



Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D.  
Commissioner of Education  
Tel. 603-271-3144

Paul K. Leather  
Deputy Commissioner  
Tel. 603-271-3801

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
101 Pleasant Street  
Concord, N.H. 03301  
FAX 603-271-1953  
Citizens Services Line 1-800-339-9900



◆ **MINUTES** ◆  
**2nd Meeting for Phase II**  
October 25, 2011  
Londergan Hall ◆ Room 15

Commissioner Barry and Karen Soule were unable to attend this meeting due to conflicting out-of-town meetings. Scott Marion opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. by welcoming everyone. He asked if there was anyone who did not attend the Kick-off Meeting last month. Those few people were asked to introduce themselves.

Scott introduced himself and went over what we would be doing tonight... surprise! No PowerPoint presentation! But lots of intense work will be done, some regarding the Phase I report, and then work on other issues indicated by the reading that had been sent out during the preceding month. The agenda (sent out the previous day) posed some questions that we will deal with. Mention was made of the handout about Tennessee's experience with RTTT and the problems with their implementation of the teacher assessment program.

**Timeline for our work:**

In NH, SIG schools will start implementing parts of our system THIS YEAR, using the Danielson rubric. We could try to formulate a complete system, using a RTTT approach without the money, and rush into full implementation. That would be a mistake, a sentiment which the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner completely agree with. We need to learn from a state like TN, who did move fast, and now has growing pains.

**First step:**

Separate into groups... working with the Phase I report, look at the Issues and Questions section. Look at what Phase I said that Phase II should work on. There's a lot there, so prioritize in a way that the most important things are attacked first. Each of the four groups should tackle a section, appoint a

recorder/facilitator and get to work on their set of issues. The agenda contained the following guidelines for priorities:

- 1. Immediate Priority: Phase II Task Force must address this question this year, prior to piloting educator effectiveness systems
- 2. Secondary Priority: Phase II TF must address this question before educator effectiveness systems are operational, but not before they are piloted
- 3. Long Term Priority: Phase II TF should address this question in the long term, but it is not as high a priority for this Task Force
- 4. Probably no longer important: Phase II TF does not have to address this question in the foreseeable future.

Also in the agenda was a worksheet on which to jot down rationale for decisions.

**Summary of the group work:**

**TEACHER PREPARATION**

*Members:* Cathy LaSalle, Yi Gong, Judy Fillion, Gail Rowe, Marianne True, Patty Ewen.

The first issue was too confusing to prioritize – needs more discussion. Items 2 and 3 are the most important – Item 2, to communicate the work of the task force to the IHEs is imperative, Item 3 will help inform the PSB. Item 4 would probably come out of 2 and 3 so can be priority 2. Items 5 and 6 are priority 4. Models and experts have already been identified – just keep open to new possibilities. Since NH has no resources there is no priority to distribute them.

<b>Teacher Preparation</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Notes/Rationale/Explanation</b>
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?	1	Communicating the work of the task force <u>effectively</u> and often to IHE’s faculty is imperative.
How will the recommendations and issues raised in this report interface with the New Hampshire Teacher Preparation process?	1	The recommendations should help inform the ongoing work of the subcommittee of the Prof. Standards Board.
How could the Department of Education support the professional development of those involved in preparing teachers, including IHE content faculty?	2	
How will the task force recommendations accommodate and promote the individuality of Pre-K-20 education partnerships?	3	
What models or experts in the field could support work to move these recommendations forward?	4	Experts have been identified in Phase I. This may be redundant though we realize additional models may emerge.
How do we distribute resources, including funding commitments from all parties involved including the Department of Education?	4?	There are no resources.

**INDUCTION WITH MENTORING**

*Members:* Kathy Boyle, Tobi Gray Chassie, Paul Leather, Diane Vienneau, Kathy Dunne, Kate Callahan, Mary Gorman.

This group used as their foundation the pure belief that there is a pure link between PD, especially for young teachers, and enhancement of teacher effectiveness. They found that most of the issues were of first priority (items 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 13). Second priority was given to items 3, 6,

12, and 14. Only item 1 was priority 3, none were priority 4. If pressed to identify some as MOST important they chose 4, 5, 7, and 8. Scott asked if they saw the role of the task force as identifying models, or creating models... their answer was creating guidance for districts.

