

New Hampshire
State Board of Education
Minutes of the June 11, 2020 Meeting
Meeting held telephonically due to the COVID-19 State of Emergency

AGENDA ITEM I. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the State Board of Education was convened at 9:01 AM. The meeting was held telephonically due to the COVID-19 state of emergency. Drew Cline presided as Chair.

Members in attendance: Drew Cline, Chair, Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow. Frank Edelblut, Commissioner of Education and Christine Brennan, Deputy Commissioner of Education were all in attendance.

AGENDA ITEM II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Board member Cindy Chagnon led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ITEM III. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no live public comment testimony at this meeting and the Board also received no written public comments.

AGENDA ITEM IV. LEGISLATIVE UPDATES

Amanda Phelps, NHDOE Administrative Rules Coordinator, presented the legislative updates.

A. Conditional Approval Response ~ School Building Construction (Ed 321)

A conditional approval response is required because the Joint Legislative Committee on Administrative Rules (JLCAR) gave conditional approval at their telephonic meeting. The conditions were all met and the updates are highlighted in the executive summary and the rule proposal in the material provided to the Board. Legislative authority is being sought for one condition, namely the 35-year cap on what is considered new construction. Ms. Phelps is working with NHDOE Attorney Chris Bond and the Attorney General's office to provide clarity on this issue; otherwise a legislative fix might be required.

Ms. Phelps said the Board was voting to approve the conditional approval response and if it passed, she hoped that it might be possible to also adopt it at today's meeting. That would require her to email it over to the Office of Legislative Services (OLS) immediately after the vote and ask OLS/JLCAR to respond back by noon. If the Board meeting is done by noon, however, it can be adopted at the next meeting.

It was asked why the word "will" was changed to "shall" throughout the document. Ms. Phelps said that the administrative rules procedure manual asked that they use "shall" instead of "will."

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, that the State Board of Education approve the conditional approval response for Ed 321 School Building Construction.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro and Helen Honorow with the Chair abstaining.

B. Update on Public Hearing Date for Remote Instruction ~ Basic Instructional Standards and School Year (Ed 306.14 and Ed 306.18(a)(7))

Because of a delay in getting the fiscal impact statement from the legislative budget assistant, the public hearing will not be held until the August 13, 2020 meeting. Chair Cline requested that everyone on the Board receive a copy of the impact statement.

A. Adopt ~ School Building Construction (Ed 321)

Chair Cline reported that the Board had received its conditional approval response on school building construction and as a result, the Board is now able to vote on this adoption.

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Sally Griffin, that the State Board of Education adopt Ed 321 School Building Construction.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Vocational Rehabilitation Programs (Ed 1000)

Chair Cline opened the public hearing on vocational rehabilitation programs at 10:08 AM (*during the preceding agenda item discussion*). He closed the public hearing for this topic at 10:30 AM. No speakers called in for this topic.

B. Robotics Education Fund (Ed 1307)

Chair Cline opened the public hearing on the robotics education fund at 10:30 AM and closed it at 11:08 AM. No speakers called in for this topic.

AGENDA ITEM VI. COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (CTE)

Laura Stoneking, NHDOE, Administrator, Bureau of Educator Preparation and Higher Education, presented the updates from the Council for Teacher Education (CTE).

A. Southern New Hampshire University (SNHU) Amendment to Recent Substantive Change

Ms. Stoneking reported that SNHU's Mary Ford was not able to join the meeting because her modem stopped working the day prior and she is therefore currently unable to access, retrieve, or send information. SNHU is requesting the retraction of the request for the substantive change that was tabled at the May 2020 Board meeting, and then they will revisit it in the fall.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Ann Lane, that the State Board of Education remove Southern New Hampshire University's substantive change request from the table and the agenda.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair and Phil Nazzaro abstaining.

B. Plymouth State University (PSU)

Ms. Stoneking introduced Dr. Mary Earick from Plymouth State University, who stated that PSU's Brian Walker will also be calling in to join the meeting.

1) Option 4 Review and Approval of 11 Programs (through CAEP):

The option 4 review has been completed and PSU received a one-month extension on its programs that expires at the end of June. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) report has been provided to the Board members in their materials. Plymouth State is requesting approval of 11 initial level programs as listed.

Chair Cline noted that CAEP flagged some areas for improvement in its April accreditation action report. Dr. Earick responded that following that report, there was another meeting to provide CAEP with additional information. The subsequent two-page decision letter lists the three final areas for improvement and that letter is included in the Board's packet.

