Established in 2010 to build a foundation for the development of a system to support effective teaching in New Hampshire, the NH Task Force on Effective Teaching was comprised of sixty representatives from a wide range of stakeholder groups. This report contains details from this effort, which represent Phase I of the New Hampshire Department of Education’s initiative to create systems that lead to teaching effectiveness across the state.
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Dear Colleague,

This past year the New Hampshire Department of Education sponsored a task force focused on “teacher effectiveness and student achievement.” This document represents the hard work and commitment of the task force – teachers, leaders, policy makers, parents, higher education, school board members, technical advisors and others, including representatives from the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast and Islands (REL-NEI), the New England Comprehensive Center, and the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center) – to develop recommendations for a fair and equitable system of evaluation for teachers.

The task force committed to a research-based process focused on a deep understanding of the seriousness of the impact an effective evaluation process has on teachers and student achievement. Throughout the year the task force stayed focused on continued student achievement as the critical element of an effective system. The discussions were enlightening to all participants. This document represents the breadth and depth of all stakeholders. The recommendations are clear, concise and provide our state with a comprehensive look at a framework for pre-service teacher mentoring, embedded professional development and the evaluation of teachers.

Phase II of the task force will continue this important work developing a recommended teacher evaluation framework to help guide schools and districts to design and implement a teacher effectiveness system. I believe the State of New Hampshire will be a leader in developing a comprehensive teacher evaluation system that supports our educators and helps to demonstrate continued student growth.

The task force is to be congratulated for setting the stage for a consensus-building model in order to create a transparent system that establishes a relationship between student achievement and teacher effectiveness. I also want to thank Governor Lynch for his continued leadership and support for the work of the task force and for our teachers who play such a crucial role in the lives of New Hampshire students.

As Commissioner, I am grateful for the thoughtful and reflective recommendations of the task force and I am particularly proud of the collaborative work that is moving our state forward to be certain all students will be work and college ready; and become engaged citizens.

Sincerely,

Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D.
Thanks to the Task Force Membership

Commissioner Barry extends her appreciation to all the members of the task force who spent so much time and effort. Without them this report would not have been possible. They have laid the groundwork so that Phase II of the task force will be able to continue seamlessly. Thank you to everyone!
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About The NH Task Force on Effective Teaching

The New Hampshire Task Force on Effective Teaching was established to build a foundation for a system to support effective teaching. Called together by the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Virginia Barry, in Fall 2010, the task force comprised 60 representatives from a range of stakeholder groups and agencies (see previous section for a full list of members). Its charge was to:

- Provide a common definition of effective teaching for all schools.
- Identify different teaching frameworks that are research-based and are critical components to a fair and equitable teaching evaluation process.
- Develop a system of preparation, professional development, and continuous advancement of teachers to impact student learning (amended by the task force and restated as: Identify components of an integrated framework to support effective teaching).
- Develop a set of recommendations that will lead to a statewide system of teacher effectiveness.

A primary goal of the task force was to build consensus among stakeholders on developing, supporting, and sustaining effective teaching in New Hampshire. As a springboard for further inquiry and planning, the task force began by enlisting members’ wisdom to identify the group’s beliefs and interests related to effective teaching and student learning.

A core leadership group planned and supported regular task force meetings and provided members with the resources needed to carry out their work. This core group was comprised of two task force Co-Chairs, New Hampshire DOE leaders, and technical assistance/research consultants from the New England Comprehensive Center (NECC) and the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast and Islands (REL-NEI).

To support the group’s understanding of the national landscape, Laura Goe, Ph.D., of the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center) presented to the task force on federal priorities on teaching effectiveness and provided examples of state systems and models being designed and implemented across the country. Over the course of several meetings, the Commissioner
invited educators from schools across New Hampshire to present their exemplary practices in implementing systems to support effective teaching.

The task force’s initial work was to create an agreed-on definition of effective teaching to be used statewide and serve as the cornerstone for designing system elements. The working definition was informed by a review of research summaries and drew on the four strands of the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards: Learners and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility. The core leadership group led the way in providing access to the latest research through resources from the REL-NEI, NECC and its affiliate, the TQ Center, and the Council of Chief State School Officer’s State Consortium for Educator Effectiveness (SCEE). In order to ensure a comprehensive system of teacher effectiveness, the task force organized its work within four subcommittees: teacher preparation, induction/mentoring, professional development, and teacher evaluation. Each subcommittee reviewed and discussed related literature and research and developed recommendations which were sent to Charlotte Danielson for technical review.

At the final task force meeting in May 2011, Charlotte provided feedback to each subcommittee on its recommendations in light of current research and best practice. The subcommittees incorporated her feedback in their final recommendations, which will be used in the Phase II design effort.

### The Four Strands

- Learners and Learning
- Content Knowledge
- Instructional Practice
- Professional Responsibility
Overview

The task force recognizes that teacher effectiveness has profound implications for all students, from the lowest performing students to the highest performing students. While New Hampshire students generally score well on national assessment tests, the needs of underachieving students must also be met. Like most districts in the country, New Hampshire districts have rarely considered student achievement when evaluating teachers. In fact, until the 2011 passage of SB196, New Hampshire had no legal requirement for evaluating teachers in any form.

The work of the task force expands upon and strengthens SB196, which includes a requirement that school boards shall have a teacher performance evaluation policy (full text of the bill can be found at http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2011/SB0196.html), by positioning the requirement for teacher evaluation within a system of key variables which influence the development, support, and sustainability of effective teachers. Further, the task force has deliberately made the links between student achievement and teacher effectiveness a prominent feature of the teacher evaluation process.