<b>Induction with Mentoring</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Notes/Rationale/Explanation</b>
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?	3	
What are the components of an effective awareness and outreach campaign to ensure high-quality, induction-with-mentoring programs from initial through sustained implementation?	1	Viewed as critical
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	2	
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?	1	
What multiple measures will be used (“soft” and “hard”) to measure teacher effectiveness?	1	“The core of why we’re here.”
What are the criteria and processes for selection of mentors and matching of mentors and new teachers?	2	
How will districts ensure that the mentor/ new teacher ratio is reasonable and allows time for coaching/observation cycles?	1	
How will new teachers be provided with consistent, ongoing opportunities to reflect on their practice?	1	
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?	1	
How will confidentiality be maintained between mentors and those who evaluate new teachers?	1	
What are the policies and practices that need to be in place to ensure that mentoring is non-evaluative?	1	
What terminology will be used to describe the role of those who support teachers in need of intensive assistance in order to make a clear distinction between that role and the role of mentors of new teachers?	2	
What are the criteria upon which induction-with-mentoring programs will be evaluated? What data sources will be used for program evaluation?	1	
What will ongoing induction-with-mentoring program evaluation look like? Who will conduct the program evaluation?	2	

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

*Members:* Lori Landry, Deb Connell, Randy Bell, Dave Backler, Janet Valeri, Susan Copley, Mary Earick.

This group described how they decided priority: 1 – essential to begin, 2 – can wait until post-pilot. They had a long list to deal with and have decided to create an online excel spreadsheet where they can weigh in and come to a decision, which they will either email to us or present at the next meeting. This is what they have sent so far:

***Summary of Action.***

Discussed and clarified the context gaining insights into a collective focus.

We identified a need for a focus on priorities on two levels:

1. Those needed to support the SIG pilot
2. Those that can be addressed during and post the SIG pilot
  - a. Secondary
  - b. Long Term
  - c. No Longer Needed

The rest of the outcome of this group will be presented at the November meeting.

**TEACHER EVALUATION**

*Members:* Irv Richardson, Ashley Frame, Dean Cascadden, Laura Hainey, Debra Livingston, Carol Keirstead, Emma Rous, Helen Honorow, Mike Schwartz.

This group felt that the issues didn't fully delineate the work to be done – the recommendations were equally important.

<b>Teacher Evaluation</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Notes/Rationale/Explanation</b>
Can student achievement receive high-priority consideration without being assigned a specific weight? Can you incorporate reteach in a narrative eval?	Immed.	SIGs implementing now. Has to have weight to be high priority. Define the metrics. See recd. 1+3
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)?	Immed.	Rec'd 1+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?	Immed.	Rec'd 1, 2, 3, 4
Given the recommendations, how do we build capacity that enables practitioners to carry out their work with fidelity?	Immed.- 2?	Do before going statewide. Rec'd 6,9
What is the optimal role for state and local agencies? What policies should be statewide and what policies should be locally determined?	2	SIG schools are required to have a growth component. SIG+= pilot, not necessary for whole state to be on this path, wait until it goes to scale. Rec. 10
What human and financial resources will be required?	Immed. 1-3	Long term, cut across, if 1, can't start. Have to answer other issues first. Rec
What changes in school resources, structures, and roles will implementation require?	2?	Rec'd 6,8

What dissemination and education will be necessary to build public knowledge of and commitment to effective systems of teacher evaluation?	2	Need a credible definable model first.
How can career ladder opportunities for teachers be incorporated into a comprehensive teacher effectiveness system?	1/2	Growth, need to build capacity of teacher leaders, peer evaluators, a big task. Rec. 5

Confusion re: SIG & pilot – Is SIG plus the pilot?

A question was raised about why we are looking at all four areas, when at the last meeting Commissioner Barry said that we were going to be working primarily on the fourth pillar – Teacher Evaluation. Other groups would be taking up the work of the other three pillars. That question was pretty much self-answered as the speaker talked about no one pillar standing alone and that everything must move forward as a unit to remain solid. Scott answered that that was indeed the case, and our discussions will be shared with the other groups. In addition, this type of discussion is valuable to ground the new people in the work that was done by Phase I, remembering that not everyone here was present for that work. Going forward we will be focusing primarily on educator evaluation, and the many questions there that need clarification. What is the role of the State, how can evaluation components be quantified, how can you support improvement while meeting goals of evaluation standards? What does a useful evaluation look like? Operationalization – data collection - evidence centered design – all this will need to be addressed.