Ms. Honorow stated that the May 15 letter in her packet does not refer to final areas for improvement at all. Chris Ward from the Council for Teacher Education noted that he is also an accreditation counselor for CAEP, attended the April meeting, and is fully aware of the communication going back and forth between CAEP and PSU. He stated that both the letter and the action report that are in the Board's packet are from after the April meeting. The action report is final and lists all the areas for improvement (AFIs), but Mr. Ward noted that PSU's accreditation decision in April was only for Standard 5. No other standards were considered because PSU had met them in 2018. All of the other AFIs are from the previous visit in 2017 and were voted on in 2018.

Mr. Ward also noted that CAEP considers areas for improvement as minor deficiencies that do not preclude accreditation for the full seven years. There is no conditional approval. They must be addressed by the next full visit, which for PSU is in 2024.

Chair Cline asked Dr. Earick how PSU has been addressing its AFIs since they were first brought up. She responded that the school has an Institutional Review Board (IRB) and has conducted case studies. They are showing impact in the field, but CAEP wants a more systematic way. In response, PSU requested data from the New Hampshire Department of Education on their teachers currently in the field, but the Department cannot legally provide that data to them. As a result, PSU is using case studies. CAEP would like PSU to try to work with the state to get data from the credentialing database. Dr. Earick is hopeful that in future that data would be available in aggregate form for all universities in the state.

Chair Cline asked if that was supposed to be included in PSU's annual reports. Dr. Earick stated that that was correct and CAEP has the case study data, but they want more systematic data from Plymouth.

Steve Appleby, NHDOE, Director, Division of Educator Support and Higher Education, noted that he has not received a formal request from PSU for the data and asked that Dr. Earick forward the emails to him to look into the matter.

Ms. Honorow asked whether PSU addresses these standards in the annual reports and noted that the state of New Hampshire is looking for data and analysis in line with the concept of continuous improvement. Ms. Stoneking asked Chris Ward to respond as the CTE Chair.

Ms. Griffin asked whether there were any other serious discrepancies identified in the May letter of approval from CAEP. Dr. Earick replied that PSU had no stipulations, received full accreditation through 2024, and was only reviewed on Standard 5. They continue to work on the three AFIs from their previous visit, including getting institutional data from the state, instituting valid and reliable tools in the field annually in accordance with CAEP standards, and making their 26 programs more consistent and standard in the field experiences.

Ms. Chagnon asked whether there were any serious deficiencies in meeting CAEP standards that would cause probationary accreditation? Dr. Earick responded that that was not the case here and PSU is fully accredited and off probationary accreditation.

Chris Ward responded to Ms. Honorow's earlier question about whether there was any question or prompt in the annual report for the state to explain continuous improvement efforts such as there is in the CAEP report. He replied that there is a question in the annual report on "improvements or revisions to programming made this year...[responding] to goals and priorities from last year." Whether the institution has conditional or full approval from the state is irrelevant. Everyone is asked to describe their continuous improvement efforts.

Ms. Honorow asked whether PSU addresses these AFIs in their annual report. Mr. Ward said there is no mechanism currently for them to specifically address any AFIs for CAEP in the DOE annual report. Ms. Honorow stated that because CAEP does not visit again for seven years, and they want the institution to work on their AFIs, it would seem to be something that the CTE would be interested in. Mr. Ward said that was a good point and it might be worth talking about getting the excerpts that PSU provides to CAEP on an annual basis into the state's annual report.

Chair Cline agreed that it would be useful, as these AFIs have been outstanding for a few years and the Board is not clear on the progress for meeting them. He asked Dr. Earick whether it would be acceptable for PSU to give the Board, at the time of the next state annual report, an update on the progress toward those AFIs. Dr. Earick said she would attach all the data they are sending to CAEP with PSU's next annual report. Mr. Ward said when they create the template for this year's annual report, they will put in some way to include that information. Dr. Earick noted that the state already has access to PSU's CAEP account. Chair Cline said data would be good, but it would also help the Board to have a specific

narrative addressing each Standard. Dr. Earick said that would be easy because that is how she does the CAEP report.

