2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

New Hampshire

OVERALL GRADA



Acknowledgments

STATES

State education agencies remain our most important partners in this effort, and their gracious cooperation has helped to ensure the factual accuracy of the final product. Every state formally received a draft of the *Yearbook* in July 2011 for comment and correction; states also received a final draft of their reports a month prior to release. All but one state responded to our inquiries. While states do not always agree with the recommendations, their willingness to acknowledge the imperfections of their teacher policies is an important first step toward reform.

We also thank the many state pension boards that reviewed our drafts and responded to our inquiries.

FUNDERS

The primary funders for the 2011 *Yearbook* were:

- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- Carnegie Corporation of New York
- George Gund Foundation
- Gleason Family Foundation
- The Joyce Foundation


The National Council on Teacher Quality does not accept any direct funding from the federal government.

STAFF

Sandi Jacobs, *Project Director*Sarah Brody, *Project Assistant*Kathryn M. Doherty, *Special Contributor*Kelli Michele, *Lead Researcher*

Meagan Staffiere Comb, Trisha M. Madden and Stephanie T. Maltz, Researchers

Thank you to the team at CPS Gumpert for their design of the 2011 *Yearbook*. Thanks also to Colleen Hale and Jeff Hale at EFA Solutions for the original *Yearbook* design and ongoing technical support.



Executive Summary

For five years running, the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) has tracked states' teacher policies, preparing a detailed and thorough compendium of teacher policy in the United States on topics related to teacher preparation, licensure, evaluation, career advancement, tenure, compensation, pensions and dismissal.

The 2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook includes NCTQ's biennial, full review of the state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession. This year's report measures state progress against a set of 36 policy goals focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers. For the first time, the Yearbook includes a progress rating for states on goals that have been measured over time. An overall progress ranking is also included, showing how states compare to each other in moving forward on their teacher policies.

New Hampshire at a Glance Overall 2011 Yearbook Grade:



Overall 2009 Yearbook Grade: D-

Area Grades	2011	2009
Area 1 Delivering Well Prepared Teachers	D	D
Area 2 Expanding the Teaching Pool	D	D
Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers	D	F
Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers	D-	D-
Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers	D-	D-

Overall Progress



Highlights from recent progress in New Hampshire include:

■ State data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness

How is New Hampshire Faring?

Area 1 Delivering Well Prepared Teachers



Policy Strengths

 The state is on the right track in ensuring that elementary teacher candidates are prepared to teach to the Common Core Standards

Policy Weaknesses

- Teacher candidates are not required to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- Although the elementary teaching standards are better than most, the subject-matter test fails to report subscores in each area and is unlikely to be aligned with the Common Core Standards.
- Teacher preparation programs are not required to address the science of reading, and candidates are not required to pass a test to ensure knowledge.
- Neither teacher preparation program nor licensure test requirements ensure that new elementary teachers are adequately prepared to teach mathematics.

- Middle school teachers are allowed to teach on a K-8 generalist license.
- Not all secondary teachers must pass a content test.
- The state offers a K-12 special education certification.
- A pedagogy test is not required as a condition of licensure.
- There are no requirements to ensure that student teachers are placed with cooperating teachers who were selected based on evidence of effectiveness.
- The teacher preparation program approval process does not hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Area 2 Expanding the Pool of Teachers



Policy Strengths

There are no restrictions on alternate route usage or providers.

Policy Weaknesses

- Admission criteria for alternate routes to certification are not sufficiently selective, although there is flexibility for nontraditional candidates.
- Alternate route preparation is not streamlined or geared toward the immediate needs of new teachers.
- The state does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part time.
- Out-of-state teachers are not required to meet the state's testing requirements, and there may be additional obstacles that do not support licensure reciprocity.

How is New Hampshire Faring?

Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers



Policy Strengths

The state data system has the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Policy Weaknesses

- Objective evidence of student learning is not the preponderant criterion of teacher evaluations.
- There is no policy addressing the number of times teachers must be evaluated.
- Tenure decisions are not connected to evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- Licensure advancement and renewal are not based on teacher effectiveness.
- No school-level data are reported that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers



Policy Strengths

Districts are given full authority for how teachers are paid, although they are not discouraged from basing salary schedules solely on years of experience and advanced degrees.

Policy Weaknesses

- All new teachers do not receive mentoring or other induction support.
- Professional development is not aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations.
- The state does not support performance pay or additional compensation for relevant prior work experience, working in high-need schools or teaching in shortage subject areas.
- Teachers are only offered a defined benefit pension plan, and pension policies are not portable, flexible or fair to all teachers.
- The pension system is significantly underfunded and requires excessive contributions.
- Retirement benefits are determined by a formula that is not neutral, meaning that pension wealth does not accumulate uniformly for each year a teacher works.

Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers



Policy Strengths

A last hired, first fired layoff policy during reductions in force is prohibited.