A number of historical strengths supported the work of the task force. Stakeholder collaboration was critical. The task force brought together leaders from higher education, state and local school boards, parent groups, administration, teacher unions, the legislature, the research community, and the New Hampshire Department of Education. Other historical strengths related to the work of the task force are strong and enduring support for robust data systems, collaboration with teacher associations, a focus on professional development, and a focus on student competencies.

The Commissioner charged the task force with developing a coherent framework that identifies the essential elements of a system to support effective teaching in New Hampshire while honoring and supporting local decision making and practices. The Blueprint for Effective Teaching in New Hampshire, illustrated in Figure 1 (on page 7), draws on an analysis of the task force’s research and recommendations as well as consideration of related initiatives underway in New Hampshire. It is intended to serve as a conceptual platform on which districts and schools can build and enhance their local teacher evaluation systems and practices. Elements of the Blueprint are described in the following pages.
Overview

Figure 1: New Hampshire’s Blueprint for Effective Teaching
Elements of the Blueprint

The foundation of a system to support effective teaching is the set of standards and competencies for students and for teachers in New Hampshire’s Pre-K-20 educational system. Such a foundation establishes clear expectations for students and teachers, and appropriate measures for assessing them. The task force’s first charge was to reach agreement on a definition of effective teaching in New Hampshire. Beginning with a definition and related research provided by the TQ Center (Goe, Bell, and Little, 2008), the task force examined existing teacher standards and competencies from national organizations and experts such as InTASC, Laura Goe, and Charlotte Danielson, and reviewed current teacher standards embodied in the New Hampshire DOE rules for teacher certification. Based on its study of teacher standards, the task force developed the following basic definition of effective teaching in New Hampshire:

The Definition of Effective Teaching

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

The Learner and Learning

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

Content Knowledge

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

Instructional Practice

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

Professional Responsibility

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

Dispositions

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

Standards and competencies for teaching will be aligned to this shared definition as they are developed.

The four pillars of a coherent system of teacher education and professional development are:

1) Teacher preparation programs, aligned with standards and competencies, that prepare teachers for their initial years in teaching;

2) Programs and practices that support teacher induction with mentoring in at least the first three to five years of service;

3) Job-embedded professional development that enables teachers to develop and refine their knowledge and skills based on teacher and student standards; and

4) Teacher evaluation policies and practices that support teachers’ continuous improvement and provide educators with usable data about teacher performance.

The task force subcommittees on each of these topics reviewed relevant research, engaged in deliberative dialogue, and formulated recommendations to guide further policy, planning, and implementation efforts.

The capacity needed to erect these pillars of a teacher education system is shown as system-wide forces in the Blueprint. Internal collaborative cultures must support the open and collegial communication and action needed in a system that continuously drives advances in teaching and learning. Recognizing the limitations inherent in any single educational enterprise’s efforts to support a statewide system effectively, external partnerships are needed to leverage and maximize resources. The task force membership illustrates how statewide resources, across a myriad of New Hampshire organizations, can provide capacity to undertake complex and important work. New Hampshire’s Performance systems must provide educators with data and tools to create and use local assessments. The New Hampshire Department of Education’s Performance Pathways system enables the use of multiple sources and forms of data to assess learning and teaching. This system, coupled with the assessment development underway in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, will allow New Hampshire educators and leaders to understand the strengths and gaps in each phase of a teacher’s career continuum.

Of course, state and district enabling policies are necessary catalysts for action across all elements of the system, and policies that serve as barriers to realizing any component of the blueprint must be remedied to ensure coherence and forward movement. By requiring local school districts to have a “teacher performance evaluation policy,” SB196 fills a void in current statutes and is an opportunity for the New Hampshire Department of Education to provide technical support to districts in developing their local policies.

The system will only function coherently and purposefully under a well-informed, prepared cadre of leaders. Leadership and governance at the state and local levels will need to both understand and actively lead the development and implementation of complementary, connected systems of teacher preparation, induction with mentoring, professional development, and teacher evaluation. In order to lead effectively from their respective roles, leaders and policy makers must draw on the research and best practices related to each element of the blueprint.
Introduction

With a primary purpose of developing recommendations to inform systems to support effective teaching in New Hampshire, the task force subcommittees examined research, engaged in collaborative dialogue, and worked to create recommendations in four areas: Teacher Preparation, Professional Development, Induction with Mentoring, and Teacher Evaluation. Subcommittee membership is noted in Appendix C. Subcommittees met approximately twice monthly from December 2010 to May 2011; they reviewed and discussed a variety of resources identified by the NECC, REL-NEI, and individual members. Subcommittees used consensus-building processes to identify core principles and recommendations in their respective areas.

Core Principles

The recommendations developed by the task force reflect core principles—the underlying beliefs and values critical to a framework for effective teaching:

- Preparing, supporting, and sustaining effective teachers requires an integrated teacher effectiveness system.
- Student learning is at the center of the teacher development continuum, pre-service through experienced educator.
- The primary purpose of a framework for effective teaching is to enhance growth and learning of students and teachers.
- Effective teaching is the lead driver in ensuring student learning.
- The collaboration of all stakeholders is critical in building a system of teacher effectiveness.
- A comprehensive framework for teacher effectiveness is research-based and standards-driven.
- Multiple measures are used to assess student learning and teaching effectiveness.
- All components of a teacher effectiveness framework are aligned and allow for local flexibility.
Subcommittee Recommendations

Teacher Preparation

Preparing effective teachers for 21st century classrooms requires that teacher education programs shift from a model that loosely couples academic preparation, coursework, and school-based experiences to one that nests academic content and pedagogy within ongoing, supervised field experiences.