Ms. Lane asked Dr. Earick to confirm that the May letter applies to the four programs that come up on agenda item VI, B, 3 for the four advanced level programs. Dr. Earick stated that PSU's advanced programs are on a different calendar. Chair Cline said the CAEP letter was just for the 11 programs under this agenda item (VI, B, 1). Dr. Earick noted that after this, she plans to put them all on the same calendar, so they can be looked at annually at one time.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Ann Lane, that the State Board of Education grant Plymouth State University approval for 11 CAEP-accredited programs through December 31, 2024: Ed 612.03 Early Childhood Education, BS level; Ed 612.04 Elementary Education Grades (K-8) (K-6), BS, M.ED, Post Bac levels; Ed 612.05 English Language Arts for Grades 5-12, BA, M.ED, Post Bac levels; Ed 612.06 English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), M.ED and Post-Bac levels; Ed 612.07 General Special Education Program, M.ED, Post Bac, Ed.S levels; Ed 612.16 Health Education, BS, M.ED, Post-Bac levels; Ed 612.18 Mathematics 7-12. BS, M. ED, Post-Bac levels; Ed 612.19 - Digital Learning Specialist, M.ED., Post-Bac levels; Ed 612.21 Physical Education K-12, BS level; Ed 612.28 Social Studies for Grades 5-12, BS. M.ED, Post-Bac levels; and Ed 614.16 School Psychologist, M.ED. CAGS levels.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

2) Science (New) 5 Programs Extension Request:

Ms. Stoneking explained that PSU is requesting that the Board formally approve an extension to 5 new science programs. These programs were initially given a one-year approval that expires July 31, 2020.

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Sally Griffin, that the State Board of Education grant Plymouth State University an extension of five science programs from May 31, 2020 to July 31, 2022: Ed 612.22 Middle Level Science for Grades 5-8, Post-Baccalaureate; Ed 612.24 Earth and Space Science For Grades 7-12, Post-Baccalaureate; Ed 612.25 Life Sciences For Grades 7-12, Post-Baccalaureate; Ed 612.26

Chemistry For Grades 7-12, Post-Baccalaureate; Ed 612.27
Physics, Post-Baccalaureate.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

3) Advanced Level 4 Programs Extension Request:

Dr. Earick stated that PSU's advanced programs are on a different calendar. They are currently fully approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and NCATE is moving to CAEP. CAEP has asked PSU to move their visit to the fall of 2021; therefore, PSU is asking for an extension until then. That will place the advanced programs on the same schedule as its initial programs.

MOTION: Sally Griffin made the following motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, that the State Board of Education grant Plymouth State University an extension of four advanced level programs from June 30, 2020 to February 28, 2022: Ed 614.04 School Principal, M. ED, Post Bac, Ed.S levels; Ed 614.05 School Superintendent, Ed.S level; Ed 614.11 Library Media Specialist, M. ED, Post Bac levels; and Ed 614.15 Special Education Administrator, M.ED level.

VOTE: The motion was approved by unanimous roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM VII. NONPUBLIC SCHOOL APPROVAL

Shireen Meskoob, NHDOE Division of Education Analytics and Resources, presented the Nonpublic School Approval session.

A. Commissioner's Nonpublic School Approval Designation Renewal Report

The Office of Nonpublic Schools is almost at the end of approving nonpublic schools for 2020 into 2023 and 2025, depending on the type of approval the school is seeking. Ms. Meskoob presented 10 schools to the Board, four of which were seeking to renew their attendance renewal status and six of which were seeking to renew their program approval status.

In her report, Ms. Meskoob recommended a conditional approval status for one school, Cardinal Lacroix Academy, given that it had two inspection reports outstanding. In the three weeks since Ms. Meskoob wrote the reports, Cardinal Lacroix has completed its fire inspection and received a passing grade from the Manchester Fire Department. The second report, a health inspection, is scheduled for the morning of June 12, 2020, the day after this Board meeting. Even though their application is still not complete, Ms. Meskoob continued to recommend conditional approval status for them.

Ms. Cassady asked whether the conditions for conditional approval can be listed on the motion. Ms. Meskoob said moving forward she will say specifically why they are listed only for conditional approval. Today's motion was also revised accordingly.

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, that the State Board of Education accept and approve the following school for conditional approval status for the period of July 1, 2020 through August 31, 2020. Cardinal Lacroix Academy needs to provide the Office of Nonpublic Schools with two inspection reports, one for fire and one for health. Upon receiving these two reports, the Office will bring a new motion at next month's meeting for the Board to consider approval.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Ann Lane, that the State Board of Education accept and approve the following schools for continued attendance approval status for the period of July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2023: Kids' Connections, Lupine Montessori and Victory Baptist School.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Sally Griffin, that the State Board of Education accept and approve the following schools for continued attendance and program approval status for the period of July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2025: Estabrook School, New Hampton School, St. Thomas

Aquinas High School, Tri-City Christian Academy, Trinity Christian School (Concord), and White Mountain School.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM VIII. CHARTER SCHOOL REPORTS/UPDATES

Jane Waterhouse, NHDOE Charter School Administrator, presented the charter school reports and updates.

