, given that the Board in its own regulations emphasizes the importance of training administrators to engender a culture of continuous improvement. Ms. Honorow also noted the lack of faculty in the program. Ms. Salvio said she has spent the last eight months working on the faculty shortage. The force behind the administrator programs at UNH has been Professor Todd DeMitchell, along with adjuncts. Ms. Honorow asked why UNH would seek approval for a program that has such difficulty finding faculty. Ms. Salvio responded that it is an exercise in hope, and the recognition that once you give something up, you do not get the resources back. Mr. Onosko noted that UNH is in negotiations with an individual who could replace Professor DeMitchell in the spring. Ms. Salvio added that the Education Department is working in solidarity with one another.

Ms. Honorow directed the Board's attention to the Special Education Administrator program on page 48. Ms. Honorow noted that the suggestions were not mandated by the review team, but asked to hear more about how the concerns about facilities would be addressed. Ms. Stoneking explained that the suggestions came out of talking with people in the trenches, but they are not directly related to the Ed 600s. Ms. Honorow stated that nobody should ignore the feedback included in the report. Ms. Honorow continued that the Board cannot mandate that UNH build different buildings, but students have to access to their classrooms, and if there is too little space to offer classes, it becomes more than just a building problem. Mr. Onosko responded that the access issue was a one-time mistake and won't occur again; and that the issue with the administrator program is that the numbers are very small, but if students take courses with Professor DeMitchell, they are in for a lot of work, and he is one of the top two education law experts in the country. Professor DeMitchell also offers independent studies because the enrollment numbers are so low.

Ms. Lane asked Commissioner Edelblut whether the 600s apply for students to have an opportunity for counseling in their subject area, and whether there is a roadmap that is made available from beginning to end. Commissioner Edelblut responded that the 600s define what has to be there but does not

sequence them. Ms. Stoneking added that departments then create their own roadmaps within their institution, along with benchmarks or gateways.

Chairman Cline stated he would now be open to suggestions about which programs to add to the list of conditional approvals. General Special Education and Music Education were already up for conditional approval. Ms. Lane added Early Childhood Special Education and School Principal. Chairman Cline added Special Education Administrator and Ms. Honorow agreed.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded Ann Lane, that the State Board of Education moves to grant UNH's Educator Preparation Programs full seven year approval for the following: Ed 612.03 Early Childhood Education, both Bachelor's and Master's; Ed 612.16 Health Education, Master's and MAT Master's; Ed 612.16/612.21 Health and Physical Education, Integrated Bachelor's; Ed 612.17 Mathematics Education 5 through 8, Bachelor's; Ed 612.18 Mathematics Education 7 through 12, Bachelor's; Ed 614.05 School Superintendent, Ed Specialist or E.Ds.; Ed 614.14 Elementary Mathematics Specialist, Master's education level.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

Ms. Honorow stated that she believes UNH will do everything they can to persuade the administration to put more money into these programs. UNH has always been the flagship of New Hampshire's 13 IHEs, and they have a tremendous educator preparation program. Ms. Honorow hopes the annual report will address the suggestions and be approved appropriately. Ms. Salvio thanked Ms. Honorow, and said that she would try to convey the history of the department to UNH's administration in solidarity with the rest of the department. Mr. Onosko said he would show the Board meeting video to the administration including Ms. Honorow's comments about UNH as a flagship institution.

Chairman Cline reiterated that there was an interest in further discussions with UNH and other programs about the oversight and review process and how it can be made more effective. Ms. Salvio responded that ongoing assessment was important. Chairman Cline stated that the rules process is bureaucratic and multilayered, and there has to be a better way to do it that would add more value for students and institutions. Ms. Salvio mentioned Doris Santoro of Bowdoin College, author of *Demoralized*, which looks at teachers who are demoralized because they cannot do what they know they need to do for students. Professor Santoro also has a generative framework for assessment. Ann Lane reiterated that this report is an opportunity to get the attention of UNH's administration based on how many retirements the Education Department has had.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Ann Lane, that the State Board of Education moves to grant UNH's Educator Preparation Programs conditional two year approval for the following: Ed 612.20 Music Education, Bachelor's level; Ed 612.07 General Special Education, Master's level; Ed 612.071 Early Childhood Special Education, Master's level; Ed 614.04 School Principal Conversation and Educational Specialist; Ed 614.15 Special Education Administrator, certificate licensure.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM VI. NONPUBLIC SCHOOL APPROVAL

A. US Performance Academy – Three Year Renewal for Attendance Purposes Only

Shireen Meskoob, NHDOE, Division of Education Analytics and Resources, began by handing out a page that was missing from the packet distributed to the Board.

The US Performance Academy is a digital school designed for high performance athletes to cater to their schedules, trainings, and competitions. They were approved for one year and now they are up for their three-year approval for attendance only. Helen Honorow stated she appreciates that the request says "for attendance only." Ms. Meskoob responded that she also included a paragraph indicating that she conferred with the head of each school to make sure they were not advertising themselves as anything other than what they are approved for.

US Performance Academy is required to report any changes since last reporting. Ms. Meskoob has gone through the requirements with them and they have submitted required documents. Nothing substantive has changed in the school handbook or policy, and they have met all of requirements of Ed 400 and 401.03. Ms. Meskoob asked the Board to approve US Performance Academy for attendance purposes only for three years, to expire June 30th, 2022.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Helen Honorow, that the State Board accept and approve the commissioner's nonpublic school approval designation report for attendance purposes only.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM VII. CHARTER SCHOOL REPORTS/UPDATES

A. Amendments to Making Community Connections Public Charter School's Charter

Kim Carter, CEO of Making Community Connections (MC2) Charter School, stated that MC2's Monadnock campus in Keene is up for renewal. As part of that process, MC2 has spent the last year on a deep dive into their charter with the Board, schools, and communities involved in both campuses.

MC2 has changed the wording of its mission to make it a positive statement instead of a negative statement at the recommendation of their board. Ms. Honorow asked what "interrupt the predictive value of race, class, language" means. Ms. Carter responded that there is an assumption supported by research that we can predict the performance of students from these different subgroups, and their performance will not be the same as other subgroups. MC2 wants to interrupt that and close that achievement gap, especially the completion and post-secondary accomplishment gaps. Chairman Cline added that in social science, especially in education, there is a lot of controlling for race, sex, and poverty. Chairman Cline suggested that what MC2 wants is to attack those underlying issues so that these students will come out better than what one would predict for the average in that subcategory. Ms. Carter agreed that this is MC2's vision, although they do not expect to accomplish it immediately, but it is what they are working towards and mindful of. MC2 also changed the word "eliminate" to "interrupt," because "eliminate" was too big, and they are focused on personalized, competency-based, community connected success for each child.

Ms. Honorow related a personal anecdote about a job interview where her son made a similar argument to MC2's vision, and was told that it affirmed stereotypes. Ms. Carter responded that it is a matter of how it is phrased. The system unquestionably has been designed and operates in terms of predictive values, but Ms. Carter said she does not believe any individual is defined by that. MC2 wants to approach the system in a way that interrupts that predictive value, not approach the children in a way that associates them with a predictive value.