This shift will allow teacher candidates to blend practitioner knowledge with academic content as they “learn by doing” (Carroll and Foster, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2006; and Stronge, 2002). Through course-based, quality field experience requiring focused, well-structured, purposeful activities, teacher candidates reflect upon their field experiences with qualified, experienced teachers who guide meaningful reflection on how instruction supports students in understanding and applying academic concepts and the skills needed for 21st century learning (Berry, Daughtry, and Wieder, 2010).

A recent report from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) calls for broad and deep changes in how teacher preparation is monitored, evaluated, managed and delivered (see “Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers.” Specifically, the report calls for a field-based model that includes:

- More rigorous accountability,
- Strengthening candidate selection and placement,
- Revamping curriculum, incentives, and staffing,
- Supporting partnerships, and
- Expanding the knowledge base to identify what works and support continuous improvement (NCATE, 2010).

In addition to having deep understanding of core academic content knowledge (i.e., mathematics, English Language Arts, science, the arts), teacher candidates must also be equipped to support student learning in 21st century learning skills and competencies. For example, in his book, The Global Achievement Gap, Tony Wagner highlights seven key survival skills:

- Curiosity and imagination,
- Critical thinking and problem solving,
- Collaboration across networks and leading by influence,
- Agility and adaptability,
- Initiative and entrepreneurialism,
- Effective oral and written communication, and
- Accessing and analyzing information (Wagner, 2008).

Research suggests that these 21st century skills are best learned through a core curriculum that is interdisciplinary, integrated, project-based, and supported by current technologies and multiple and ongoing opportunities for collaboration (Partnership for 21st Century School and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2010). Our next generation of teachers will utilize 21st century skills as they prepare young people to use those same skills to become globally competent in a global age. (Longview Foundation for Education in World Affairs and International Understanding, Inc., 2008). The next generation of teachers will also be increasingly encouraged to be highly skilled in the use of educational technology in order to support learning that is more personalized and tied to the student’s own engaged discovery.

In order to effectively implement this type of teacher preparation model, it is essential that...
Subcommittee Recommendations

Teacher Preparation, Cont.

Faculty from colleges and universities model what new teachers are expected to provide their students. Significant changes in the incentives (i.e., tenure, salary increases, sabbaticals) must be tied to this new way of teaching and learning at colleges and universities versus an overemphasis on faculty research capacity.

Professional development must be provided to both education and core content faculty to support collaborative learning about how academic content, coursework, and field experiences are intentionally blended together (NCATE, 2010).

In addition, a learning continuum must be established, using Pre-K-20 partnerships, for the mutual and long-lasting benefit of both colleges and universities, and preschool, elementary, middle, and high schools. “Partnership” means having mutually determined goals for Pre-K-20 student learning and for professional development; this results from sustained and common collaboration vested in the development of future teachers. Support for these partnerships through state regulation and by local and state boards, as well as colleges and universities is essential.

The primary instructor for a teacher candidate is the cooperating or mentor teacher. Working collaboratively, colleges and universities and their “partner schools” should develop and utilize selection criteria consistent with this recommendation and devote resources to train, support, and assess mentors who affect all learners in the schools (Berry et al., 2010).

The “Pre-K-20 Partnership” approach to teacher education provides aspiring teachers the opportunity to integrate theory with practice, to develop and test classroom management and pedagogical skills, to hone their use of evidence in making professional decisions about practice, and to understand and integrate the standards of their professional community (NCATE, 2010).

The subcommittee on Teacher Preparation recommends that teacher preparation programs:

**Recommendation #1**
Are based on agreed-upon criteria for excellence in teaching with respect to essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions in order to attract, select, place, and retain teacher education candidates.

**Recommendation #2**
Ensure that all faculty associated with the preparation of teachers, in both content and pedagogical fields, are aware of the standards for teacher certification and the cultural reality of schools, and model best practices in teaching.

**Recommendation #3**
Establish a selective process to identify and train high-quality mentors or cooperating teachers who can share curricula, model best practices, and provide feedback through frequent observations and reflections.

**Recommendation #4**
Support the creation, establishment, and continued assessment of well-defined and mutually beneficial partnerships between teacher preparation programs and cooperating schools and districts.

**Recommendation #5**
Provide early, substantive, and prolonged supervised field experiences in a variety of settings and grade levels and with diverse populations. High-quality mentors and college supervisors will assist students by providing timely, ongoing, and meaningful feedback.

**Recommendation #6**
Expect and empower candidates to fulfill the NH definition of effective teaching, including engaging students in a culture of learning, practicing self-assessment, being reflective about their own teaching and learning, and developing productive learning partnerships.
Subcommittee Recommendations

Induction with Mentoring

There are two primary goals of induction-with-mentoring programs: retaining effective new teachers who are intentional in their instruction and assessment of student learning and improving teaching effectiveness of new teachers. A mere “buddy system” is inadequate in meeting these goals. Effective mentors provide guidance, orientation, instructional support, and reflective coaching for the new teachers with whom they work (Bickmore and Bickmore, 2010; Crasborn, Hennissen, Brouwer, Korthagen and Bergen, 2010; Moir, 2009; Oliver, McConney and Maor, 2009). The focus of mentoring is on assisting new teachers in becoming consistent and intentional in their instruction around agreed upon domains of practice. Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching is a comprehensive instructional framework that is often used as a focus for mentoring, professional development, and teacher evaluation systems. It identifies four domains of practice, i.e., planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. Each domain is subdivided into several elements which are described in a series of performance rubrics (Danielson et al., 2009).

Effective induction extends beyond a quality mentoring component and provides new teachers with various collaborative learning opportunities with other teachers, e.g., grade-level teams, content teams, or cross-grade teams focused on specific priority issues such as formative assessment, Response to Intervention, and school climate.