A. Heartwood Public Charter School Startup Extension Request and Update

Heartwood Public Charter School was authorized by the State Board in November 2018. The school planned to open in August 2019, but financial constraints prevented the school opening. The school developers submitted a progress report to the Department that requests an extension to the school startup period.

Ms. Waterhouse introduced Courtney Vashaw, Stacy Zemla, and Bethany Bond from Heartwood Public Charter School to answer any of the Board's questions.

Ms. Lane asked whether Heartwood Public Charter School had any concerns about their financial sustainability. Ms. Zemla replied that with federal or state funding, the school believes they will be sustainable in time. Initially, however, they need that money and they will not open without it.

Chair Cline noted that in the summary, it mentioned the inability to access a federal charter school startup grant. He asked if this is the same start up grant the legislature refused to accept. Ms. Zemla responded that yes, it is the same grant.

Ms. Honorow said she was unclear on the status of the grant and asked Ms. Waterhouse or a Heartwood representative to address it. What did not happen in terms of the initial funding? Where was the downfall in the original budget that was submitted to the Board? Ms. Waterhouse replied that the initial federal grant that provided startup funds for the more recent charter schools was expended. The Department applied for another grant, which they received in August 2019 for \$46 million. The legislature, however, has not approved the Department accepting those funds. This is why Heartwood was not approved for their grant.

Ms. Honorow asked whether there was a component of other sources of income beside the startup grant in the budget that was initially presented? If so, what happened with those? Ms. Zemla replied that Heartwood would never have been able to open without funding from the federal grant. They have not raised any money yet. The school has been waiting and hoping that they would receive funding from the grant and would then move forward from the award. The school has communicated with people in the community and done some legwork, but they have not raised money.

Ms. Chagnon noted that finding facilities is often a “chicken or the egg” process, so she asked about the status of finding school building and if not having the funding was a factor or lack of appropriate buildings. Ms. Zemla said it is the funding. The school is in touch with a developer in the area and they feel they could find something, but without the money, no one has wanted to make long-term plans with the school. As individuals or a foundation, they do not have money to back opening a school.

Ms. Chagnon also asked for a clarification about a statement in the materials that read, “while some local partners believe in school choice personally, they feared stating so publicly.” Ms. Zemla said that some partners may come out of the woodwork and support the school once it is rolling, but are not necessarily feeling confident in their positions at this time to support charter schools.

Ms. Chagnon noted that the COVID crisis has put tremendous stress on bank loans, so she is concerned with Heartwood trying to remedy this and move forward in the midst of this crisis. Ms. Zemla agreed and said they are asking for more time because they spent a lot of time developing this and circumstances thus far have prevented them moving forward. They are hopeful that in time this could still happen. They felt one year was the most appropriate time frame to request for an extension.

Ms. Lane agreed with an earlier aside by Ms. Chagnon that Heartwood reconsider a yurt as a possible location for the school as she could not see one meeting the health and fire regulations required of a public school. Ms. Zemla noted that the idea was intended as a supplemental or additional structure for outdoor space.

Chair Cline thought he remembered from the original presentation to the Board that Heartwood was to be the first Waldorf public school in the state, to which Ms. Zelma responded that it is a “play-spaced model”. Chair Cline remembered their approach as being unique and he was impressed with what they were trying to do. He thought it would be disheartening if they were not be able to start because of a dispute over the charter school startup money. Given the circumstances, he saw no reason why the Board would not grant the extension request.

Ms. Vashaw stated that the budget was established with the belief that they could reach sustainability by the end of year three if they had startup funds to get them rolling. They originally planned a staggered start to establish lower grades and roll up to the upper grades.

Ms. Vashaw added that some public school administrators in Heartwood's area have privately expressed a belief that education is not a one-size-fits-all approach, but it is politically challenging for them to publicly say so. They do not want to be on the wrong side of the conversation because it may affect their jobs. Chair Cline noted that this is not the first time he has heard that.

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Sally Griffin, that the State Board of Education, pursuant to RSA 194-b:3,11, authorize Heartwood Charter School to extend the startup period for one year.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair abstaining.