Policy Weaknesses

- Teachers can teach for up to three years before having to pass required subject-matter tests.
- There is no assurance that teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations will be placed on structured improvement plans or that they will be eligible for dismissal if they fail to improve.
- Ineffective classroom performance is not grounds for dismissal, and the state could do more to ensure that the appeal process for teacher dismissal occurs within a reasonable time frame.

New Hampshire Goal Summary

Goal Breakdown			
Best Practice	0	Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers	
Fully Meets	3	3-A: State Data Systems	
Nearly Meets	1	3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness	
Partially Meets	4	3-C: Frequency of Evaluations	
Only Meets a Small Part	9	3-D: Tenure	
O Does Not Meet	19		
Progress on Goals Since 2009 3 U 1 C 25 NEW 7		3-E: Licensure Advancement	
3 V 1 W 23 GOAL /		3-F: Equitable Distribution	
Area 1: Delivering Well Prepared Teachers		Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers	
1-A: Admission into Preparation Programs	0	4-A: Induction	
1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation	•	4-B: Professional Development	
1-C: Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction	0	4-C: Pay Scales	
1-D: Teacher Preparation in Mathematics	0	4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience	
1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation	0	4-E: Differential Pay	
1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation	0	4-F: Performance Pay	
1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science		4-G: Pension Flexibility	
1-H: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies	•	4-H: Pension Sustainability	
1-I: Special Education Teacher Preparation	0	4-I: Pension Neutrality	
1-J: Assessing Professional Knowledge	0	Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers	
1-K: Student Teaching	0	5-A: Licensure Loopholes	
1-L: Teacher Preparation Program		5-B: Unsatisfactory Evaluations	
Accountability Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers		5-C: Dismissal for Poor Performance	
2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility	0	5-D: Reductions in Force	
2-B: Alternate Route Preparation	0		
2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers			
2-D: Part Time Teaching Licenses	0		
2-E: Licensure Reciprocity	0		

About the Yearbook

The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) has long argued that no educational improvement strategies states take on are likely to have a greater impact than policies that seek to maximize teacher effectiveness. In this fifth edition of the State Teacher Policy Yearbook, NCTQ provides a detailed examination of state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession, covering the full breadth of policies including teacher preparation, licensure, evaluation, career advancement, tenure, compensation, pensions and dismissal.

The Yearbook is a 52-volume compendium of customized state reports for the 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as a national summary overview, measuring state progress against a set of 36 specific policy goals. All of the reports are available from NCTQ's website at www.nctq.org/stpy.

The 36 Yearbook goals are focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive policy framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers. The goals were developed based on input and ongoing feedback from state officials, practitioners, policy groups and other education organizations, as well as from NCTQ's own nationally respected advisory board. These goals meet five criteria for an effective reform framework:

- 1. They are supported by a strong rationale, grounded in the best research available. The rationale and research citations supporting each goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.
- 2. They offer practical rather than pie-in-the-sky solutions for improving teacher quality.
- 3. They take on the teaching profession's most pressing needs, including making the profession more responsive to the current labor market.
- 4. They are, for the most part, relatively cost neutral.
- 5. They respect the legitimate constraints that some states face so that the goals can work in all 50 states.

The need to ensure that all children have effective teachers has captured the attention of the public and policymakers across the country like never before. The Yearbook offers state school chiefs, school boards, legislatures and the many advocates who press hard for reform a concrete set of recommendations as they work to maximize teacher quality for their students.

How to Read the Yearbook

NCTQ rates state teacher policy in several ways.

For each of the 36 individual teacher policy goals, states receive two ratings. The first rating indicates whether, or to what extent, a state has met the goal. NCTQ uses these familiar graphics to indicate the extent to which each goal has been met:









A new feature of this year's *Yearbook* is a progress rating for each goal NCTQ has measured over time. These ratings are intended to give states a meaningful sense of the changes in teacher policy since the 2009 *Yearbook* was published. Using the symbols below, NCTQ determines whether each state has advanced on the goal, if the state policy has remained unchanged, or if the state has actually lost ground on that topic.








Some goals are marked with this symbol , which indicates that the bar has been raised for this goal since the 2009 *Yearbook*. With many states making considerable progress in advancing teacher effectiveness policy, NCTQ raised the standards for some goals where the bar had been quite low. As this may have a negative impact on some states' scores, those goals are always marked with the above symbol.

States receive grades in the five goal areas under which the 36 goals are organized: 1) delivering well prepared teachers; 2) expanding the pool of teachers; 3) identifying effective teachers; 4) retaining effective teachers and 5) exiting ineffective teachers. States also receive an overall grade that summarizes state performance across the five goal areas, giving an overall perspective on how states measure up against NCTQ benchmarks. New this year, states also receive an overall progress ranking, indicating how much progress each state has made compared to other states.

As always, the *Yearbook* provides a detailed narrative accounting of the policy strengths and weaknesses in each policy area for each state and for the nation as a whole. Best practices are highlighted. The reports are also chock full of reader-friendly charts and tables that provide a national perspective on each goal and serve as a quick reference on how states perform relative to one another, goal by goal.