Ms. Carter continued with the charter's amendments, directing the Board's attention to item number one, which states that students will make no less than one year's academic growth in reading, writing, math, social studies and science. MC2 is competency-based, not time-based, and has worked for the last year to come up with measurable benchmarks to help not only measure whether they are doing what they say they are doing, but also help guide their school communities, teachers, and staff. Ms. Carter noted that after doing some research, saw that all charter schools are accountable to state standards, so MC2 added goal six. MC2 expects to see growth as part of accountability, but also wanted to include benchmarks around competencies and proficiency. MC2's premise is based on education science, social-emotional development, work-ready competencies, and content understanding, and have tried to capture in their competency statement

the benchmarks that will map progress in, and attainment of, the requirements for a high school diploma.

Ms. Carter noted two things about this change. First, these work habits align to state work ready skills and dispositions that are very important to life such as curiosity. Second, MC2 does not use numbers like 25, 50, 75, or 100%. MC2 is trying to step out of the time-based model, and what they have found is that there is significant growth in those dispositions and work habits, and as that growth is taking place, there is slower growth in the competency attainment. Once students have attained the basic dispositions, they accelerate in their attainment of knowledge and skills. Ms. Carter added that MC2 is working hard to have a data management system that tracks that for each individual so they can look at the program as a whole to see how they are keeping students on track and how they are being accountable to the learning students could have.

Ms. Honorow asked whether MC2 has a current database system they are using. Ms. Carter responded that they have two systems, one MC2 is developing on their own and one from a management system that has been very supportive. MC2 will be including data in their charter renewal application. Ms. Carter added that if MC2 intends to be competency based, they need to identify accountability in measures that are not standardized tests but that are rigorous and meaningful, so that is what they are working on.

Ms. Carter directed the Board's attention to number four, in which MC2 refers back to their mission statement and added "and meaningfully collaborates with peers to further their own learning." MC2 believes that collaboration is important. Personalization is important, but it must be done in a community.

Ms. Carter noted that MC2 did not get rid of number six, they just moved it to number five. They added a sixth goal which is now listed as number one. Ms. Carter continued to section H, where the wording was changed from saying Smarter Balanced to saying NH State Assessment System.

MC2 updated graduation requirements. World languages are often a requirement for college ready, but not every one of their learners is going to college. At the same time, MC2 wanted to acknowledge those aforementioned habits and dispositions including things like goalsetting and project management, which is a key piece of the MC2 advisory curriculum. Rather than make it a 26 credit diploma, MC2 decided to make world languages an elective that students on a career pathway should definitely incorporate. But MC2 will also recognize the learning that happens in the advisory program, so that is really 0.5 per phase, and that represents the four phases. MC2 has an accelerated pathway which represents the state's minimum diploma with a focus on career education. Transition preparation is critical for all of MC2's learners, and MC2 did not want to cut out career exploration. MC2 split career education and the advisory curriculum and added a credit, so the accelerated pathway is now 21 credits instead of 20.

Ms. Carter continued to the addition of the statement, “students and teachers use assessment tools.” MC2 moved this from a different paragraph where it did not make as much as sense--just a relocation of that sentence. Ms. Carter emphasized that learning progressions and those levels of understanding are important to bringing rigor and fidelity to MC2’s accountability and assessment.

The next section addresses the business manager. MC2 must be flexible. The business management responsibility is critical but may not always reside with one person. MC2 wanted to make sure to capture the internal controls that are essential but not associated with a person so much as a responsibility.

Similar to the update on the internship coordinator position, ELOs are an important part of NH’s landscape and that role is 40% of MC2’s program design at minimum, so they wanted to capture that more accurately in their charter and have added more detail there.

MC2 added a responsibility that they have found to be critical to the sustainability of their charter school: Lead Teacher. Many pieces of MC2 are unique, and there must be somebody to assist with orientation and onboarding of new staff and to support them in their development work.

MC2 updated the admissions process to be clear about what they are doing and not doing. They are not screening students. MC2 wants students and their families to know what the school is so they can make an informed decision. MC2 does not take educational history before they enroll a student. They do take educational history once a student is enrolled, but they have clarified this process in the charter.

Ms. Carter stated that MC2 has updated their financials as part of the requirements for the charter renewal application. MC2 is more realistic about their enrollment projections and associated staffing, largely because Manchester now has a significant number of charter schools and so the environment has changed. Ms. Carter also noted that MC2 plans to sync their two campuses so they do not have to do a charter renewal every two or three years.

Chairman Cline congratulated Ms. Carter on MC2’s work, and stated that he is encouraged to see a charter school look at their charter and go through it and reassess. Ann Lane commended MC2 for their sense of responsibility particularly in coordinating special ed. MC2 is a role model for every other charter school based on how they itemize what it is they are responsible for and how they actually put it into practice. Ms. Carter responded that she is very proud of that aspect, particularly MC2’s school leader at Monadnock who has worked with the special education coordinators in that region and developed some models that MC2 hopes to share with other charter schools and other school districts.

Ms. Lane directed Ms. Carter's attention to page 11 and the phrase "regarding 10% of MC2's resident pupils." Ms. Lane asked what that meant. Ms. Carter responded that this must be from the old charter, and her recollection was that it refers to the state law about how many students MC2 can accept from each district. Ms. Lane said she was unfamiliar with that requirement in the charter law, and Ms. Honorow affirmed that it is open enrollment. Ms. Lane quoted from the document: "MC2 is an open enrollment school of choice. There are students throughout NH for state sponsored student placements. MC2 will comply with the statutory provision declared by not more than 10% of the resident pupils in any grade shall be eligible to transfer to a charter school in any school year without approval of the local school board."

Chairman Cline suggested that this provision may be from an old version of the law. Ms. Carter asked about another provision, that if a student enrolls and then leaves, they cannot return without school board approval. Chairman Cline responded that that provision is no longer applicable either, and suggested that the website may be out of date. Ms. Carter said that they will take up these changes in the next amendment to the charter.

Ms. Chagnon asked whether MC2 has been able to move their Manchester campus to a facility that allowed for outdoor activities. Ms. Carter answered that they changed facilities two years ago, moving to the old Union Leader building with outdoor space.

Ms. Honorow expressed appreciation for the report and the included chart. She then drew the Board's attention to page 6 under the mission section: "Every young person deserves to graduate from high school with options, options to go to college or the option to work." Ms. Honorow asked if this meant any postsecondary education, for example cosmetology, or the option to go to college. Ms. Carter responded that it was MC2's intention to step out of the tract program where students are sorted by whether they are going to college. MC2 believes that all students need both work ready skills and academic skills, so MC2 is not going to make those decisions. MC2 is going to support their young people so they graduate ready to make whatever choice is best for them.

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, that pursuant to RSA 194-B:3 XI, the State Board of Education authorize a revision of Making Community Connections Public Charter School charter.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

Ms. Carter closed by inviting the Board to serve as panelists in a graduation defense at MC2. Commissioner Edelblut stated that the defense was the best student presentation he had ever seen. Ms. Carter explained that in one hour's

time, Board members would get the best introduction to MC2 and what is possible with a competency-based model.