B. Annual Public Charter School Progress Report Update

Nate Greene reported that he and Caitlin Davis have analyzed the Charter School Annual Reports, but they are not ready to present that analysis to the Board. They are trying to determine the most salient points for accountability for charter schools. They have discussed possibly providing the Board with the reports themselves with the analysis to spur a conversation about which pieces the Board wants to have for oversight. Chair Cline said that would be okay.

Ms. Chagnon said she would like the analysis to show two categories. One should pull out some schools that are set up for high-risk students that would be expected to be below state standards in English language arts and math. She would like to see a growth cycle on graduation rates. How are they improving? The second category would be with schools like Strong Foundation and Founders Academy that are not particularly set up for high-risk students. How much below are they?

Chair Cline agreed that it would be important in a report to look at the percentage of children that are low income, with socio-economic issues, and came into the school with low grades. It is important to measure growth and the value-add the school brings. Mr. Greene concurred that mere comparisons to the state average do not take into account the many other factors involved with a charter school, whether it is their mission and vision, their intent to graduate at-risk students, etc. Chair Cline noted that where comparisons are made, they should not just be to the state average, but to the district.

Mr. Greene reiterated that they need more time to give a full analysis of where the charter schools are currently.

Ms. Honorow feels that the state still needs to stay on top of charter schools if they are not able to meet their identified mission. There can be an expectation that a school may have lower scores, but lower graduation rates concern Ms. Honorow more. If a charter school is set up to try to capture students who are in danger of becoming dropouts, she would like to see how the school is dealing with that. The population may be somewhat self-selecting, but they are at a school that has been set up to address those concerns.

Ms. Honorow also feels they are seeing some “frequent flyers.” For example, the issue of low proficiency in math is not new at Foundation or Gate City. At their five-year progress reviews, they were going to be addressing it, so if the progress reports show the same thing, Ms. Honorow would like to know that. Finally, the Board has said previously that they want to jump on the issue of late filing of reports (e.g., quarterly financial reports). When the Board sees late reports and audits, that is “smoke” and it should be investigated before it becomes a fire.

Mr. Greene said that the new template for charter schools to submit their annual reports for the past school year is organized around the three categories that the Board has requested: organization and management, fiscal and reporting, and academic performance.

Ms. Lane said it would be useful to see a snapshot of four to five years if a school has been consistently low proficiency or late on reports. From year four through year five, is there a change? A group of children are matriculating and as you follow them through, you will either see progress made when new children enter the system or when some children leave the system. A generalized comment is less meaningful than one that would be broken down by year.

Ms. Chagnon reported that she is very concerned that Gate City’s financial audit is outstanding for 2018. She wondered whether the Department has a method to get them to turn it in. She would not like them to become two years behind.

Ms. Cassady asked whether the Department still audits schools on their vision. Her understanding is that it is no longer done, but she feels it is very important. Second, Ms. Cassady noted that while all charter schools are different, she feels it is a big concern to see low math be a common denominator. Something needs to be done to improve that and hold the schools accountable. Third, Ms. Cassady also was concerned about the missing 2018 audit report for Gate City and offered to call them if it would help.

Mr. Greene noted that unfortunately the Department has no recourse when a charter school does not turn in those reports. There is no consequence or punishment if a school does not produce its reports. They tried to introduce some legislation this past year that would allow the Department to impose some level of consequence, but unfortunately it did not go anywhere. Caitlin Davis noted that for public schools who do not produce reports, the Department can withhold state funding. If a charter school has a large amount of federal funding that requires an audit, however, the Department can withhold federal funding, but not state funding.

Chair Cline said that the rules are not as clear as they should be on the consequences for not filing required materials, but Chair Cline, Mr. Greene, and Ms. Waterhouse are working on addressing that in proposed revisions to the rules.

Ms. Lane asked how difficult it would be if while looking at the proficiencies of charter schools, the Department also produced a report of the proficiencies of public schools regionally, which would also include a demographics comparison.

Mr. Greene reported that that is something that can be done now with a lot of different variables using the Department's iReport and iExplore systems, which are public on the website. If there were specific variables that the Board would like to see, Mr. Greene offered to put that together. Caitlin Davis said that Dina Rabuck, who came to a Board meeting about two years ago to present on iPlatform, could come back and provide an overview of the system to the Board.

Mr. Nazzaro wanted to reinforce Ms. Honorow's earlier comment that reporting is a lead indicator of problems within an organization. He would encourage editing the rules sooner rather than later to provide for repercussions for lags in reporting. Second, Mr. Nazzaro noted that 11 charter schools have academic proficiency challenges, so it might be interesting to do an analysis of these specific schools to see what trends occur across them that might allow the Department to recommend some interventions or program changes.