When new teacher induction programs are planned and implemented in such a comprehensive approach, there is a positive impact on human capital (individual teacher’s knowledge and skills) and social capital (collective/group knowledge and skills). With regard to impacting systems change for improving student learning, it is social capital that emerges as the most influential (Fullan, 2010).

New teachers continue to leave the profession at alarming rates with 30-50% leaving within the first five years of teaching. Additionally, teacher preparation pathways have a direct relationship to the attrition of new teachers with the highest attrition rates being teachers who are alternatively certified. Mentoring and induction programs significantly increase retention rates upwards to 95% when new teachers are provided trained mentors, administrator support and involvement, common planning time, professional development in classroom management and instructional practices, and networking opportunities with other new teachers (Fulton, Yoon and Lee, 2005; Moir, 2009; Smith and Ingersoll, 2004; Strong, 2005). Even when retention is not an issue, quality induction-with-mentoring programs significantly change the professional culture of a school by promoting collaboration and focused reflection on practice targeted to improve student learning and achievement (Wood and Stanulis, 2009).

Effective induction-with-mentoring programs hinge on planned selection and training of experienced teachers who serve as mentors, and administrator commitment and participation. The mentor’s signature role within an induction program is that of classroom coach, guiding a new teacher through reflective conversations about teaching and learning. The importance of this role cannot be overstated with regard to supporting new teachers in becoming intentional in their consistent demonstration of effective teaching practices (Costa and Garmston, 2002; Moir, 2009). By themselves, practices such as conveyance of theoretical knowledge, demonstration lessons, and application of new practices are not enough to ensure high levels of transfer of knowledge and
skills for new teachers. However, when classroom coaching is added to this list of strategies there is a radical shift toward high levels of transfer of knowledge and skills into new teachers daily teaching practice (Joyce and Showers, 2002).

Administrators must experience the professional development training provided to mentors to fully understand how a mentor’s roles and responsibilities differ from the supervision and evaluation roles that administrators provide. Without this shared experience, administrators may have the perspective that mentors are pseudo evaluators or that mentors are now doing aspects of the administrator role that administrators look forward to doing themselves. When administrators and mentors participate together in mentor training the distinctions and overlaps of these two roles become clear to everyone (Bickmore and Bickmore, 2010; Moir, 2009; Wood and Stanulis, 2009).

Finally, it is essential to gather evidence about whether induction-with-mentoring programs are accomplishing the goals of the program. Success of these programs goes well beyond teacher retention and delves into the impact of new teacher’s instruction on student learning and growth. Additionally, there are implications for how a well-designed and implemented induction-with-mentoring program can positively impact the culture of the school. A variety of evaluation and evidence gathering strategies will be needed so that data can be triangulated in measuring the effectiveness of induction-with-mentoring programs (McConney and Maor, 2009; Wood and Stanulis, 2009).

The subcommittee on Induction with Mentoring recommends that induction with mentoring:

**Recommendation #1**
Is required in all New Hampshire School Administrative Units (SAUs) for teachers new to the profession, district, content area or grade level.

**Recommendation #2**
All new educators receive induction with mentoring for a minimum of 3-5 years to ensure alignment with New Hampshire certification rules and regulations for Beginning and Experienced Educators.

**Recommendation #3**
Is accompanied by professional development differentiated to meet the needs of educators new to the profession, new to the district, or alternatively certified.

**Recommendation #4**
Is associated with clearly defined teacher effectiveness competencies or standards that are a core focus of the work between mentors and new teachers.

**Recommendation #5**
Takes place under clearly defined mentor effectiveness competencies or standards that inform mentor selection and mentors’ preparation and ongoing professional development.

**Recommendation #6**
Is designed so that mentors serve as classroom coaches and provide a minimum number (determined by local districts) of coaching cycles with new teachers each year of the induction-with-mentoring program and that coaching is confidential and non-evaluative.

**Recommendation #7**
Includes, at a minimum, orientation, classroom coaching, and content- and grade-specific professional development focused on student learning and growth.

**Recommendation #8**
Includes a system for gathering evidence that demonstrates educator growth toward the stated teacher effectiveness competencies or standards.

**Recommendation #9**
Includes professional development training for administrators as well as mentors.

**Recommendation #10**
Is evaluated annually and the data used to continually improve and revise the program.
Professional Development

The development of high quality teacher effectiveness systems is a whole system reform effort that requires deliberate and strategic use of specific levers or drivers of change. In particular, this kind of system change necessitates a shift in emphasis within four sets of drivers (Fullan, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less emphasis on “wrong drivers”…</th>
<th>More emphasis on “right drivers”…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teacher and leader quality</td>
<td>Group solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies not connected to the system</td>
<td>Integrated or systemic strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“This is not to say... that the accountability, individual quality, technology and targeted strategies are …forever wrong. They are just badly placed as lead drivers… The right drivers – capacity building, group work, instruction and systems solutions – are effective because they work directly on changing the culture of school systems (values, norms, skills, practices, relationships); by contrast the wrong drivers alter structure, procedures, and other formal attributes of the system without reaching the internal substance of reform…” (Fullan, 2011, p. 5).

Professional development that is strategically designed and implemented can serve as the catalyst for implementing the right drivers of system change as part of an integrated human resource management system by adhering to five principles. In such a system, professional development would be:

- Driven by the district vision for teaching and learning;
- Aligned vertically and horizontally;
- Managed with resources being allocated through a clear, district-wide process;
- Differentiated in its approach, distinguishing three critical purposes – teacher effectiveness, school capacity building, and program implementation; and
- Monitored for quality delivery and evaluated using data on classroom instruction and student achievement (Garet et al., 2011).