B. Updates on New Charter Application for Northeast Woodlands Public Charter School

Mr. Gagnon Gagnon of Northeast Woodlands Public Charter School (NWPCS) began by thanking the Board for its work. Commissioner Edelblut asked if there was a handout available since the Board did not have any documentation except for a legal notice. It was determined that there had been an email issue and Northeast Woodlands' response would have to be photocopied. Chairman Cline asked Mr. Gagnon to walk through the text regardless.

Mr. Gagnon stated that he believes Northeast Woodlands has answered the Board's questions from the January meeting and are looking forward to hiring staff and acquiring a physical space.

The first issue addressed was to demonstrate how Northeast Woodlands' curriculum meets or exceeds state standards. The curriculum encompasses the scope of Common Core standards as set by the state of NH although it differs in its implementation and timing. This is outlined in Part 3 of the Alliance for Public Waldorf Schools Handbook and is included with the application in Appendix J. Chairman Cline clarified that although Northeast Woodlands may differ in timing from a traditional public school, they have agreed to perform at or above grade level based on NH standardized testing by seventh grade. Caroline of Northeast Woodlands added that the school's curriculum map is included in Appendix J as well. Commissioner Edelblut noted that the Waldorf approach has been approved by other states to meet Common Core standards.

Mr. Gagnon continued to the second point, which was the structural clarification of the board of trustees and school board including term lengths for the board of trustees. The Northwest Waldorf Education Foundation Board of Trustees is the founding board responsible for ensuring that the mission and the vision of Northeast Woodland Charter School stays focused over time. They are pillars of the community continually working to build support for the school through their strong network of educational, financial and community relationships. Staggered terms of two years shall be set for the trustees with appointments to the Board of Trustees made by a two-thirds majority vote of existing trustees. In the application, the word trustee or trustees refers to this overarching group. The Northeast Woodland Charter School Board will focus on school operations, providing fiscal oversight and administrative direction to school employees. The school board will be responsible for working with charter school staff to ensure the day-to-day operations are carried out in an efficient, fiscally responsible manner, final personnel decision making authority with recommendation from the head of the school and faculty chair, and conflict resolution within the student, faculty, staff and local education agency (LEA) communities. Mr. Gagnon explained that the

phrase “school board” refers to the group managing day-to-day operations. Northeast Woodlands recognizes that this is a lot of work and the people serving on these boards are volunteers with day jobs, so to do these tasks well, the work has to be divided so that there is adequate personnel capacity to make sure it can happen.

Ms. Honorow asked if there would be term limits. Mr. Gagnon answered that there would be no term limits, especially because the community in the Mount Washington Valley is so small and there are only so many volunteers.

Mr. Gagnon continued to the next item, a list of trustees and affiliations with the White Mountain Waldorf School. These are provided in writing, and Mr. Gagnon stated that they have spoken with an attorney who said there were no issues.

For the next item, Northeast Woodlands was asked to remove grants and fundraising from their budget as these are not yet secured, and to add proper taxes to the budget. There were also questions about contingencies which have been addressed, specifically to identify areas where if for some reason enrollment projections are not met, the budget can be scaled to be fiscally responsible. Next, Northeast Woodlands was asked to produce a formal well-organized fundraising plan, strategic goals, objectives, detailed plans to execute and a timeline for implementation. That is attached as a spreadsheet broken down with different events and dates.

Section F was revised to include all grades and discipline areas for the required NH SAS tests: ELA and Math for 3rd through 8th grades, and 5th and 8th grade science.

Ms. Lane asked how Northeast Woodlands arrived at their fund raising numbers. Mr. Gagnon responded that the board has been doing research on what the potential might be of available money and have set a realistic bar for what they think is possible. They know there is a lot of competition for these funds. It was also mentioned that they have spoken with other schools who have put on specific fundraisers and developed numbers based on what those schools were able to do. Cindy Chagnon stated that she was glad to see that they have reality-based numbers to work from. It was noted that Northeast Woodlands has tried to take as much information as possible from other people who have done similar things in similar geographic areas.

Mr. Gagnon returned to Assessment Section F, in which Northeast Woodlands addresses competency based portfolios, lesson book assessments, different opportunities for students to showcase and register their work and some of the example assessments.

Ms. Chagnon asked whether their assessments would be age specific or whether they would let advanced students move ahead in grades depending on their ability level. Caroline responded that when a child is enrolled, Northeast Woodlands is looking at their developmental and physical body so that they are prepared to learn. If a child is not meeting these assessments, Northeast Woodlands would sit down with the parents, talk about what it would look like if they stayed another year in kindergarten, and talk about how that would help them so that they are more ready to learn academically starting in first grade. If a child was older, Northeast Woodlands might say they can move forward but they are going to do some remedial intervention to help the child work with the curriculum. Ms. Chagnon asked about the opposite situation, since there has been criticism of public schools that children who are ready to move on are kept back with students in their age group. Ms. Chagnon also wondered how much individual education there would be, or whether it would be more of a group mindset. Caroline stated that the child becomes part of the community of their class, and it is important to have different ranges within one classroom. Most likely, with the interdisciplinary methods of Waldorf education, a child may need something from somewhere else. For example, they may be wonderful at reading but need a lot of work with their painting or physical education, or they are struggling socially/emotionally to work with their peers. When students are pushed along, they may not be socially or emotionally prepared when they get to high school.

Mr. Gagnon continued to the next item, a general description of a proposed or potential location. The Mount Washington Valley is a north-south strip of population, so Northeast Woodlands aims to be as close to the center of that population as possible in the Conway or North Conway area. There is high property demand in that area, but Mr. Gagnon stated that they have identified raw land that may work in the long term and buildings that may work in the short term. Until Northeast Woodlands has a charter in hand, it is difficult to seriously pursue property acquisition. Outdoor resources and proximity to existing transportation are priorities in securing a location.

The next item related to educational need. There is a long history of private Waldorf education in the Valley, so residents are well aware of the benefits and there is a strong foundation and demand for Waldorf education. All of the nearby private Waldorf schools cost a lot of money, so there is a desire to have this program but not an economic base to support it. Northeast Woodlands feels that there is a strong need for this type of education.

The next item referred to the governing board's rules, responsibilities, qualifications, skillset, and experience. Northeast Woodlands has expanded on the difference between the Board of Trustees and the School Board and what specific skillsets they are looking for. The method by which the trustees and their terms are determined was addressed earlier in the presentation.

Mr. Gagnon continued by reading the opening sentence of the organizational structure and growth plan section: "Our plan for growth will initially be focused on strengthening the structure of Northeast Woodland Charter School from within before considering external growth or expansion." Northeast Woodlands needs to make sure to strengthen the foundation of their school before expanding into more students or other areas. Resources are limited, so as Northeast Woodlands grows, hopefully they will be able to offer internal support services to take the burden off the LEAs for things like supplemental programming.

The next item was the grievance, complaints process and policy. Northeast Woodlands looked at what other schools are doing and have come up with some basics for how to handle grievances that really work. These are spelled out in the document.