Chair Cline noted that math proficiency scores are a problem in all types of schools: public, nonpublic, and charter. The Department is aware of it, but it is a tough challenge.

Ms. Cassady asked Ms. Davis about a report that the state used to put out comparing public and charter schools in terms of test scores. Ms. Davis did not remember that specific report, but stated that they had a report that shows all scores, including charter schools.

Mr. Greene noted that mission and vision are still part of the renewal for charter schools. It is discussed when site visits are made, with groups of teachers and students. They look at whether the overall goal of the charter school is still being fulfilled.

AGENDA ITEM IX. COMMISSIONER'S UPDATE

Commissioner Frank Edelblut began with a consultation required under the Duties of the Commissioner in RSA 21-N:3, II on the reappointment of Stephen Appleby to the position of Director for the Division of Educator Support and Higher Education. The commissioner is recommending Mr. Appleby be reappointed, which comes up in late July or early August. Mr. Edelblut asked for any feedback from the Board on the work that Mr. Appleby is doing.

Chair Cline responded that Mr. Appleby has been thoughtful, a joy to work with, and is very data-driven. Chair Cline continued that he can't say enough about the quality of work Mr. Appleby has done in his position and he hopes this goes through unanimously. Other Board members agreed.

Commissioner Edelblut next turned to the issue of re-engaging the schools in September. One issue that has come up in higher education is the curtailment of opportunities for education preparation students. One large district that normally takes up to 18 student teachers is saying that they will not take any this year. These student teaching opportunities are part of the education preparation students' ability to be certified. The Department is working with schools to make sure that they do what they can to support these opportunities and wanted it to be on the Board's radar.

Ms. Honorow said that anything the Department can do to help the schools figure out a way to take these student teachers would be very helpful.

Ms. Lane said she was surprised because of the opportunities to use student teachers as a resource to have smaller groups in educational settings or remote instruction by more vulnerable staff with the support of a younger, less vulnerable student teacher. Commissioner Edelblut noted that student teachers tend to be very tech savvy, which is helpful in classrooms these days.

Ms. Chagnon said this is very disappointing. In addition, many districts are looking at a hybrid approach, so she would think they would want to utilize these young, tech-savvy, energetic people. Given that no one knows what the future looks like, this training for student teachers would be excellent.

Commissioner Edelblut said the Department is continuing to work with the districts to make sure that student teacher placement does not become a problem.

The commissioner then gave an update on the School Transition Reopening and Redesign Taskforce (STRRT). Their work is at a midpoint and the initial six workgroups have now met and generated a lot of survey questions. These were compiled into a survey that was given to parents, teachers, administrators, and wellness personnel in the schools. The response was overwhelming, with 56,000 completed surveys. That data is now being worked on by AIR, who is the

state's partner and facilitator. AIR gave an initial presentation of the data to the workgroups earlier this week.

The workgroups will work on recommendations and push those to the task force (*each workgroup has members on the taskforce*), where they will be coalesced into specific recommendations for the governor, the Department, and school leaders about reopening in September. School leaders are going to make local decisions, which is appropriate given that circumstances are different in schools throughout the state. School will likely not look the same in September everywhere in the state.

Commissioner Edelblut is comfortable with having the timing of the initial set of high-level recommendations at the end of June. The goal is to get recommendations into the hands of school leaders so it takes into consideration information from what is happening on the ground at the time of the release, but not so late that they cannot act on the recommendations.

Ms. Lane asked for the Commissioner's observation on whether other states have made a similarly collaborative effort. Commissioner Edelblut said while he thought all states were trying to hear from as many as possible, most are following a plan similar to one the Commissioner read from Mississippi, where they gathered a team of nine superintendents from around the state. He thinks that is a process that works well for Mississippi, but he also thinks there is some value for New Hampshire in getting broader input.

Ms. Chagnon said she was happy to hear that they are doing so much work, but she noted that some districts are doing the same level of work as the state. As a result, she is happy to know that these things can work together and the state is not demanding that people do certain things. Commissioner Edelblut said the goal was to work collaboratively.

The Department is working hard to get its summer programming started. They typically run 67 21st Century programs in the summer. He reported that today, he has three programs opening following the governor's guidance on opening day camps. Many are not opening at this point in time. The Department is trying to solve funding problems, permission problems, etc., so these programs can take place for students in the summer. The commissioner acknowledged that in some areas of the state, people are nervous.