Another new feature this year makes it easier to distinguish strong policies from weaker ones on our charts and tables. The policies NCTQ considers strong practices or the ideal policy positions for states are capitalized. This provides a quick thumbnail for readers to size up state policies against the policy option that aligns with NCTQ benchmarks for meeting each policy goal. For example, on the chart below, "BEFORE ADMISSION TO PREP PROGRAM" is capitalized, as that is the optimal timing for testing teacher candidates' academic proficiency.



Goals

AREA 1: DELIVERING WELL PREPARED TEACHERS

PAGE 9

1-A: Admission into Preparation Programs

The state should require undergraduate teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with good academic records.

1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core Standards.

1-C: Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.

1-D: Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.

1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

The state should ensure that science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

1-H: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies

The state should ensure that social studies teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

1-I: Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they will be required to teach.

1-I: Assessing Professional Knowledge

The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.

1-K: Student Teaching

The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high-quality clinical experience.

1-L: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

AREA 2: EXPANDING THE POOL OF TEACHERS

PAGE 59

2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility

The state should require alternate route programs to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

2-B: Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide streamlined preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers.

2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from regulatory obstacles that limit its usage and providers.

2-D: Part Time Teaching Licenses

The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.

2-E: Licensure Reciprocity

The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.

AREA 3: IDENTIFYING EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

PAGE 81

3-A: State Data Systems

The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.

3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness

The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

3-C: Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

3-D: Tenure

The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

3-E: Licensure Advancement

The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

3-F: Equitable Distribution

The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.

AREA 4: RETAINING EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

PAGE 105

4-A: Induction

The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools.

4-B: Professional Development

The state should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

4-C: Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience

The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.

4-E: Differential Pay

The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.

4-F: Performance Pay

The state should support performance pay but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.

4-G: Pension Flexibility

The state should ensure that pension systems are portable, flexible and fair to all teachers.

4-H: Pension Sustainability

The state should ensure that excessive resources are not committed to funding teachers' pension systems.

4-I: Pension Neutrality

The state should ensure that pension systems are neutral, uniformly increasing pension wealth with each additional year of work.

AREA 5: EXITING INEFFECTIVE TEACHERS

PAGE 147

5-A: Licensure Loopholes

The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.

5-B: Unsatisfactory Evaluations

The state should articulate consequences for teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations, including specifying that teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations should be eligible for dismissal.

5-C: Dismissal for Poor Performance

The state should articulate that ineffective classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and ensure that the process for terminating ineffective teachers is expedient and fair to all parties.

5-D: Reductions in Force

The state should require that its school districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off when a reduction in force is necessary.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal A – Admission into Preparation Programs

The state should require undergraduate teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with good academic records.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. All preparation programs in a state should use a common admissions test to facilitate program comparison, and the test should allow comparison of applicants to the general college-going population and selection of applicants in the top half of that population.
- 3. Programs should have the option of exempting candidates from this test who submit comparable SAT or ACT scores at a level set by the state.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal A **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Rar Raised for this Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not require aspiring teachers to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs, instead delaying its basic skills assessment until teacher candidates are ready to apply for licensure.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules 604.01

RECOMMENDATION

 Require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.

Teacher preparation programs that do not screen candidates end up investing considerable resources in individuals who may not be able to successfully complete the program and pass licensing tests. Candidates needing additional support should complete remediation prior to program entry, avoiding the possibility of an unsuccessful investment of significant public tax dollars.

Require preparation programs to use a common test normed to the general college-bound population.

The basic skills tests in use in most states largely assess middle school-level skills. To improve the selectivity of teacher candidates—a common characteristic in countries whose students consistently outperform ours in international comparisons—New Hampshire should require an assessment that demonstrates that candidates are academically competitive with all peers, regardless of their intended profession. Requiring a common test normed to the general college population would allow for the selection of applicants in the top half of their class, as well as facilitate program comparison.

Exempt candidates with comparable SAT or ACT scores.

New Hampshire should waive the basic skills test requirement for candidates whose SAT or ACT scores demonstrate that they are in the top half of their class.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that the administrative rules governing educator preparation programs are currently under review and revision by a subcommittee of the Professional Standards Board.


In a subsequent response, New Hampshire also indicated that the state will waive the basic skills test requirement for candidates whose SAT or ACT scores demonstrate that they are in the top half of their class.



Although there are a number of states that require teacher candidates to pass a basic skills test as a criterion for admission to a preparation program, **Texas** is the only state that requires a test of academic proficiency normed to the general college bound population rather than just to prospective teachers. In addition, the state's minimum scores for admission appear to be relatively selective when compared to other tests used across the country.

Figure 2


Do states require a test of academic proficiency that is normed to the general college-going population?



1. Strong Practice: Texas

- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Newada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming

Figure 3
When do states test teacher candidates' basic skills?