Ms. Honorow asked what the internal grievance dispute policy would be. Mr. Gagnon said as soon as the charter was approved they would hire the head of school who can write these policies. Ms. Honorow noted that other charter schools have experienced issues by not having a clear conflict of interest policy in place, so it is important to be clear who handles conflict and how it is resolved.

Ms. Chagnon noted that the next item regarding disputes between the LEA and Northeast Woodlands was well considered. She wondered if this came from knowledge of other charter schools that have had issues. Mr. Gagnon responded that they did not anticipate conflict with the LEA based on their experience developing this application, but in their research, other charter schools have had some issues so they decided to look at different options for handling disputes in an effort to be well prepared.

Mr. Gagnon continued to item 5-J, supplemental programming, where Northeast Woodlands addressed Title I programs specifically for schools with high percentages of students from low income families, how they will work to integrate those students and support their school as best they can. Once staff is in place, Northeast Woodlands will be better able to work with the Board to make sure the details are done right. Ms. Chagnon added that Title I is complex, and even if students are not from a low income family, they can still receive Title I services. Caroline interjected that the classification has to do with academic achievements, and noted that she researched a school that uses Title I money to hire a remedial teacher to work with all children.

Ms. Lane stated that the enrichment piece makes sense, but the accelerated education program does not seem to satisfy the need of a Title I student who is behind. Caroline responded that Title I would not be for an accelerated program, so the wording in the document is wrong and needs to be reviewed.

Ms. Lane also asked for a clarification of section 7A regarding special ed. Mr. Gagnon responded that Northeast Woodlands clarified their application to convey their understanding that they would not receive funding for special education, so it was an accident. Ms. Lane responded that Northeast Woodlands would have to provide those services if they received a student with an IEP. Mr. Gagnon agreed, and Caroline added that they can work together with the LEA to provide those services. Jane Waterhouse, NHDOE, Charter School Administrator interjects that it was a reviewer question and they did mention that they would be using funds from special education provided services. But it is actually the school district that gets the funding, the home district of the student, and the district is responsible for providing all the services and making all the decisions. Then if they contract with the charter school, the charter school will provide the services.

Ms. Chagnon added that in discussions with the LEA, this has been a huge problem, and encouraged Northeast Woodland to understand exactly what the LEA will provide because it is a big issue on both sides. The LEA does not want their special educator to leave their school to come over to Northeast Woodlands because it dilutes their services. Caroline responded that she has already begun those discussions with Pam Stimpson, the head of special education in SAU 9. Caroline was also approached by the head of special education at Kennett High School, who wants to be a part of Northeast Woodlands.

Ms. Honorow asked to clarify the section of the organizational structure and growth plan, which should be very clear because the money for special needs students will be with the sending district. School districts have to provide services and they have no control on the number of students that might need services. Ms. Honorow encouraged Northeast Woodlands to be clear about their relationships and what they can provide through Waldorf education, but in terms of what the LEA has to do, they need to pay for that and provide it.

Chairman Cline asked the Board if these updates have answered their questions, if the school is incorporating the Board's concerns and is capable of addressing them. Chairman Cline also asked if the Board were to give Northeast Woodlands an approval, would this document be incorporated into the official charter. Mr. Gagnon responded that Northeast Woodlands asked that question last week and were told not to incorporate the updates it into the charter. Chairman Cline agreed that it was easier to follow in this form than it would have been in the charter document. However, it is difficult for the Board to approve a charter without a charter to approve. Chairman Cline presented the possibility that if the Board is comfortable with the update, they could approve the charter based on incorporating these updates in the appropriate places. Representatives of Northeast Woodlands asserted that they could turn around an updated charter document very quickly. Ms. Chagnon asked if it would be possible to do a conditional approval pending Northeast Woodlands returning next month with an updated charter.

Ms. Honorow interjected and referred to the previous month's meeting minutes and the question for Northeast Woodlands about computers. Caroline responded that she researched the NH standards for computer programming, and the first response was to incorporate a tech teacher to work solely on tech curriculum, possibly also as a math specialty teacher. The Waldorf math curriculum develops computer programming knowledge and skills from a young age and meets the computer programming standards without actually using a computer until about fifth grade. Caroline has also been researching a program called Cyber Civics, which allows children to learn how to be good citizens in the cyber world starting in the third grade. Caroline acknowledged she is not a tech expert and would have to work with the tech teacher to develop a program that meets NH standards. Chairman Cline asked if there was a technical advisory on computer science requirements. Commissioner Edelblut explained that there was no Department produced technical advisory, but there is a fairly extensive guidance document that was produced by a national group with the national computer science standards that is aligned to NH state standards. There is a link on the DOE website to an extensive handbook and guide for adopting and implementing the standards.

Ms. Honorow acknowledged that computer science would probably be the one place where a Waldorf curriculum would be the most difficult. Caroline responded that the Alliance for Public Waldorf Schools is working through this in many states and developing their own curriculum. There is also a professor of computer science at UMass Amherst who has taken it upon himself to work with the Waldorf standards to make them relevant in today's world of technology. Ms. Chagnon relayed a personal anecdote about observing Waldorf students recording bird migration data on a computer. Caroline responded that many Waldorf schools now include Chromebooks in their classrooms beginning with fourth grade, partly because students with disabilities get a lot of help with the Chromebook. She also stated that Northeast Woodlands is not opposed to the use of computers, but believes there are many different mediums and that would be one way.

Ms. Honorow asked if it is possible to give Northeast Woodlands a conditional approval of their charter subject to incorporating their responses into the charter. Chairman Cline responded that a conditional approval is possible. Northeast Woodlands would come back next month with an updated charter for a full approval. Ms. Honorow expressed concern that Northeast Woodlands would not be able to secure a building in time for the fall semester unless the updated charter is approved as soon as possible. Caroline responded that the charter could be updated in a week or two. Ms. Waterhouse added that Northeast Woodlands had already addressed this in a conversation before the meeting in which she told them that their responses had to be in the charter, so they are prepared to get that done.

Chairman Cline asked how much the conditional approval would help Northeast Woodlands convince a potential landlord to let them sign a lease. Mr.

Gagnon responded that the final approval is the most important thing, but the conditional approval may help. Phil Nazzaro interjected that he did not need to see the charter to approve it. Caroline asked if the charter could only be approved at the Board's monthly meeting and was informed that it had to be done at a public meeting and the next one is March 12. Chairman Cline suggested the approval could go on the consent agenda for March, so that Northeast Woodlands would not have to attend a third monthly meeting. If Northeast Woodlands submits the updated document soon, the Board will have time to review and note any additional changes before the date of the next meeting. Chairman Cline and Mr. Nazzaro both asserted that the updated charter should not be done in haste because it is a foundational document, and the Board should have time to read through it.

Mr. Gagnon asked the Board if the process of updating the charter could go on forever. Caroline added that Northeast Woodlands needs to start an admissions process soon, in addition to the need for a building and staff. Chairman Cline clarified that he only meant small errors, nothing that would delay the charter approval further. Ms. Lane asked if the Board could provide Northeast Woodlands with a letter to present to potential landlords that would state that they have conditional approval from the Board. Chairman Cline stated that the motion could be worded to approve the charter conditioned on incorporating these responses into the charter document, which will lead to full approval anticipated on March 12.