Ms. Lane asked what the age groups were for the camps and their location. The commissioner responded that the 67 21st Century programs are located all over the state and they generally accommodate elementary and some middle school students.

Next, Commissioner Edelblut outlined Executive Order 48, the governor's executive order relative to special education services. The order reemphasizes

guidance that has been in place throughout the pandemic that education is an essential business and there is the possibility in limited cohorts to provide in-person services in school settings, particularly to students who need special education. The order was targeted at ensuring that plans are in place for students who need extended school year (ESY) services and that there is an ability to execute ESY, preferably on an in-person basis. Second, the order is aimed at making sure there is a plan to work with special education students and their families to close any deficiencies toward education goals where educational progress has been disrupted. The Department issued technical guidance yesterday on this topic. In addition, he is scheduled to speak with special education directors across the state about technical assistance later this afternoon.

The commissioner spoke two weeks ago with approximately 25 people from the mental health communities around the state. These organizations generally support students in the school and at home. They discussed strategies to support families and students in keeping students connected, particularly as the school year ends. Various ideas were brainstormed that will be brought back to school leaders.

Through the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, New Hampshire received \$37 million of funding for schools. Those funds are being dispersed to schools through the Department's grant management system. The total number of schools expected to apply is 189 and as of this meeting, three grants had been approved, four were in the queue for approval, 47 have started an application, and approximately 135 schools have not yet logged in to start their grant applications, but are expected to soon.

AGENDA ITEM X. OPEN BOARD DISCUSSIONS

Ms. Lane wished to comment on the vocational rehabilitation programs (Ed 1000) from today's public hearing. On page 15, she wondered why there was no input for whether the individual has received prior services, as it would seem like a logical place to do that. Amanda Phelps, NHDOE Administrative Rules Coordinator explained that this will be answered when the Board sees the final proposal. The Department has been borrowing language from New York State, which has a very detailed intake procedure. If it is still not in the final proposal, it was suggested that they could talk to Lisa Hatz about adding something in.

Ms. Lane asked about page 33 and rules around the maintenance of student records. Are they digitally maintained some place? Or when the file is closed, does it go away? Amanda replied that she was not sure what the rules are for keeping records, but she is sure they have them. Ms. Lane stated that it would be valuable to maintain the records in case the person needs them in the future to verify that they have had this training. Amanda stated that there was definitely a

records section and they would look at that and the federal regulation for record keeping.

Ms. Lane next asked about page 42 and why the section “Part Ed 1017 State Independent Living Services and Centers for Independent Living” was deleted? Amanda replied that the funding does not go through the Department, but rather, through the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). They are currently looking into that as the Department needs to have rules for DHHS in place.

Ms. Chagnon wanted to give kudos to so many of the districts of the state that have worked so valiantly—particularly those that worked with students and parents—on graduation this year. There have been many innovative ideas. It has shown such respect for the Class of 2020 that so many districts have tried to make this a special experience.

Ms. Lane noted that on the second public hearing, on page 2, it states that you are eligible to make an application to the Robotics Fund if you have not received a grant from the Robotics Education Development Program in prior years. Ms. Lane found this problematic because districts with limited resources, for whom a robotics program is a stretch, may have received money before, but the only way they will ever have a robotics program is if they get help. Amanda said she would look into that, but pointed out that it was written into the statute that way, so it would require a legislative change.

Ms. Cassady asked whether it was possible to table the discussion about annual progress reports for charter schools, so the Board can talk more about it at the next meeting. She felt that accountability was still an issue. Chair Cline said he would make a note to add that as a discussion item for the next meeting. Ms. Cassady said that she was going to a superintendents’ meeting as well and she would bring up some of her concerns.

Ms. Cassady then returned to the discussion about the Heartwood Public Charter School. She noted that north country gets hit hardest—the first to get hit and the last to recover. She would like to see Heartwood give the Board an update or report in 2021, as it may be a challenge for them to come up with that money given the current climate. She feels it would be good for Heartwood to give the Board an update in a year, as they may not realize that they will need another year extension. She also noted that the school has not touched base with the school system or superintendents. She noted that she knows of a building that they might be interested in looking at. Chair Cline noted that the Board has given them a year so they will see what happens in a year and then reassess.

Regarding the legislature refusing to accept the federal charter school grant funds, Ms. Chagnon asked whether there was any indication from the federal government whether the funds can be held indefinitely. Commissioner Edelblut

replied that the feds are permitted to take back the money at any point and they have not signaled whether they are going to do that.