Creating and sustaining an effective teacher effectiveness system that enhances student achievement hinges on a well-developed professional development strategy focused on district goals (DeArmond, Shaw, and Wright, 2009; Miles, Odden, Fermanich, Archibald, and Gallagher, 2004). Currently, professional development is one of the most significant capacity-building investments in our public education system. There has been much debate as to whether or not there is a return on the financial investment in professional development with regard to how these efforts enhance the knowledge and skills of educators that also impact student learning and achievement (Rice, 2009; Jerald, 2009). There is good news however. Professional development that is strategic in its design and delivery, i.e., aligns with system goals, is purpose-driven, and monitored for quality and impact can increase teaching effectiveness and student learning and achievement (Garet et al., 2011). Such professional development is of high intensity and focused on job-embedded collaborative learning (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, and Orphanos, 2009).

Developing a strategic approach to professional development will require challenging and changing the mental models that currently exist with regard to how time and resources are used, how
professional development decisions are made, and how professional learning is embedded in the daily lives of teachers.

A recent report that focused on teacher development in the United States and abroad examined what research has shown about professional development that improves teachers’ practice and student learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Several key findings emerged including:

• Collaborative approaches to professional learning can promote school change that extends beyond individual classrooms.

• Effective professional development is intensive, ongoing, and connected to practice; focuses on the teaching and learning of specific academic content; is connected to other school initiatives; and builds strong working relationships among teachers.

• Other nations that outperform the United States on international assessments invest heavily in professional learning and build time for ongoing, sustained teacher development and collaboration into teachers’ work hours.

• American teachers spend much more time teaching students and have significantly less time to plan and learn together, and to develop high-quality curriculum and instruction than teachers in other nations.

• United States teachers have limited influence in crucial areas of school decision making.

The subcommittee on Professional Development recommends that professional development offerings:

**Recommendation #1**
Identify and use teacher effectiveness research accompanied by sustained implementation of effective instructional practices in an effort to improve outcomes for all students.

**Recommendation #2**
Are aligned to local and state goals and curriculum and state standards.

**Recommendation #3**
Are based on research, including research on adult learners and learning.

**Recommendation #4**
Draw on research, study, and discussion of best practices in responding to student needs as reflected in their work, motivation, aspirations, and assessment results.

**Recommendation #5**
Cultivate a culture of collegiality that invites stakeholders’ involvement and commitment.

**Recommendation #6**
Provide collaborative learning opportunities within and across grade levels and disciplines that support students’ academic, behavioral, and social-emotional growth.

**Recommendation #7**
Are provided the time and resources necessary to address both school/district goals and the needs of teachers with varying levels of skill and experience.

**Recommendation #8**
Embed and frame learning opportunities in the daily work of teaching and learning activities, such as designing appropriate learning environments and lesson plans, assessing student work and progress, providing ongoing feedback, differentiating and modifying instruction, and remaining current in one’s content area.

**Recommendation #9**
Acknowledge and incorporate the recommendations of informed educators, including mentors, colleagues, coaches, and administrators.

**Recommendation #10**
Provide diverse learning opportunities.

**Recommendation #11**
Evaluate their impact on an ongoing basis.
Teacher Evaluation

The components of effective teaching are not ends in themselves but tools to serve the ultimate goal of improving student learning. Studies repeatedly have shown that nothing schools can do for students is more valuable than providing effective teachers. A few years with effective teachers can put even the most disadvantaged students on the path to college. A few years with ineffective teachers can deal students an academic blow from which they may never recover (Jordan, Mendro, and Weerasinghe, 1997).

The primary measure of effective teaching is the impact of teaching on student growth and achievement. The challenge of evaluating teacher effectiveness is two-fold: how to measure student achievement and how to measure a teacher’s impact on that achievement. No single point-in-time measure of student learning can effectively measure all areas—social, emotional, academic, and physical—of student growth and success. Students’ depth of learning cannot be captured simply by averaging test scores. While further research is needed to establish the reliability of alternative forms of measurement (Rabinowitz, 2011), multiple measures of student achievement, such as formative classroom assessments, exhibitions, demonstrations, performances, portfolios, and self-assessments should accompany standardized tests. New Hampshire’s participation in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium will help educators stay current with the ongoing research on performance assessment.

Just as multiple measures are necessary to gauge student achievement, so should they inform teacher evaluation. Standardized test scores cannot be the sole measure of teacher effectiveness because teachers are not the sole factor in student learning. Nor should innovations in measurement drive the teacher effectiveness debate. Test scores cannot help districts choose among inexperienced new hires nor can they shed light on what made a teacher successful or not successful in order to replicate teacher success or remediate weakness (Goe, et al., 2008). Sixty-nine percent of teachers work in non-tested subjects or grades, including special education and English language learning (Prince, et al., 2008).

Increasing numbers of studies have failed to establish the validity of value-added growth models (VAMs) for measuring teacher impact on student achievement (Golhaber and Hansen, 2010; Braun, 2005; Rothstein, 2009; Goe, 2008). Appropriately applied, multiple measures of teacher effectiveness can include student test scores, classroom observation, analysis of classroom artifacts, portfolios, self-reports, student evaluations, and parent surveys. Measures should match the behavior evaluated; for example, parent surveys are appropriate measures of school-community outreach, or artifacts such as syllabi or lesson plans are appropriate measures of instructional planning (Little, Goe, and Bell, 2009).