MOTION: Phil Nazzaro made the following motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, that the State Board of Education approve the Northeast Woodlands Public Charter School charter conditional upon the inclusion of the agreed upon edits into the final charter. The Board will take up the final charter at its March 12, 2020 meeting and anticipates full approval on that date.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM VIII. LEGISLATIVE UPDATES

A. INITIAL PROPOSAL – Vocational Rehabilitation Program (Ed 1000)

Amanda Phelps, NHDOE, Administrative Rules Coordinator, began by introducing Lisa Hatz, State Director for Vocational Rehabilitation. Ed 1000 was broken up into two different proposals, so Ms. Phelps suggested looking first at Ed 1001 through Ed 1012.

Ms. Phelps stated that upon reviewing these rules, she realized that they were copied and pasted from the federal regulations, creating a very lengthy document and duplicating what is in the federal regulations. All of the edits in this section are removing what is copied and referencing the federal regulations. Ms.

Phelps decided to keep certain sections because expansion was required, so those sections are still in there, but the rest just points to the relevant regulation.

Chairman Cline noted Ed 1003.02 on page 5, the paragraph above Data Collection or paragraph B. He expressed discomfort that the wording could be interpreted that a fee is charged for downloading information. Ms. Phelps responded that the federal regulation does not require that NH charge; it is up to the state to decide whether to charge any fees, and there is no evidence that NH ever has. Typically, this comes up when there is a customer requesting a fair hearing and they want a copy of their file. Occasionally, there are subpoenas of information which could be more extensive, and the Department wants the option to charge if it is exorbitant. Chairman Cline reiterated that he does not like the wording or the implication of a document retrieval fee. Lisa responded that they could change the wording.

Ms. Phelps stated that there were no substantive changes to the first half.

MOTION: Phil Nazzaro made the following motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, that the State Board of Education approve the initial proposals for Ed 1001 through Ed 1012, Vocational Rehabilitation Programs.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

Ms. Phelps continued to the second half, which addresses specific programs within the Vocational Rehabilitation Program. Most of the changes in this document are due to deleting sections in the first half, so Ms. Phelps had to renumber all of the rules and realign the rule references. One section was removed beginning on page 9, State Independent Living Services and Centers for Independent Living. The section before it is General Provisions for Independent Living Services and Centers for Independent Living Program, which refers to the money that VR receives for individuals requiring services at an independent living center. Ed 1017 is the money that is funneled from the federal government for the actual independent living center which does not get funneled through Vocational Rehabilitation anymore—it goes through the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

Ms. Honorow asked what an independent living center is. Lisa responded that Granite State Independent Living is the one center for independent living (GSIL). They receive a separate grant for Part B independent living services which are services to help people stay in their home, get to doctor's appointments, get to funerals, those kinds of things. That money comes in and then is contracted out to GSIL, the Brain Injury Association and to Northeast Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and anybody else that would respond to an RFP during that session. But since reauthorization, independent living has been separated away from Department

federally and moved over to DHHS. To help clarify, Lisa provided another example, that the State Independent Living Council has determined that VR and the DOE would still be the designated state entity. They could have said they wanted it to be DHHS or the Governor's Commission on Disability but they wanted it to remain with Department. Some of this change is due to the fact that Department is not receiving the money or overseeing them. The Department is the designated state entity, but the money goes right to Granite State Independent Living.

Ms. Honorow asked if the documents would be merged for public comment. Ms. Phelps confirmed.

MOTION: Phil Nazzaro moved to amend his motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, to include approval of the initial proposal for Ed 1000.

VOTE The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

B. INITIAL PROPOSAL – Adult High School, Basic Education Program and High School Equivalency Program (Ed 700)

Ms. Phelps introduced Sarah Bennett, Administrator, Bureau of Adult Education and stated that they updated these rules to comply with federal guidelines and state statutes. Ms. Phelps directed the Board's attention to an amendment on page 4 of the proposal where eligibility has been changed from 18 years old to 16 years old to align with federal regulations.

Ms. Bennett clarified that this amendment is relevant to adult basic education, and Ms. Phelps stated that the amendment would point to the new eligibility in the handout, which points to Title II, Section 203, Subsection 4 for eligible individual. Cindy Chagnon said she thought that students needed to be enrolled in school through age 18 according to state regulation. Ms. Bennett responded that there are circumstances when somebody under the age of 18 may not be enrolled in high school. For example, there was a student who had moved to NH from Puerto Rico who had a high school diploma but needed to build her English skills. She was 17 and would meet that criteria to attend adult basic education.

Ms. Chagnon asked if anything else was substantially different. Helen Honorow stated that the next section refers to having a math and reading skill below 12:9. Ms. Bennett explained that in the original state rule there was a grade level, whereas the actual federal eligibility requirements would take out that section altogether. Ms. Chagnon stated that it is probably very easy to have a math score less than 12.9. Ms. Bennett responded that she had originally intended to expand that, because it did not cover anything at the secondary level.

Ms. Honorow asked why the Board was readopting these rules when there will be changes after the adoption. Ms. Phelps answered that she had talked to Attorney Bond and discovered that these rules are expired. Once the rules are in place, Ms. Phelps will go through these rules with the federal guidelines more in depth because she believes that the Department is missing pieces as far as what to do with money that comes in for adult education. Ms. Honorow asked what falls through the gaps if the Board does not readopt the rules. Ms. Phelps responded that technically, without rules in place, the Department cannot take action on any applications that come in, so right now the Department is in violation. Ms. Honorow noted that having a public hearing on rules that are not very good and are going to change seems like a waste of resources.

Ms. Chagnon asked where the adult basic education programs were run. Ms. Bennett responded that they are run through the Bureau of Adult Education, which is federally funded through the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, along with state funding for adult diploma programs. There is a competitive bidding process to get grants for that money. Ms. Chagnon asked for a physical location of the program, and Ms. Bennett answered that there are 14 centers across the state, some located in school districts and some in community nonprofit organizations. Ms. Chagnon wondered if there should be more publicity for the program due to its unknown status. Ms. Bennett agreed and stated that the Department has done a lot of work to educate people that they exist. The reality is there are not a lot of people in NH who do not have a high school diploma, but there are some individuals, many of them English language learners who make up 70% of the program. 96% of NH residents have a high school diploma; the state ranks third in the country. There are about 80,000 people in NH over the age of 25 who do not have a high school diploma.

Ms. Lane asked if there was information about whether the students without high school diplomas had moved to the state as adults or matriculated through the schools. Ms. Bennett responded that since the compulsory attendance law went into effect, the dropout rate has dropped considerably. Chairman Cline added that it is reflective of NH's system and the fact that the state attracts a higher educated workforce. NH's system produces almost universal high school graduation. Ms. Lane asked how many people who were not college graduates had moved to the state versus matriculating through NH schools. Ms. Bennett responded that she did not know and it would be difficult to track. However, the adult high school program referenced here has been working with students enrolled in high school as a dropout prevention map, serving almost 1,500 high school students last year in addition to adults.