Scott mentioned that all groups failed to do what he hoped for – no priority four items were identified!

## **BREAK**

### **Second Step:**

Focus on foundational questions – new groups were organized. Discussions started and facilitator/recorders were chosen once again. The questions were listed in the agenda by group and each group took about 40 minutes to hash out answers to these difficult questions.

### **Summary of the group work (in opposite order of how they presented):**

#### **POLICY**

*Members:* Laura Hainey, Judy Fillion, Kathy Boyle.

#### *Questions:*

1. What should be the role of the State in defining educator evaluation systems in NH?
  - a. Should the same components be required in all schools for all similarly defined educators?
  - b. Should districts/schools be able to design their own systems?
    - i. If so, should these local systems be required to follow a “state framework?”
    - ii. Should these local systems be subject to state review and what criteria should be used for the evaluations?
    - iii. Who should do such reviews?
2. What will be done with the results of the evaluations? Will educators be dismissed, provided with raises/bonuses, targeted for improvement, etc.?
  - a. Who should make these decisions?

*Brief Summary:* This group felt they had more questions than answers, but they definitely felt that the rulemaking currently in progress will have a big role for this group. They had a problem with the definition of terms (framework, model), so weren’t sure whether they could determine how to start. Should the DOE say here’s a method – use this? Or here’s a model – tweak it to fit your schools? They wondered who reviews plans, by what criteria are the plans reviewed? They noted problems with peer

reviews. They noted that there is a need for consistency and documentation, and that teachers who are laid off or fired need guidelines that they can understand that have been followed in making the decision.

#### *Group Notes:*

We ended up with more questions than answers.

Part of this is connected to the rules process. And currently working its way through the process is reviewing the “master plan” 500’s. Defining beginner, experienced and master teacher will also need to be reviewed.

Need to make sure that everyone is on the same page with defining terms i.e., framework.

There needs to be more consistence with documenting teacher effectiveness and evaluations.

We discussed who would review such plans – is it appropriate to have the DOE or peers, or both, along with what criteria would be used.

We were not able to answer any of the questions at this time.

#### SUPPORT/IMPROVEMENT

*Members:* Cathy LaSalle, Marianne True, Sue Copley, Mary Gorman, Kate Callahan, Kathy Dunne, Diane Vienneau, Randy Bell.

#### *Questions:*

1. What type of information about their performance (or their students’ performance) would teachers need to be able to improve their own practice?
  - a. How often and in what form would they need this information?
2. What type of information would school leaders need in order to improve the practices of individual teachers? Groups of teachers?
  - a. How often and in what form would they need this information?
3. What type of information would leaders need to be able to improve their own practice?
  - a. How often and in what form would they need this information?
4. Should all of these types and forms of information “count” in educator evaluation? If not, which one should count?

*Brief Summary:* This group felt that their issues were very interrelated with the next group (who had gone before them). They came up with a nested approach: What students need to know and be able to do is core to what teachers need to know and be able to do, and leaders need to be cognizant about those things as they telescope together, leading to what leaders need to know and be able to do. Teachers, leaders and students all need to be reflective of their own learning and opportunity should be provided to do that. They spoke about intentionality in teachers’ practice and clearly articulating unit of study with outcomes clearly identified. The four essential questions were brought up: What should “they” know? How do “we” know “they” know? What do “we” do when “they” are not achieving goals? How do “we” challenge “them” to achieve these goals? The group felt that there should be a 360° set of information derived from students, teachers, parents, and leaders.

#### *Group Notes:*

1. *What type of information about their performance (and their students’ performance) would teachers need to improve their own practice?*

Mary – As teachers get “more” into the profession, to see the problem through the eyes of students.