- Strong Practice: Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- Alabama, Alaska, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachussets, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont
- 3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming



Figure 5

Do states measure performance in reading, mathematics and writing?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- California⁴, District of Columbia⁴, Hawaii⁴, Indiana, Iowa, Maine⁴, Maryland, New Hampshire⁴, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁵, Pennsylvania⁴, Rhode Island⁴, Vermont, Virginia
- 3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming
- 4. Minimum score must be met in each section.
- Composite score can only be used if passing score is met on two of three subtests.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal B – Elementary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core Standards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that its approved teacher preparation programs deliver a comprehensive program of study in broad liberal arts coursework. An adequate curriculum is likely to require approximately 36 credit hours to ensure appropriate depth in the core subject areas of English, science, social studies and fine arts. (Mathematics preparation for elementary teachers is discussed in Goal 1-D.)
- 2. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all subjects.
- 3. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to complete a content specialization in an academic subject area. In addition to enhancing content knowledge, this requirement also ensures that prospective teachers have taken higher level academic coursework.
- 4. Arts and sciences faculty, rather than education faculty, should in most cases teach liberal arts coursework to teacher candidates.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal B **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Nearly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire has adopted the Common Core Standards, and the state is on the right track in ensuring that its elementary teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach the rigorous content associated with these standards.

New Hampshire requires candidates to pass the Praxis II general elementary content test, which does not report teacher performance in each subject area, meaning that it is possible to pass the test and still fail some subject areas, especially given the state's low passing score. Further, based on available information on the Praxis II, there is no reason to expect that the current version would be well aligned with the Common Core Standards. In addition, candidates with master's degrees in the subject area to be taught are exempted from the Praxis II test; it is unclear whether such an exemption would apply to elementary teacher candidates.

In addition, all teacher candidates in New Hampshire, including elementary teacher candidates, must complete an area of concentration (10 courses above the institution's introductory level) in a field such as humanities, fine arts, social sciences and sciences. Although this is an important requirement in that it ensures that teacher candidates have taken higher-level academic coursework and provides an option for teacher candidates unable to fulfill student teaching or other professional requirements to still earn a degree, it may be too broad to guarantee that the courses used to meet it will be relevant to the topics taught in the PK-6 classroom.

New Hampshire has also articulated elementary teaching standards that its approved teacher preparation programs must use. These standards are better than those found in many states, alluding to important areas of academic knowledge. For example, in the area of social studies, teacher candidates must be able to:

- Explain world geography and its effects on human, physical, political, and economic systems;
- Explain the pre-history and early civilizations and compare them to those of the current day, including their developments and transformations;
- Explain United States history from European exploration and colonization to current developments and transformations;
- Explain the nature, purpose and forms of local, state, national and international government;
- Demonstrate a working knowledge of the tools, goals and areas of study in anthropology, sociology and psychology; and
- Explain basic micro- and macroeconomics.

Finally, there is no assurance that arts and sciences faculty will teach liberal arts classes to elementary teacher candidates.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 611.02, 507.11, 513.01 Praxis II www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require a content test that ensures sufficient knowledge in all subjects.

New Hampshire should ensure that its subject-matter test for elementary teacher candidates is well aligned with the Common Core Standards, which represent an effort to significantly raise the standards for the knowledge and skills American students will need for college readiness and global competitiveness.

The state should also require separate passing scores for each content area on the test because without them it is impossible to measure knowledge of individual subjects. Further, to be meaningful, New Hampshire should ensure that these passing scores reflect high levels of performance.

■ Ensure that arts and sciences faculty teach liberal arts coursework.

Although an education professor is best suited to teach effective methodologies in subject instruction, faculty from the university's college of arts and sciences should provide subject-matter foundation.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire added that it recently participated in a Multi-State Standard Setting Study for the new Elementary Education Praxis II test, which was developed after the release of the Common Core Standards. This new test will provide a required cut score for each of the four subtests. The Department of Education will bring this test forward to the State Board of Education after final review by ETS.

In a subsequent response, New Hampshire stated that the new Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Praxis II test has been adopted by the State Board of Education. The test is available immediately and will be required beginning July 1, 2012.

Finally, the state added that it is beginning to modify and enhance its testing requirements. The first group of new assessments includes a reading test. The next group to be validated will include a test that requires prospective elementary teachers to earn a passing score in each of four academic disciplines: English language arts, mathematics, science and social science.


LAST WORD

NCTQ commends the efforts of states, like New Hampshire, that have advocated for a new elementary education test from ETS. Requiring subscores for each of the content areas is a significant step toward ensuring that all elementary teachers possess the requisite knowledge for the classroom. NCTQ looks forward to reviewing New Hampshire's progress in future editions of the Yearbook.



Although no state meets this goal, three states have noteworthy policies. Massachusetts's testing requirements, which are based on the state's curriculum, ensure that elementary teachers are provided with a broad liberal arts education. Indiana and Utah are the first two states to adopt the new Praxis II "Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects" content test, which requires candidates to pass separately scored subtests in reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies and science.