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Phil Nazzaro, that the State Board of Education approve the initial proposal for Ed 700 Adult Education.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

C. FINAL PROPOSAL – School Building Aid (Ed 321)

Ms. Phelps began by noting that some edits were made in the initial proposal. There were also edits based on comments from the Office of Legislative Services (OLS). Representative Hill sent in some suggestions for edits which address the rule, and in the executive summary there are comments from OLS that were not addressed, but that will be explained. Amy Clark, Administrator for School Safety and Administrator of the School Building Aid Program introduced herself.

Chairman Cline stated that he had some concerns which should have been brought up earlier in the process regarding the very detailed requirements in some places. For example, on page 6-F, it states that every general purpose classroom shall have an erasable surface of at least 32 square feet. Chairman Cline wondered why these seemingly arbitrary rules were in place.

Ms. Clark began by addressing the intent of the edits: House Bill 175 came about and was approved last summer, so the Department had to add changes to mimic what is now in the new law. Building Aid has been around since the 1940s. In 2009 there was a ten-year moratorium on school construction in the state of NH by House Bill 2. The legislature decided to redo the rules in 2013, and the law changed the process a lot. Ms. Clark stated that she was unsure if these rules existed before 2013 or not, but the intent of the rules is to address House Bill 175 and things that have changed since 2013. There were changes along the way that were made at the state level so those were addressed, and people are now applying for Building Aid for the first time. Ms. Clark explained while reviewing the rules when she encountered wording that caused a problem with her ability to process an application, she made changes. If it was not causing a problem, she left the language as it was, and has no idea why there is a requirement for a 32 square foot erasable surface. She added that schools do not ever complain about it, and she doubts that schools measure their whiteboards.

Chairman Cline said that he understands this is not a complete revision of the rules. This is one of those small details that probably does not cause problems but could be improved. Chairman Cline also stated that the Board does not know how these rules could affect school building design in the future. Ann Lane added that she would like to know the science behind the numbers that assign a certain square footage number per child. The square footage requirements make building costs prohibitive for some districts. Ms. Clark responded that she does not know the origin of these requirements, but could do research to find out.

Ms. Clark proposed a stakeholder group to address all of the rules. Phil Nazzaro asked if the Board should approve these rules and then take a full robust look, or not approve. Chairman Cline stated that his initial look at the rules was in terms of compliance within the law and substantive changes without getting into a full review. However, Chairman Cline wanted to call attention to his concerns. For example, new high schools have to have a size of 50 contiguous acres when NH is losing population. Chairman Cline would like to get a group together to revise the rules in a way that leaves school districts more flexibility to control costs. Mr. Nazzaro agreed, pointing to the requirements for bookshelves in library-media centers, which may stifle innovation.

Ms. Phelps responded that the initial proposal was not a complete review. Since Ms. Clark received money this year for the first time in a long time, she must apply the new law and needs the rules to reflect the new law in order to appropriately process applications. The plan has always been for a more thorough review with a stakeholder group. Ms. Lane asked if schools that are designated to receive the funds are held to these rules. Ms. Clark responded that she does not believe schools are designing their buildings to leave a space for a 32 square foot board, but the rules do give them guidance, especially for example on square footage. Schools also have waiver criteria, so if they only have 10 students in a classroom, the Department lets them know that some of these classrooms may be oversized. Ms. Clark acknowledged that the square footage requirements are in line with other states, but it is true that some requirements are out of date.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Phil Nazzaro, that the State Board of Education approve the final proposal for Ed 321, School Building Construction.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

Ms. Chagnon asked whether the process for distributing Building Aid money would now speed up. Ms. Clark affirmed that it would, and that she will likely return before the Board in December or January with a ranked list.

D. FINAL PROPOSAL – Special Education Teacher and Early Childhood Special Education Teacher (Ed 507.40 & Ed 507.41)

Ms. Phelps stated that this proposal received comments from OLS. There were no comments from the public hearing so all the edits are editorial, nothing substantive.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Phil Nazzaro, that the State Board of Education approve the final proposal for Ed 507.40 and Ed 507.41, Special Education Teacher and Early Childhood Special Education Teacher.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

E. FINAL PROPOSAL – Credential Standards for Educational Personnel (Ed 501-Ed 504)

Stephen Appleby, Director, Division of Educator Support and Higher Education began by thanking Ms. Phelps for her work. Ms. Phelps stated that the Department did receive some substantive comments from OLS, and addressed most of them in the rules. There are two that Department did not address in the rules, and Ms. Phelps already spoke to Mike Morrill at OLS about both of them. Mr. Morrill wanted to know how the new nurse law aligned with the rules, and Ms. Phelps explained that she helped draft the new nurse law so that it would directly align with state laws. Mr. Morrill also wanted to know where PTs, OTs and SLPs fit into the Department's groups of licenses, and explained that the Department does not license PTs, OTs and SLPs.

Ms. Phelps stated that most of the changes were editorial. The Department changed the term Senior Education Official, because throughout all the 500 rules, sometimes it says superintendent, or superintendent or head of school, or superintendent and head of a public chartered school. Ms. Phelps said that it references the head of whatever educational institution an administrator is in charge of. Everywhere that said superintendent or head of school was changed to Senior Educational Official. This was the only substantive change.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Phil Nazzaro, that the State Board of Education approve the final proposal for Ed 501 through Ed 504, Credential Standards for Educational Personnel.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

F. FINAL PROPOSAL – How to Obtain a NH Educator License (Ed 505)

Ms. Phelps stated that the one comment made by OLS throughout this proposal was the observation that the Department does not have the authority to call educator licenses "licenses," because the statutes refer to a credential or a certification. The only time the statutes refer to a license is in reference to an intern, which is not a license. If someone is on the intern license in NH and they move out of state, another state could see license and think they are fully credentialed and issue them a license even though they have not received full licensure. Ms. Phelps emphasized the importance of clarifying what it means to be licensed versus a

credential. A credential is the overall group of everything issued from the Department, and a license is included in the credential.

There is also a bill right now for background checks, and because of the way the Department has changed definitions in the code of conduct, the bill's author took it upon herself to cross out certification and credential and insert license. This bill is going to change the word credential and certification to license in 75 statutes that governs the State Board of Education. However, the Department will most likely have to go through and change them, or convince OLS that the Department has the authority to call it a license.

Mr. Nazzaro asked for clarification on the difference between licensure and certification. Ms. Phelps responded that a license is full licensure, and everything else is a certification or authorization, but they are all different types of credentials.

Ms. Lane directed the Board's attention to page 7 under Ed 505.06, Demonstrated Competencies. Ms. Lane stated that it was not clear whether or not a teacher must hold all of these things, and it gets confusing at the end when it says "as applicable" and "qualifying and applying for." Ms. Phelps responded that teachers must hold the minimum degree required for the endorsement sought. They have to meet endorsement specific requirements which are outlined in separate rules Ed 506 through Ed 508. They have to meet the requirements of Ed 505.01, the testing requirement, and Ed 505.03, professional educational requirements. It says "as applicable" because the testing requirement is not required for every endorsement. If Ed 505.01 and Ed 505.03 apply to the actual endorsement, the educator does not have to meet that requirement. Ms. Lane asked whether the individual applicant would have to meet all of these requirements. Ms. Phelps responded yes, and added that teachers would have to also complete the competency pathway they want to apply for.