Ms. Griffin asked what the legislative fiscal committee's rationale was for refusing the money. Commissioner Edelblut stated that the fiscal committee was concerned that the state did not need additional charter schools and the state should work on the charter schools that it had. Ms. Honorow replied that [the rationale] is on the public record and the fiscal committee also had concerns about the eventual impact on funding for traditional public education and the state's responsibility for funding once the startup funds were used. Ms. Honorow urged Ms. Griffin to read the transcripts.

Commissioner Edelblut replied that there was an initial concern on the part of some committee members that there would be a long-term financial impact to the state, so the Department put out 16+-page research report that pointed out that it would be a financial benefit to the state and school funding. Ms. Honorow responded that although the Department responded to the fiscal committee, she was not sure there was agreement on the numbers and the result. She did not want to characterize it, but instead urged Ms. Griffin to look at what is available from the public hearing.

Moving on to a new topic, Ms. Honorow proposed forming a group or committee to look at some statutes and regulations related to charter schools. The Board has previously talked about that and trying to agree on legislative proposals that could be offered up so the Department is not in a position of not being able to enforce things that intuitively make a lot of sense, for example consequences for not turning in financial reports and audits.

Chair Cline noted that the staff has spent a lot of time going through this. He hopes that they can get a grasp on what the big issues are before the Board starts to talk about staffing a committee, because the staff has probably already done three-quarters of the work in terms of cataloguing where the problems are in the laws and rules. Once there is more clarity on the issues, Chair Cline would be happy to put a taskforce together.

Ms. Honorow stated that she would not want to waste anyone's time, but it feels like they have been talking about this for a long time and they run into issues when a charter gets in trouble. She wants charters to succeed, but it will take some changes in the rules and regulations that the Board already knows about. Ms. Honorow stated that she would volunteer, if that would be helpful. Chair Cline said he thought that he and Ms. Honorow generally agree on the big issues and that better rules would help the charter schools. It is not a question of disagreement, but of not wasting a taskforce's time on work the Department has almost finished doing.

Ms. Chagnon said that she was asked at her local school board meeting the week prior about the status of setting new standards for social studies. Chair Cline said it is a work in progress and has been on hold because of the COVID-19 situation. His understanding is that a draft is nearing completion. Ms. Chagnon asked if there were two parallel committees working on it. Chair Cline replied that there is a large standards review team as well as a separate social studies review panel to look at the actual implementation. Chair Cline has participated in the latter and although it has not met for a while because of COVID-19, at the last meeting they worked on a draft of a survey for social studies teachers to learn about how instruction is working in the field. He believes they will get some interesting feedback and a clearer picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the way social studies is taught in New Hampshire.

Ms. Chagnon asked whether the survey would occur before the draft of the standards. Chair Cline replied that the survey is not running in tandem with the standards. Those are separate. The review panel is looking more at how social studies works in practice.

AGENDA ITEM XI. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

AGENDA ITEM XII. TABLED ITEMS

A. Southern New Hampshire University (SNHU) Amendment to Recent Substantive Change

Removed from table under agenda item VI, A. motion.

B. Capital City Public Charter School Status Change Request and Progress Report

AGENDA ITEM XIII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Meeting Minutes of May 14, 2020

B. Revised Tuition Agreement Between Pinkerton Academy and Chester School District

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Sally Griffin, that the State Board of Education approve as a slate the consent agenda the meeting minutes from May 14, 2020 and the revised tuition agreement between Pinkerton Academy and Chester School District.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Phil Nazzaro, and Helen Honorow, with the Chair and Cindy Chagnon abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM XIV. NONPUBLIC SESSION

MOTION: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Cindy Chagnon, that the State Board of Education move to nonpublic session under RSA 91-A:3, II(c).

VOTE: The motion was approved at 11:44 AM by unanimous roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, Helen Honorow with the Chair abstaining.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Ann Lane, that the State Board of Education to leave nonpublic session and return to public session at 12:59 PM.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, Helen Honorow with the Chair abstaining.

MOTION: Cindy Chagnon made the following motion, seconded by Ann Lane, to seal the minutes of the nonpublic session.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon, Phil Nazzaro, Helen Honorow with the Chair abstaining.

AGENDA ITEM XIV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ann Lane made the motion, seconded by Sally Griffin, to adjourn the meeting at 1:00 PM.

VOTE: The motion was approved by roll-call vote by State Board of Education Members Sally Griffin, Ann Lane, Kate Cassady, Cindy Chagnon and Helen Honorow with the Chair abstaining.



Secretary