Figure 7
Where do states set the passing score on elementary content licensure tests¹?



¹ Based on the most recent technical data that could be obtained; data not available for Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon and Washington. Montana and Nebraska do not require a content test. Colorado score is for Praxis II, not PLACE. Indiana, Maryland, Nevada, South Carolina and Utah now require new Praxis tests for which the technical data are not yet available; analysis is based on previously required test.


Figure 8

Have states adopted the K-12 Common Core State Standards?



- 1. Alaska, Minnesota, Nebraska, Texas, Virginia
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 9
What subjects does **New Hampshire** expect elementary teachers to know?




igure 10		EN	GLISH		/		SCIE				S	OCIAI						INE RTS
o states expect		Writing Co.	/ /	/		General pu	/ ညွ	/ /	/		/	World H:	/ 4	World His	^/	/ /	/ /	,
lementary teachers	American Literature World	ratu,	Children's Literat	e /	/	/ /	Scie	Biology/Life Scien	هِ /	2	America.) July	$^{4n_{C\acute{\epsilon}}}$	100	/	/ / /		
o have in-depth	erat	/ [ife	fe. / ###	i / /	/	' /	10)	" / 's		stor.	sto ²	/ w	2/	\&\ \&\	33	' / /	/	
nowledge of	n Lii		, st.	/ / ,	s /	/ \d	ږ /څ	1. [j.]	/			G /	ots. / 5	o 1840 History		<u> </u>	^ / /	/
rore content?				Chemica	Physics	Jeral	Earth Scie		leric	America:	, \ , j	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		1/0	Geograph	Art History	Music	
ore content?	4/3	ि / ≥ ⊘	<i>'\ है </i>	/ ඊ	\ 4	/ હૈં /	Ear	\ ig \	47	\ \ \ \ \ \	\ \\ \frac{4}{L} \.	/ 😤	/3	/ *	/ تق / ع	/ / L	/ ž /	
Alabama		*																
Alaska																		
Arizona		*				*	*	*	*	*	*				*		*	
Arkansas																		
California		*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*	
Colorado																		
Connecticut									*	*								
Delaware																		
District of Columbia																		
Florida				*		*	*	*			*				*			
Georgia							X											
Hawaii																		
Idaho				Ц														
Illinois							X	<u> </u>			×				*			
Indiana							X										*	
lowa																		
Kansas			×				X											
Kentucky																		
Louisiana									Н		Н		Н					
Mandand																		
Maryland Massachusetts																		
Michigan								_			_							
Minnesota						<u> </u>	7	<u> </u>			7							
Mississippi			*															
Missouri													П					
Montana																		
Nebraska		+			Н			_	Н				П				_	
Nevada		$\hat{\Box}$				П				П			П		П			
NEW HAMPSHIRE					П													
New Jersey					П	_	_	_	_	$\overline{}$			_					
New Mexico		-															*	
New York								_			П							
North Carolina																		
North Dakota																		
Ohio																		
Oklahoma																		
Oregon		*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	
Pennsylvania															î			
Rhode Island																		
South Carolina																		
South Dakota																		
Tennessee						*	*	*			*				*			
Texas		*				*	*	*	*	*	*				*	*	*	
Utah																		
Vermont																		
Virginia		*		*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Washington		*				*	*	*			*				*		*	
West Virginia																		
Wisconsin																		
Wyoming																		

Subject mentioned

★ Subject covered in depth

Figure 11

Do states expect elementary teachers to complete an academic concentration?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico
- 2. Strong Practice: Indiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma
- California, Connecticut, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri,
 New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia
 These states require a major, minor or concentration but
 there is no assurance it will be in an academic subject area.
- 4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal C – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. To ensure that teacher preparation programs adequately prepare candidates in the science of reading instruction, the state should require that these programs train teachers in the five instructional components shown by scientifically based reading research to be essential to teaching children to read.
- 2. The state should require that new elementary teachers pass a rigorous test of reading instruction in order to attain licensure. The design of the test should ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without knowing the science of reading instruction.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal C **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not require that teacher preparation programs for elementary teacher candidates address the science of reading. The state has neither coursework requirements nor standards related to this critical area. New Hampshire's standards do indicate that elementary teacher candidates should be able to promote student learning through the "development of student literacy, including reading instruction that leads to development of student strategies for word recognition, decoding skills and reading comprehension." However, these standards do not explicitly require that teachers receive training in the five essential components of reading instruction.

Interestingly, while the elementary teacher standards do not specify scientifically based reading instruction, the standards for certification in English Language Arts for grades 5-8 do include the five components of scientifically based reading instruction.

New Hampshire also does not require teacher candidates to pass an assessment that measures knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction prior to certification or at any point thereafter.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 507.11 and 507.241

RECOMMENDATION

■ Ensure that teacher preparation programs prepare elementary teaching candidates in the science of reading instruction.

New Hampshire should ensure that teacher preparation programs adequately prepare elementary teacher candidates in the science of reading by requiring that these programs train candidates in the five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

Require teacher candidates to pass a rigorous assessment in the science of reading instruction.