Ms. Honorow recalled the Board's intention to raise up the profession during the discussion of ethics rules. Other professions that have codes of conduct—lawyers, doctors—are licensed. Ms. Honorow expressed concern about calling it something other than a license. Ms. Phelps answered that the Department is calling it a license: a full license is a beginning educator license or an experienced educator license, but it is also a credential because a statement of eligibility is a credential, an intern authorization is a credential, an emergency authorization is a credential. But all of those are credentials that are not full licensure. OLS thinks the Department does not have the authority to call it a license, but Ms. Phelps is going to convince OLS that they do. Ms. Phelps stated that she did not bring the statute with her, but it says: "the State Board shall write rules for credentials and any other rules necessary to implement the credentials." Ms. Phelps noted that there are seven different statutes for the Board's ruling authority and in each one, it varies whether they call it a certification or a credential. The only place where it's called a license is when applied to an intern. Ms. Phelps stated that the Department

will likely get a conditional approval, and then the legislature will decide whether to do a legislative fix.

Chairman Cline stated that the legislature has the same problem, where they pass a law that uses one term and then it is discovered that it conflicts with something else with the terminology in a law passed 100 years ago.

Ms. Phelps addressed one final substantive change, calling the Board's attention to page 6. This change was in response to a substantive comment from OLS. Prior to these new rules, the Department's basic entry requirements for obtaining a statement of eligibility said "by obtaining the entry requirements on our website," so in the new rules it is phrased the same way. This came back as a flag from OLS that if it is a requirement for application, it has to be in the rules and adopted as a rule because the Department is requiring it. There are 74 endorsement areas and every endorsement area has a different basic entry requirement. That document including all of the entry requirements for every endorsement area for a statement of eligibility was 13 pages long.

Mr. Appleby added that it would have enshrined them in the rules as well, which he guessed was one of the reasons historically that this document was separate, to be able to provide flexibility around critical shortage areas. The rule-making process, of course, is so long that the school year is often done before rules are passed.

Ms. Phelps explained that they came up with the language on page 6 so that the entry requirement would be meeting the degree and experience requirement of the endorsement area sought, which is at the beginning of every endorsement area, and either passing the subject area assessment for endorsements for which the Board has adopted a cut score, or, only if a subject area test does not exist, using transcript analysis to determine a passing grade for three college level courses which directly translate to required competencies in the endorsement area sought. The difference is that in the 13-page document that the Department would have had to put into the rule, some endorsements said two courses, some endorsements said three, some said one. This would be a better way to do it than incorporating that entire document, but it would require the Board to adopt more subject area assessment cut scores, because they do exist.

Mr. Appleby stated that by looking around at other states, the Department was able to work through this process. A number of meetings back, he raised concerns around putting grade point average into this due to grade inflation and GPA not being an objective measure. Instead, this change will actually raise the bar from a rigor standpoint while making it simpler and more objective. Chairman Cline agreed that there were test scores for lots of subject areas but not for everything, so this gives the Department a way to get somebody through in those areas where there is not a test with a cut score.

Ms. Phelps handed out a small amendment to this section because at some colleges and institutions, their college level course is only comparable to one credit or two credits. The amendment changes it to say “transcript analysis to determine a passing grade for three full-semester, full college level courses comparable to three-credit courses which directly translate to required competencies.” Ms. Phelps stated that the motion would have to be changed to include the amendment.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Phil Nazzaro, that the State Board of Education approve the final proposal for Ed 505, incorporating the recommended amendments, How to Obtain a NH Educator License.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM IX. COMMISSIONER’S UPDATE

Commissioner Edelblut began by introducing the Preschool Development Grant, a \$26 million grant in partnership with UNH, DHHS and the Department. The Department is going to be the administrator of the grant for at least a portion of it, because it is the only participating organization with a grant management system. UNH has the reporting responsibility. There are already some connections between the Department, DHHS and UNH, but the grants themselves enable communities to be connected as well to start conversations, planning, and implementation. Commissioner Edelblut also mentioned Waterford Upstart, a participating Pre-K program sponsored by TED through philanthropy, equipping parents to be effective with their four year olds in terms of brain-building exercises and parent coaching and engagement. Commissioner Edelblut has published an op ed in the Concord Monitor where Board members can read more about it.

Commissioner Edelblut also introduced the Mobile Access Possibilities (MAP) RV, which was parked by the hospital. Commissioner Edelblut is anticipating a new design for the MAP RV that will be bright, outrageous and attract attention. The Department already has a waitlist for MAP programs and events from businesses and schools. The MAP RV will be traveling around, bringing career and technical education, with manufacturers already stepping up to sponsor lots of “bling” to hand out to students. Commissioner Edelblut hopes the MAP RV is always on the move, or in a worst case, parked in a visible location so people will see it as they drive by.

Commissioner Edelblut provided an update on the NH Career Academy, a program through the charter schools to allow seniors in high school to stay in the game, keep them mission focused and not treading water. The program allows those students to leave the high school and go to the community college, where they have an extended 12th year. When they complete that program, they are able

to earn a high school diploma, Associates degree, or certificate and an interview with a NH company.

Commissioner Edelblut mentioned that he met a student last week that would be a good candidate for the NH Career Academy. Commissioner Edelblut was rewarding students in the Top Chef Challenge, which the Department runs with the National Guard. The winning team was from Pinkerton, and one of the team members was a junior just finishing a two year CTE program in the culinary arts. Commissioner Edelblut recalled asking the program director what he would do with this student, and the director responded that he would have to figure out an independent study to keep him engaged. Commissioner Edelblut suggested that the student enroll in the NH Career Academy and that would pay for the student's tuition for two years, graduate debt free and launch himself into his career. The Governor also highlighted the NH Career Academy in his State of the State address.

Commissioner Edelblut invited the Board to attend the Family Engagement Summit being held on April 8 with keynote, Professor Karen Mapp of Harvard University. This one-day event focuses on family engagement.

Commissioner Edelblut mentioned he will be interviewing with WMUR's Fred Kocher later this evening discussing student assessments.

In a few weeks he will travel to Vermont to check in on a new partnership between Colebrook, NH and Canaan, VT. Commissioner Edelblut and the Secretary from Vermont both signed an interstate compact enabling these two north country districts to open up conversations about how they can substantively collaborate around educating their students in these rural areas.

Ms. Chagnon asked if there was anything about education mentioned in the State of the State. Commissioner Edelblut stated that the Department got a shout out on the NH Career Academy and on the Preschool Development Grant. There were no other programs mentioned.

Ms. Honorow asked Commissioner Edelblut to address a press release on economic analysis for the charter school grant. He stated that the Department received a \$46 million charter school grant, and he has been advocating for the grant both publically and privately. Last Friday, he met with Senator D'Alessandro and Senator Wallner to figure out how to move this forward because it is a great opportunity. Superintendents have reached out to the Department to ask how to access this money, one being Lori Landry at Fall Mountain. She is thinking that a lot of her students would benefit from some type of a career high school and she has a wing in her high school that is not being used right now. She could set up a magnet school inside her school that would be focused on those students that are not postsecondary bound.