Because the goal of an effective evaluation system is the support and improvement of teaching in order to improve student achievement, effective evaluation requires a close integration of informal (formative) and formal (summative) evaluation (Jerald and Hook, 2011; Stiggins and Duke, 1988; and Wise,
Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein, 1984). Frequent formative evaluation or feedback by peers, coaches, and mentors as well as administrators is critical to teacher improvement; infrequent evaluation, particularly of experienced teachers, creates missed opportunities to inform and improve student learning. Beginning teachers and teachers in new subject areas or grade levels need more frequent formative evaluation opportunities. Both experienced and beginning teachers learn from a range of support opportunities such as peer review, coaching and mentoring, model lessons, professional learning communities, walk-throughs, and self-reflective portfolios as well as formal, end-of-year summative evaluations. Some New Hampshire districts conduct summative evaluations for all teachers yearly; others only evaluate continuing contract teachers every three years. Formative evaluations should be annual for all teachers and more frequent for beginning and struggling teachers (Little, et al., 2009; Mathers, Oliva, and Laine, 2008; Rhode Island Department of Education, 2009).

Other important components of an effective system of teacher evaluation include training for administrative and peer evaluators, clear communication and stakeholder involvement regarding policy formulation and revision, alignment with professional development, personnel accountability, resources, pilots provided at the state level (Mathers, et al., 2008), and alignment with clear standards of teacher effectiveness. Based on the “widget effect,” which finds that 99% of teachers receive satisfactory ratings on “yes-no” checklists, a graduated rubric of skills and competencies should be based on valid and reliable standards, be applied appropriately, and be based on a practitioner’s assignment and experience.

Flexibility must be part of a New Hampshire system to allow for local adaptations and discretion.

The task force recommends that a New Hampshire teacher evaluation system be part of a pre-service through continuing-contract, integrated system of teacher effectiveness, and allow for local decision making while adhering to research-based standards and best practice.

The subcommittee on Teacher Evaluation recommends that teacher evaluation:

Recommendation #1
Is based on the ultimate goal of improving student learning and, to that end, supporting teacher growth and improving teacher effectiveness. To ensure that teacher evaluation is fair, valid, and reliable, it should be based upon curriculum, instruction, and assessments aligned to agreed-on standards of student achievement.

Recommendation #2
Is based on clear, rigorous standards and measures which are derived from the New Hampshire definition of teacher effectiveness.

Recommendation #3
Includes multiple measures of student learning and teacher performance. Student measures will include, but are not limited to, standardized and locally developed assessments, portfolios, and other demonstrations of achievement. Measures of teacher performance will conform to the Personnel Evaluation Standards (see Appendix B, p. 28) and may include self-assessments, supervisor and peer observations, teacher portfolios, and student and parent feedback. Measures are appropriately matched to purpose and are valid and reliable or based on the best available evidence of effectiveness.

Recommendation #4
Includes both formative and summative processes. Formative evaluation provides
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frequent, specific, and actionable feedback to improve teacher practice; summative evaluation, based on multiple measures, links teacher practice to data on student learning.

Recommendation #5
Is differentiated based on level of experience, level of performance, assignment, and continuing versus non-continuing contract status. Formative assessment processes should occur many times over the course of a year.

Recommendation #6
Whether formative or summative, it is conducted by trained personnel, who could include, but are not limited to, building administrators, master teachers, peers, and department chairs.

Recommendation #7
Establishes a performance scale (which could include narrative reports) based on recognized skills and competencies in each domain of the definition of effective teaching and applied in the context of the level of experience in a teacher’s respective assignment.

Recommendation #8
Informs professional development planning for individual goal-setting and professional growth plans, embedded professional development, and district-wide goal-setting.

Recommendation #9
Invites the participation of teachers in its development and implementation. All teachers will understand the purpose, process, and use of a teacher evaluation system to improve teaching and learning and in personnel decisions.

Recommendation #10
Is informed by guidance and resources from the New Hampshire Department of Education on implementing high-quality evaluation systems, guidance which fosters coherence and consistency across the state while enabling local decision making and adoption.
Beginning in September 2011, Phase II of the New Hampshire Task Force on Effective Teaching will be convened to build upon Phase I work and to respond to Commissioner Barry’s charge of creating a framework for implementing a comprehensive teacher effectiveness system. This multi-representative group will include: teachers, administrators, faculty from colleges and universities, legislators, state board of education members, local school board members, department of education staff, psychometric experts, technical assistance providers, content experts, parents and community members, and business leaders.

The goals for the Phase II work are to:

- Review the recommendations developed by the Phase I task force;
- Respond to the issues and questions identified by the Phase I task force;
- Examine comprehensive teacher effectiveness models from other states that are examples of the New Hampshire recommendations “in practice;”
- Create a framework for a comprehensive teacher effectiveness system;
- Develop a three-year implementation plan including an initial pilot phase;
- Identify guidelines for preparing those who will evaluate teachers within this system;
- Establish criteria for selecting the New Hampshire school districts that will participate in the pilot process; and
- Identify a communication and outreach strategy to develop public awareness about New Hampshire’s effort in this area.

Phase II of the task force will convene on a bi-monthly basis from September 2011 through January 2012. Implementation of the pilot phase of New Hampshire’s teacher effectiveness framework will begin in the fall of 2012.
The following questions grew out of the work of each subcommittee. These issues, along with the subcommittee recommendations, form the basis for Phase II of the task force work.

Teacher Preparation

1. How will institutions of higher education (IHEs) find opportunities to articulate their criteria for excellence in education?

2. What is the commitment of higher education content faculty to make changes based on these recommendations?

3. How will the recommendations and issues raised in this report interface with the New Hampshire teacher preparation process?

4. How could the Department of Education support the professional development of those involved in preparing teachers, including IHE content faculty?

5. How will the task force recommendations accommodate and promote the individuality of Pre-K-20 education partnerships?

6. What models or experts in the field could support work to move these recommendations forward?

7. How do we distribute resources, including funding commitments from all parties involved including the Department of Education?

Induction with Mentoring

1. How can we ensure that induction-with-mentoring programs exist in New Hampshire districts given the New Hampshire statute that does not allow for unfunded mandates?