New Hampshire should require a rigorous reading assessment tool to ensure that its elementary teacher candidates are adequately prepared in the science of reading instruction before entering the classroom. The assessment should clearly test knowledge and skills related to the science of reading, and if it is combined with an assessment that also tests general pedagogy or elementary content, it should report a subscore for the science of reading specifically. Elementary teachers who do not possess the minimum knowledge in this area should not be eligible for licensure.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that the new elementary education Praxis II test will have a subtest for reading that includes the five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction. The Department of Education will bring this test forward to the State Board of Education after final review by ETS.


In a subsequent response, New Hampshire stated that the new Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Praxis II test has been adopted by the State Board of Education. The test is available immediately and will be required beginning July 1, 2012. The Reading and Language Arts subtest includes the following topics: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, fluency and comprehension strategies.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE


Eight states meet this goal by requiring that preparation programs for elementary teacher candidates address the science of reading and requiring that candidates pass comprehensive assessments that specifically test the five elements of instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Independent reviews of the assessments used by Connecticut, Massachusetts and Virginia confirm that these tests are rigorous measures of teacher candidates' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction.

Figure 13 Do states require preparation for elementary teachers in the science of reading?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 2. Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 14 Do states measure new teachers' knowledge of the science of reading?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota⁴, New Mexico⁵, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania⁵, Tennessee,
- 2. Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Missouri, New York, Oregon, Texas
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Based on the limited information available about the test on the state's website.
- 5. Test is under development and not yet available for review.

Figure 15	DE	REPARATIO QUIREMEN	/	TEST REQUIRI	
Do states ensure that	READING SCIESS	QUIKEMEN	/	KEQUIKI	EIVIEIVIS
elementary teachers	દ્વ	٣ , ۵	/	757	, ,
know the science of	S.F.	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	/	167	test / sat
reading?	40 VC S	Leading science	4PPROPR.,	MATE TES	No reading test
reading:	13/2 15/2 15/2 15/2 15/2 15/2 15/2 15/2 15	o no	/ J	/ bəp	/ Lea
	RE	/ 7 %	/ ₹	/ ਪ੍ਰੌ	/ >
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
Iowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota			1		
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
New Jersey					
New Mexico			2		
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania			2		
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
,	26	25	9	10	32
	20	23	9	10	32

^{1.} Based on the limited information available about the test on the state's website.

^{2.} Test is under development and not yet available for review.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal D – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require teacher preparation programs to deliver mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates. This content should be specific to the needs of the elementary teacher (i.e., foundations, algebra and geometry with some statistics).
- 2. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to pass a rigorous test of mathematics content in order to attain licensure.
- Such test can also be used to test out of course requirements and should be designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of mathematics.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 16 How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation in Mathematics **Best Practice State** Massachusetts States Meet Goal State Nearly Meets Goal Indiana 1 States Partly Meet Goal California, Florida, Minnesota 1, New Mexico, Utah 1 30 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa 1, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, **NEW HAMPSHIRE**, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming 14 States Do Not Meet Goal Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, West Virginia, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **↓**:0 **1**:4 •: 47

Area 1: Goal D **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire relies on both coursework requirements and its standards for teacher preparation programs as the basis for articulating its requirements for the mathematics content knowledge of elementary teacher candidates.

All teacher candidates in New Hampshire, including those for elementary schools, must complete an area of concentration (10 courses above the institution's introductory level) in a field such as mathematics. The state neither specifies the requisite content of these classes nor that they must meet the needs of elementary teachers.

New Hampshire has also articulated teaching standards that its approved teacher preparation programs must use to frame instruction in elementary mathematics content. The state's standards appropriately address content in mathematics foundations, but although they mention such areas as algebra and geometry, the standards lack the specificity needed to ensure that teacher preparation programs deliver this mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates.

Finally, New Hampshire requires that all new elementary teachers pass a general subject-matter test, the Praxis II. This commercial test lacks a specific mathematics subscore, so one can likely fail the mathematics portion and still pass the test. Further, while this test does cover important elementary school-level content, it barely evaluates candidates' knowledge beyond an elementary school level, does not challenge their understanding of underlying concepts and does not require candidates to apply knowledge in nonroutine, multistep procedures.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 611.02 and 507.11

www.ets.org/praxis

"No Common Denominator: The Preparation of Elementary Teachers in Mathematics by America's Education Schools," NCTQ, June 2008 http://www.nctq.org/p/publications/docs/nctq_ttmath_fullreport.pdf.

RECOMMENDATION

■ Require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.

Although New Hampshire requires some knowledge in key areas of mathematics, the state should require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers. This includes specific coursework in foundations, algebra and geometry, with some statistics.

■ Require teacher candidates to pass a rigorous mathematics assessment.