- Samples of student work
- Student interviews
- RtI – monitoring/assessment data.
- Descriptive/objective feedback based on standards of instructional practice.
- Comprehensive unit plan that include backward mapping and explicitly designed student engagement, student learning outcomes, and how I will know they have learned.
- Written and verbal articulation (vertical & horizontal) re: links in C-I-A.
- Student task samples + performance tasks
- Videotape of teaching

- Lesson plan books, my reflections/notes to inform how to revise, where important
- To reteach and why (include Responses to DuFour's 4 Essential Questions):
  1. What should they know?
  2. How do we know they know?
  3. What do we do if students are not achieving goals?
  4. How do we challenge students who achieve the goals and are ready to move on?
- 360° data – from students, parents, peers, evaluators.

2. *What types of information would school leaders need to improve teaching for individuals and groups?*

- A map of the current level of demands on teachers, all of the initiatives that are underway and which initiatives are getting in the way.
- Classroom observation data and teacher interviews/conversation.
- List of people who are resources to call on to support instructional improvement.
- Identify opportunities for system collaboration building – build – and within and across grades and from system of Superintendent/Board – within and across building.
- First-hand information re: effective instructional practices e.g., teams of teachers visiting sites together).
- Student surveys
- How to have meaningful conversations with teachers to improve their practice, e.g., coaching.
- Examination/identification of personal beliefs, values and assumptions.
- Research and best practice.
- Knowledge of who can model where – example of best practices.

3. *What types of info would leaders need to improve their practice?*

- 360° data (see teacher example) – upward and all around assessment.
- Objective feedback about/on performance and what they don't know.

**OPERATIONALIZING AND MEASURING INDICATORS**

*Members:* Lori Landry, Deb Connell, Janet Valeri, Carol Keirstead, Yi Gong, Mary Earick, Mike Schwartz, Paul Leather, Tobi Gray Chassie.

*Questions:*

1. Describe the types of evidence—not how you would collect the evidence—that you would need to see to convince you that the teacher/leader possessed the particular knowledge and skills described for the “*Instructional Practice*” domain of an effective teacher (see page 8 of the Phase I report). Please be as specific as possible such that the descriptions can lead to measureable indicators. Note: this will be very challenging.
2. Once the evidence statement has been clearly explicated, try as specifically as possible to describe ways that you would gather information to contribute to the evidence described in #1. Please try to describe as many sources of information as possible as well as the rationale for using each approach. For example, you might indicate that content tests and/or teacher interviews would be useful approaches for providing evidence about teachers' content knowledge and provide a rationale why each of these could provide useful information.
3. After completing 1 & 2, conduct a crosswalk between the evidence statements and the Danielson framework to honestly indicate which aspects of the evidence statements are covered by the Danielson framework and which one are not covered by Danielson. [Note: I am not sure we will have time for this.]

*Brief Summary:* This group came up with a “laundry list” of 30 evidences and 25 indicators, which they will sort out and send by email later. They were convinced to share a few items right away. All 30 evidences revolve around what you should see in a classroom: “a co-facilitated, reflective, responsive educational community where children have ownership, access and opportunity towards equalized growth across the levels.” (Hopefully I got the \$10 sentence right!) They then had 25 indicators (methods of collection of data), some of which are: lesson plans with specific components, rubric and protocol integrated into core curriculum and instruction, survey data from facility and students, walk-through programs, portfolios, student conferencing, and more.

### Group Notes:

What would one expect to see?

*Co-facilitated, reflective and responsive educational communities where children have ownership, access and opportunity towards equalized growth across performance levels.*

- Evidence
  - Student Survey
  - Family Survey
  - Faculty Survey
  - Focused/Intentional Walk Through Programs
  - Teacher Portfolio/Data Notebook- Rubric
  - Student Portfolios
    - Student Set Up Goals
    - Conference with Teacher
- Facilitate personalized learning through intentional, flexible, and research-based strategies
  - Diagnostic Approach
  - Student Ownership of Curriculum
  - Differentiation: (Tomlinson (2001) – elements of Curriculum and Instruction – Content\*Process\* Products\*Affective Environment)
    - Lesson Plans with rubric, protocol and curriculum alignment
  - Teachers are facilitator facilitating
  - Students expressing their learning
  - Active rather than passive participation
  - Student ownership leads to accountability
    - Commitment from the student in addition to the teacher
    - Conferencing Model of Leadership
  - Teachers sharing knowledge, strategies
- Incorporate multiple forms of assessment to evaluate student learning and adapt instruction accordingly
  - Use of learning progressions rather than standards (Common Core)
  - Matched to their (students) instructional level
  - Students are working on standards in a learning progression
  - Ongoing, formative assessment and check ins
  - Students involved in assessment, collection, development and reflection to include co-constructed goals leading to an understanding of their performance levels
  - Portfolios
  - Evidence of Common Assessment
  - Equalized growth across all levels
- Integrate technology as a tool for education and assessment
  - Portfolios
  - Competent In Communication Technologies to Bridge Home and Schools
    - Parent Portals
    - New Letters
    - Program Goals