Commissioner Edelblut said that the fiscal committee had done a couple of different analyses, and one question that came up was around the financial viability of the charter schools. In fact, the Department conducted their own analysis of all of the traditional schools as well as the charter schools and it turns out from a financial viability and a fragility standpoint, the charter schools are probably stronger than some of the traditional schools. The Department provided this analysis in a packet to the fiscal committee as well as presenting it at their last meeting. This is one of the concerns that the fiscal committee has—what is the long-term effect of the grant on the state. They believe that if we accept more charter schools in the state we will create a long-term cost obligation to the state, and in fact what the Department's analysis shows is that over ten years, conservatively, it will save \$62 million and maybe as much as \$178 million for state taxpayers over the course of a ten-year period.

The analysis the Department conducted was a deep dive into understanding the full flow of the funding, weighing factors for special education very heavily, taking into consideration the fact that just because a student leaves a public school and goes to a charter school, it does not mean they can adjust their costs right away. There is some fairly generous and evidence based work that shows that when a student leaves a traditional school to go to a public charter school, no money is saved in the first year. In the next year, the savings maybe a third, and in the next year maybe another third. It is a three year cost adjustment period which actually coincides with some of the history that has been seen in terms of school performance when we have economic downturns and a school's ability to respond to cost-cutting. In the end, there is no risk to the state—in fact, there is a benefit to the state with stronger outcomes for students and a lower burden on NH taxpayers.

Commissioner Edelblut stated that at any point in time the federal government could say that NH is not meeting the requirements of the grant and take it back, which would be a tragedy, to lose \$46 million of investment and education innovation in NH. Senator D'Alessandro in particular has had questions, and the Department is being responsive to questions so the grant can be moved forward.

Commissioner Edelblut said that he continues to hear the misstatement that NH charter schools have 1,000 open seats. Actually, NH has a waitlist of over 1,300 students. For example, Mills Falls is authorized up to 250 students but only accepts 167, which is their current capacity. The fiscal committee sees them as being authorized for 250 students, but Mills Falls sees it as needing the grant so they can expand programming to serve the 250 student they are authorized to accept. Commissioner Edelblut stressed the importance of getting people to accurately talk about charter schools. He has run into people who still think charter schools are not public schools.

Ms. Honorow noted that MC2 has consolidated their numbers because of a plethora of charter schools in the Manchester area. Ms. Honorow stated that in

Manchester there are empty seats. Commissioner Edelblut responded that Mills Falls was in Manchester and has a waitlist, so it depends on what the school is offering, but he agrees with the central point. As the Department begins to charter additional schools, the Board has to weigh enrollment concerns. Ms. Honorow said the Board discusses this all the time. Commissioner Edelblut stated that the Department has to be honest and look broadly. There is a very methodical and thoughtful process to make sure that Department opens up the right kind of schools in the right places and that is the role this Board has played historically.

Ms. Chagnon stated that she had just spoken with Jane Waterhouse about making an appointment with her and Sue Vaughn, who is very new to education but very influential, and have Jane walk them through the process of evaluations and oversights. Sue said there is a perception in the legislature that the charter schools are just rote and there is no accountability. Public schools have all this accountability, charter schools have none and they just go do their own thing. Ms. Honorow said the Board has gotten better about this after being lackadaisical for a while. Chairman Cline expressed frustration that the Board hears the same false talking points from lawmakers over and over, which are demonstrably not true, even after the Department has corrected them. Chairman Cline has talked to these people and reporters to point out some of the myths that continue to circulate despite being completely wrong.

Ms. Chagnon asserted that when Commissioner Edelblut goes before the legislature, he will have to have line by line documentation of the \$62 to \$178 million in charter school savings. Commissioner Edelblut responded that it is a 16 page reported, vetted by a number of different firms.

Commissioner Edelblut also mentioned the opening of a recovery high school in the Seacoast region. Twenty states have recovery high schools, with four in Massachusetts. With the intensity of the opiate crisis and the substance abuse crisis in NH, the school could be a valuable tool for some students.

AGENDA ITEM X. OPEN BOARD DISCUSSIONS

Ms. Honorow stated that it was unacceptable to receive meeting materials on Tuesday, as some people received them on Friday but the majority did not. Ms. Honorow also expressed that the public needs the materials sooner than that. If organizations cannot submit their materials by the cutoff date a week before the meeting, they should be pushed to the next month.

Chairman Cline agreed with Ms. Honorow and stated that he and Angela have been working hard to have materials submitted on time. Some things cannot wait until the following month and that has been an issue. That was not the issue this week. Angela asked whether Board members would be okay with receiving materials in pieces as they come in rather than waiting for the whole packet. Angela

also stated that she would not be at next month's meeting, so the materials would go out early before she left.

Ms. Honorow reiterated that the public needs access to the materials earlier. Angela noted that this was a fairly new practice, and previously the public did not have advance access to those materials. Ms. Honorow said that the Board would like feedback from the public. Commissioner Edelblut responded that transparency has improved dramatically, and recognizes the Board's interest in improving practices.

Ms. Honorow asked Commissioner Edelblut what he found out regarding the computer science curriculum requirement and explained she did not have the minutes from last month to know what to refer back to and follow up on.

Ms. Honorow inquired about the February 11th due date for materials from the Capitol City Public Charter School. Chairman Cline responded that it was due back but the Board did not receive it and it will be on next month's agenda.

Commissioner Edelblut stated that Department continues to monitor Capital City and had a surprise visit with them. The Department has met regularly with the Capitol City, and recently with the new chair of the board. From Commissioner Edelblut's perspective, the new chairman was very responsive and understands the need for speed. Cindy Chagnon expressed concern that the process would drag on, ruin the reputation of the charter school movement in NH, and become the poster child for why NH should not receive this grant. Commissioner Edelblut countered that it could also be the poster child for why the Department monitors them closely and acts deliberately when things are not working.

Ms. Chagnon called attention to Sally Griffin's sons, who have raised \$100,000 for Parkinson's research through fundraisers and marathons in Washington, D.C.

AGENDA ITEM XI. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

AGENDA ITEM XII. NONPUBLIC SESSION

There was no Nonpublic Session.

AGENDA ITEM XIII. TABLED ITEMS

A. Capitol City Public Charter School Status Change Request

AGENDA ITEM XIV. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Meeting Minutes of January 9, 2020

Ms. Honorow noted a few updates. She called attention to page 4802, and suggests making a recommendation to help clarify the withdrawal statute. On page 4805, in the second full paragraph it says “for the educational students”—Ms. Honorow stated this should read “for the education students.” On page 4809, Chairman Cline is spelled with a small c. On page 4810, it says “Kate Cassady expressed her concern about enrollment.” Ms. Honorow believes it was her that expressed concern about enrollment. On page 4827, second paragraph, Ms. Honorow stated that it should read “Ms. Higgins has written a school culture plan.”

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Phil Nazzaro, that the State Board of Education approve the minutes of January 9, 2020 as amended.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM XIV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the motion, seconded by Phil Nazzaro, to adjourn the meeting at 3:35 PM.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.



Secretary