New Hampshire should assess mathematics content with a rigorous assessment tool, such as the test required in Massachusetts, that evaluates mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenges candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts. Such a test could also be used to allow candidates to test out of coursework requirements. Teacher candidates who lack minimum mathematics knowledge should not be eligible for licensure.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that the new elementary education Praxis II test will have a subtest for mathematics. The Department of Education will bring this test forward to the State Board of Education after final review by ETS.

New Hampshire also noted that the Professional Standards Board has convened a subcommittee to develop certification standards for a new math specialist endorsement. This new professional endorsement will support statewide professional learning in both math content and pedagogy.


In a subsequent response, New Hampshire stated that the new Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Praxis II test has been adopted by the State Board of Education. The test is available immediately and will be required beginning July 1, 2012.



Massachusetts is the only state that ensures that its elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of mathematics content. As part of its general curriculum test, the state utilizes a separately scored mathematics subtest that covers topics specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.

Figure 17

Do states articulate appropriate mathematics preparation for elementary teachers?




1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Massachusetts

 Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 18

Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?



1. Strong Practice: Massachusetts

- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Montana, Nebraska

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal E - Middle School Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should encourage middle school candidates who intend to teach multiple subjects to earn minors in two core academic areas rather than earn a single major. Middle school candidates intending to teach a single subject area should earn a major in that area.
- The state should not permit middle school teachers to teach on a generalist license that does not differentiate between the preparation of middle school teachers and that of elementary teachers.
- 3. The state should require that new middle school teachers pass a licensing test in every core academic area they intend to teach.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal E **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire offers a middle school (grades 5-9) license for middle school teachers and allows teachers with secondary certificates to teach single subjects. All candidates must complete a major consisting of at least 10 courses above the introductory level. Regrettably, New Hampshire also allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license.

Not all middle school teachers in New Hampshire are required to pass a Praxis II subject-matter test to attain licensure. To demonstrate content knowledge, they (with the exception of middle school math teachers) must either pass the Praxis II test or earn the equivalent of a content major.

Further, those seeking the elementary license are only required to pass the general content test for elementary education, in which subscores are not provided; therefore, there is no assurance that these middle school teachers will have sufficient knowledge in each subject they teach. In addition, candidates with master's degrees are exempted from the Praxis II test.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education Chapter 500, 513.01, 611.02 www.ets.org/praxis
Required Tests for Certification
http://www.education.nh.gov/certification/req_tests.htm

RECOMMENDATION

■ Eliminate K-8 generalist license.

New Hampshire should not allow middle school teachers to teach on a generalist license that does not differentiate between the preparation of middle school teachers and that of elementary teachers. These teachers are less likely to be adequately prepared to teach core academic areas at the middle school level because their preparation requirements are not specific to the middle or secondary levels and they need not pass a subject-matter test in each subject they teach. Adopting middle school teacher preparation policies for all such teachers will help ensure that students in grades 7 and 8 have teachers who are appropriately prepared to teach grade level content, which is different and more advanced than what elementary teachers teach.

■ Strengthen middle school teachers' subject-matter preparation.

New Hampshire should encourage middle school teachers who plan to teach multiple subjects to earn two minors in two core academic areas, rather than a single major. However, the state should retain its requirement for a subject-area major for middle school candidates who intend to teach a single subject.

Require subject-matter testing for middle school teacher candidates.

New Hampshire should require subject-matter testing for all middle school teacher candidates in every core academic area they intend to teach as a condition of initial licensure.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that it does encourage middle school candidates who plan to teach multiple subjects to earn two minors in two core academic areas, rather than a single major.

In a subsequent response, New Hampshire added that the new Elementary Education:Multiple Subjects Praxis II test has been adopted by the State Board of Education. The test results will provide a separate score for each of the subtests in Reading and Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies and Science. The test is available immediately and will be required beginning July 1, 2012.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Arkansas, Georgia and Pennsylvania ensure that all middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach middle school-level content. Teachers are required to earn at least two content-area minors. Georgia and Pennsylvania also require passing scores on single-subject content tests, and Arkansas requires a subject-matter assessment with separate passing scores for each academic area.

K-BLICENSE NOT OFFERED K-8 license offered for self-contained dassrooms Figure 20 Do states distinguish middle A Carse offered grade preparation from elementary preparation? Alabama Alaska П Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois 2 Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska П Nevada **NEW HAMPSHIRE** New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma **4** Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 29 6 16

^{1.} California offers a K-12 generalist license for self-contained classrooms.

^{2.} Illinois offers K-9 license.

^{3.} With the exception of mathematics.

^{4.} Oregon offers 3-8 license.

^{5.} Wisconsin offers 1-8 license.

Figure 21 What academic prepara	tion		Sy /	/ :	loos
o states require for a	LIOII	/ .		7.	5 / 5
niddle school endorsen	ant S		? / %		nent or
riladie scribbi eridorseri er license?	ient &	8	/ 8	lan a	r mir
r ucense?	nent WAO	MAJOR OR TWO	NOMINORE	less than a major or	No requiement of content
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado Connecticut					_
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
Iowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky		1			
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts			1		
Michigan Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska			1		
Nevada					
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio			1		
Oklahoma					
Oregon Pennsylvania		2			
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	13	3	9	12	14

^{1.} State does not explicitly require two minors, but it has equivalent requirements.