### STUDENT GROWTH

*Members: Ashley Frame, Irv Richardson, Emma Rous, Helen Honorow, Patty Ewen, Dave Backler, Ira Glick, Debra Livingston, Dean Cascadden, Gail Rowe.*

Questions:

1. What should be the role of standardized test scores (e.g., NECAP, NWEA) in educator evaluation?
2. What sort of evidence of student achievement should schools use in educator evaluations for those educators responsible for non-tested subjects and grades?
3. Campbell's Law and other corrupting influences are at play in most accountability systems, but will undoubtedly play a bigger role in educator evaluation systems than in school

accountability systems. Yet, trying to maximize security could have a negative effect on usefulness. What might be some ideas to help “thread this needle?”

*Brief Summary:* The group agreed that standardized testing should have a small role, that it should be understood by teachers, and that it should be used to inform instruction. The big issues (actually more questions) that they discussed were: Is standardized testing important? How should it be used? What do these tests mean? How can teachers use them? They should not be dismissed altogether... the public likes to see numbers. They are scary for teachers.

Scott asked if student performance (however defined) should count in evaluation of teachers? The group gave a resounding amen. Ira mentioned that there are many versions and types of standardized tests, and they all need to be understood as to what test is being used and for what purpose.

*Group Notes:*

- Ira introduces, has background in state testing (standardized)
- What is/should be the role? (State, commercial, NWEA, Iowa)
- David – places where it’s good not to be at the front. The results are so variable – citing the pre-reading – variability – look at recommendations – it should have a small role. It is a better evaluation of school vs. eval. of teacher.
- Irv – standard vs. statewide. Shouldn’t use NECAP, since it’s leaving. Smarter balance curriculum will need to catch up.
- Roll out of common core 13/14, one year of roll out. Implementation of a brand new ripples of high stakes.
- Helen – Is testing a requirement of state?
- Elementary teacher questions?
- Dean – How are you using data to improve practice?
- Onus on teachers to use their own data to direct PD and teacher growth.
- Used to re-work curriculum.
- Educators should show that they have to know what to do with data.
- Helen – Important not to dismiss altogether public opinion is important. State shouldn’t have any role, multiple measures are important.
- Connecting total information and using it to inform.
- Do the stand. Touch all subjects. Issues of equity? Teachers using data.
- Resource list of measurement tools
- Gail – cross-curricular, but the pressure is on content – content tests
- Dean – Growth has to be a component, whole school results. Using it. Portfolio design
- Stanley Rabinowitz – Hierarchy of multiple measures – premise – some level of patience.
- Limitations of standardized testing – being careful.
- Criteria
- Common core states – Criteria based portfolio. Early ed - running reports – missing domains. Dangers of portfolios. How to balance. Work sampling.
- Small role (one of multiple measures) understood by teachers and used to inform instruction.
- 50% what is teacher doing; 50% what are students doing
- Adequacy – you have to focus on outputs – well how does that affect what students are doing.
- How do we report? It must be fair and consistent. Comparing apples to apples. Doing it in layers – we all own the data.
- District data team – some years are difficult.
- RtI – repurposing data
- PR – inform vs. punish

**Wrap-up**

Scott thanked everyone for their hard work at the end of a long day. He stated that we need to get clear on what it is that we are building: a state model, or a framework to fit within. Next time the Commissioner will be present and we can make decisions about where we go next. The **next meeting is on November 8<sup>th</sup>**, same time-same place, and we will have Karla Baehr from the Massachusetts DOE who will present information on their model and experiences in this same area. The **subsequent meeting will be December 6<sup>th</sup>**.

*Submitted by Cindy Rosborough, October 28, 2011. Revised November 2, 2011.*