2. What are the components of an effective awareness and outreach campaign to ensure high-quality, induction-with-mentoring programs from initial through sustained implementation?

3. How will induction-with-mentoring programs provide unique support to Alternative IV and V candidates who may not have classroom experience and/or knowledge/skill regarding effective instruction?

4. What competencies will be used to measure teacher effectiveness? How will we ensure that assessments of teacher effectiveness are valid, reliable, and free of bias?

5. What multiple measures will be used ("soft" and "hard") to measure teacher effectiveness?

6. What are the criteria and processes for selection of mentors and matching of mentors and new teachers?

7. How will districts ensure that the mentor/new teacher ratio is reasonable and allows time for coaching/observation cycles?

8. How will new teachers be provided with consistent, ongoing opportunities to reflect on their practice?

9. How is the professional development (content and structure) that will be provided to mentors and new teachers aligned with the 2011 Learning Forward (formerly National Staff Development Council) professional development standards?

10. How will confidentiality be maintained between mentors and those who evaluate new teachers?

11. What are the policies and practices that need to be in place to ensure that mentoring is non-evaluative?

12. What terminology will be used to describe the role of those who support teachers in
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- Need of intensive assistance in order to make a clear distinction between that role and the role of mentors of new teachers?
- What are the criteria upon which induction-with-mentoring programs will be evaluated? What data sources will be used for program evaluation?
- What will ongoing induction-with-mentoring program evaluation look like? Who will conduct the program evaluation?

Professional Development

1. What research exists that makes the connection between teacher professional development and student performance?
2. What other professional development models might be used, based on the particular needs under consideration?
3. To what extent do the recommendations “hang together” as a group?
4. Do the recommendations have merit?
5. Are the recommendations on target with respect to building an effective program of professional development?
6. What’s missing—what recommendations should we have made that are excluded?
7. Are the recommendations practical and doable?
8. Will the recommendations create difficult and burdensome practices for a school district?
9. Will all school systems, regardless of size, circumstances, location, etc. be able to act on these recommendations?
10. Are the recommendations appropriate for all types of school systems (e.g., large, small, urban, rural)?
11. Will the recommendations contribute to a sustainable system of professional development for a school or district?
12. Are the recommendations “administration free”? That is, are they independent of any single administrator or set of administrators in a school system?
13. Will the recommendations meet teachers’ needs regardless of their circumstances (e.g., beginning teacher, experienced teacher, etc.)?
14. What are the implications of the recommendations for school, local, and state education leaders?

Teacher Evaluation

1. Can student achievement receive high-priority consideration without being assigned a specific weight?
2. The subcommittee did not make recommendations concerning non-tested subjects. What is the best approach for evaluating teachers in non-tested subjects and grades (e.g., should whole-school measures be used in individual teacher evaluation)?
3. In the absence of sufficient measures that meet standards of reliability and validity, how can New Hampshire begin to implement high-quality systems of teacher evaluation?
4. Given the recommendations, how do we build capacity that enables practitioners to carry out their work with fidelity?
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5. What is the optimal role for state and local agencies? What policies should be statewide and what policies should be locally determined?

6. What human and financial resources will be required?

7. What changes in school resources, structures, and roles will implementation require?

8. What dissemination and education will be necessary to build public knowledge of and commitment to effective systems of teacher evaluation?

9. How can career ladder opportunities for teachers be incorporated into a comprehensive teacher effectiveness system?

These issues, along with subcommittee recommendations, will be the focal point of the Phase II Task Force as it creates a teacher effectiveness framework to be piloted by New Hampshire school districts in Fall 2012.
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B: Personnel Evaluation Standards

Summary of the Standards

Propriety Standards
The Propriety Standards are intended to ensure that a personnel evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of the evaluatee and those involved in the evaluation.

P1 Service Orientation Personnel evaluations should promote sound education, fulfillment of institutional missions, and effective performance of job responsibilities, so that the educational needs of students, community, and society are met.

P2 Appropriate Policies and Procedures Guidelines for personnel evaluations should be recorded and provided to the evaluatee in policy statements, negotiated agreements, and/or personnel evaluation manuals, so that evaluations are consistent, equitable, and fair.

P3 Access to Evaluation Information Access to evaluation information should be limited to the persons with established legitimate permission to review and use the information, so that confidentiality is maintained and privacy protected.

P4 Interactions with Evaluatees The evaluator should respect human dignity and act in a professional, considerate, and courteous manner, so that the evaluatee’s self-esteem, motivation, professional reputations, performance, and attitude toward personnel evaluation are enhanced or, at least, not needlessly damaged.

P5 Balanced Evaluation Personnel evaluations should provide information that identifies both strengths and weaknesses, so that strengths can be built upon and weaknesses addressed.

P6 Conflict of Interest Existing and potential conflicts of interest should be identified and dealt with openly and honestly, so that they do not compromise the evaluation process and results.

P7 Legal Viability Personnel evaluations should meet the requirements of all federal, state, and local laws, as well as case law, contracts, collective bargaining agreements, affirmative action policies, and local board policies and regulations or institutional statutes or bylaws, so that evaluators can successfully conduct fair, efficient, and responsible personnel evaluations.

Utility Standards
The Utility Standards are intended to guide evaluations so that they will be informative, timely, and influential.

U1 Constructive Orientation Personnel evaluations should be constructive, so that they not only help institutions develop human resources but encourage and assist those evaluated to provide excellent services in accordance with the institution’s mission statements and goals.

U2 Defined Uses Both the users and intended uses of a personnel evaluation should be identified at the beginning of the evaluation so that the evaluation can address appropriate questions and issues.

U3 Evaluator Qualifications The evaluation system should be developed, implemented, and managed by persons with the necessary qualifications, skills, training, and authority, so that evaluation reports are properly conducted, respected and used.

U4 Explicit Criteria Evaluators should identify and justify the criteria used to interpret and judge evaluatee performance, so that the basis for interpretation and judgment provide a clear and defensible rationale for results.

U5 Functional Reporting Reports should be clear, timely, accurate, and germane, so that they are of practical value to the evaluatee and other appropriate audiences.

U6 Professional Development Personnel evaluations should inform users and evaluatees of areas in need of professional development, so that all educational personnel can better address the institution’s missions and goals, fulfill their roles and responsibilities, and meet the needs of students.

Feasibility Standards
The Feasibility Standards are intended to guide personnel evaluation systems so that they are as easy to implement as possible, efficient in their use of time and resources, adequately funded, and viable from a political standpoint.

F1 Practical Procedures Personnel evaluation procedures should be practical, so that they produce the needed information in efficient, non-disruptive ways.

F2 Political Viability Personnel evaluations should be planned and conducted with the anticipation of questions from evaluatees and others with a legitimate right to know, so that their questions can be addressed and their cooperation obtained.

F3 Fiscal Viability Adequate time and resources should be provided for personnel evaluation activities, so that evaluation can be effectively implemented, the results fully communicated, and appropriate follow-up activities identified.

Accuracy Standards
The accuracy standards determine whether an evaluation has produced sound information. Personnel evaluations must be technically adequate and as complete as possible to allow sound judgments and decisions to be made. The evaluation methodology should be appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and the evaluatees being evaluated and the context in which they work.
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A1 Validity Orientation The selection, development, and implementation of personnel evaluations should ensure that the interpretations made about the performance of the evaluatee are valid and not open to misinterpretation.

A2 Defined Expectations The qualifications, role, and performance expectations of the evaluatee should be clearly defined, so that the evaluator can determine the evaluation data and information needed to ensure validity.

A3 Analysis of Context Contextual variables that influence performance should be identified, described, and recorded, so that they can be considered when interpreting an evaluatee’s performance.

A4 Documented Purposes and Procedures The evaluation purposes and procedures, both planned and actual, should be documented, so that they can be clearly explained and justified.

A5 Defensible Information The information collected for personnel evaluations should be defensible, so that the information can be reliably and validly interpreted.

A6 Reliable Information Personnel evaluation procedures should be chosen or developed and implemented to assure reliability, so that the information obtained will provide consistent indications of the evaluatee’s performance.

A7 Systematic Data Control The information collected, processed, and reported about evaluatees should be systematically reviewed, corrected as appropriate, and kept secure, so that accurate judgments about the evaluatee’s performance can be made and appropriate levels of confidentiality maintained.

A8 Bias Identification and Management Personnel evaluations should be free of bias, so that interpretations of the evaluatee’s qualifications or performance are valid.

A9 Analysis of Information The information collected for personnel evaluations should be systematically and accurately analyzed, so that the purposes of the evaluation are effectively achieved.

A10 Justified Conclusions The evaluative conclusions about the evaluatee’s performance should be explicitly justified, so that evaluatees and others with a legitimate right to know can have confidence in them.

A11 Metaevaluation Personnel evaluation systems should be examined periodically using these and other appropriate standards, so that mistakes are prevented or detected and promptly corrected, and sound personnel evaluation practices are developed and maintained over time.
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<td>Pittsfield Middle School</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Keene State College</td>
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<td>St. Anselm College</td>
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</table>
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<table>
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<tbody>
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</table>
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<table>
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#### Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Backler</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Milan Village School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Bell</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SAU #81, Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chagnon</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Bedford School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Clifford</td>
<td>Bureau of Credentialing</td>
<td>NHDOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Connell</td>
<td>Administrator, Bureau of Integrated Programs</td>
<td>NHDOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Copley (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>NHASCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Earick</td>
<td>Education Department, Early Childhood Studies</td>
<td>Plymouth State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira Glick</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>New England Comprehensive Center at RMC Research Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Murphy</td>
<td>Director, Division of Instruction</td>
<td>NHDOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard S. Muscott</td>
<td>NH CEBIS Project Director, NH RESPONDS Initiative Director</td>
<td>SERESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Porter</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant Elem. School, Nashua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda WesoIowski (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>NEA-NH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Teacher Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Boodey</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Woodman Park School, Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrick Bramante</td>
<td>NH State Board of Education</td>
<td>District at Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Cascadden</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SAU #67, Bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Casey</td>
<td>Former Legislator</td>
<td>E. Kingston Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Cremer</td>
<td>NH Researcher</td>
<td>Learning Innovations at WestEd/REL-NEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd A. DeMitchell</td>
<td>Prof. &amp; Chair, Dept. of Ed., Lambertson Prof. Justice Studies</td>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri D. Donovan</td>
<td>Dir. of Field Services &amp; Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>AFT-NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ewen</td>
<td>Early Childhood Specialist</td>
<td>NHDOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Frame</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Nute High School, Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Gong</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof., Educ. &amp; Coord. for Accred. &amp; Assessment Support</td>
<td>Keene State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hainey</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>AFT-NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen G. Honorow</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Keirstead</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>New England Comprehensive Center at RMC Research Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mica Kurtz</td>
<td>Ph.D. Student in Economics</td>
<td>UNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott McGilvRay</td>
<td>Social Studies Teacher</td>
<td>Memorial High School, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Nash (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Science Teacher</td>
<td>Winnacunnet High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Newton</td>
<td>Retired Teacher</td>
<td>Rochester High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irv Richardson (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Coordinator for Public Education and School Support</td>
<td>NEA-NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma L. Rous</td>
<td>Former Chair, NH House Education Committee</td>
<td>Task Force Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Sanborn</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Beaver Meadow School, Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne E. Woolridge</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SAU #29, Keene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>