Pennsylvania has two options. One option requires a 30 credit concentration in one subject and nearly a minor (12 credits) in three additional subjects; the second option is 21 credits in two subject-area concentrations with 12 credits in two additional subjects.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal F – Secondary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a licensing test in every subject they intend to teach.
- 2. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a content test when adding subject-area endorsements to an existing license.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 22 How States are Faring in Secondary Teacher Preparation **Best Practice States** Indiana, Tennessee 29 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin States Nearly Meet Goal States Partly Meet Goal District of Columbia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico States Meet a Small Part of Goal 12 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, NEW HAMPSHIRE, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **New Goal**

Area 1: Goal F **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not ensure that its secondary teachers are adequately prepared to teach gradelevel content.

Although New Hampshire requires Praxis II subject-matter testing for its secondary teachers, the state undermines this policy by allowing an exemption for those candidates with a master's degree or higher in the subject area. Further, New Hampshire offers a general social studies license—and does not require subject-matter testing for each subject area within this discipline (see Goal 1-H).

To add an endorsement to a secondary license, teachers in New Hampshire may either pass a Praxis II content test or earn a master's degree or higher.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education, 513.01(c)

RECOMMENDATION

Require subject-matter testing for all secondary teacher candidates.

As a condition of licensure, New Hampshire should require its secondary teacher candidates to pass a content test in each subject area they plan to teach to ensure that they possess adequate subject-matter knowledge and are prepared to teach grade-level content. While a degree—even an advanced degree—may be generally indicative of background in a particular subject area, only a subject-matter test ensures that teachers know the specific content they will need to teach.

■ Require subject-matter testing when adding subject-area endorsements.

New Hampshire should require passing scores on subject-specific content tests, regardless of other coursework or degree requirements, for teachers who are licensed in core secondary subjects and wish to add another subject area, or endorsement, to their licenses.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Not only do Indiana and Tennessee require that secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subjects, but these states also do not permit any significant loopholes to this important policy by allowing secondary general science or social studies licenses (see Goals 1-G and 1-H).


Figure 23 Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area for licensure?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. (For more on loopholes, see Goals 1-G and 1-H.)
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming

Figure 24 Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area to add an endorsement?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. (For more on loopholes, see Goals 1-G and 1-H.)
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal G – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

The state should ensure that science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require secondary science teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each science discipline they intend to teach.
- 2. The state should require middle school science teachers to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of science.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal G New Hampshire Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not offer certification in general science for secondary teachers. It should be noted, however, that the ETS/Praxis website refers to a physical science certification. NCTQ continues to encourage the state to ensure that its testing requirements are listed accurately so that teachers seeking certification have correct information.

Middle school science teachers in New Hampshire have the option of earning an endorsement in middle level science. Candidates must pass both the Praxis II "General Science: Content Essays" test and the "General Science" test. Regrettably, however, the state also allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license (see Goal 1-E).

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 612.22 **Praxis Testing Requirements** www.ets.org

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that it requires all middle school teachers in grades 7-8 who teach core content areas to demonstrate content knowledge by either passing a Praxis II content test or earning the equivalent of a college major in that content area. The state added that it recently adopted the Praxis II Middle School Science test.


Figure 26		State offers Beneau State Combination State of	STATE OFFICE OF STATE	State offer only single subject
Do states ensure that	8			VSESW Wesub
secondary science teachers	ENE	100 / SO /		
have adequate subject-	18 S	TAAL See	Tuate Fig.	ESTIN Sony ting
matter knowledge?	10 M			offe, of the state
matter knowledge:	STATE OFFERS GENERAL S.	State Combi Vithou	STATE OFFIS OUV SWALL	State of first MC BASES. State of first only single sub- adequate facting without
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas		$\overline{}$		
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts		_		
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
New Jersey				
New Mexico	_			
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	1	39	10	1



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

New Jersey does not offer certification in general science for secondary teachers. Although the state allows a combination physical science certificate, it ensure adequate content knowledge in both chemistry and physics by requiring teacher candidates to pass individual content tests in chemistry, physics and general science. Further, middle school science teachers must pass a science-specific content test.

Figure 27 Do states ensure that middle school teachers have adequate preparation to teach science?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia
- 2. Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Wyoming

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal H – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies

The state should ensure that social studies teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require secondary social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each social studies discipline they intend to teach.
- The state should require middle school social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of social studies.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 28 How States are Faring in Preparation to Teach Social Studies **Best Practice State** Indiana States Meet Goal Georgia, South Dakota States Nearly Meet Goal Minnesota, Oklahoma 32 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, NEW HAMPSHIRE, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming State Meets a Small Part of Goal 13 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **New Goal**

Area 1: Goal H **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire only offers a secondary general social studies certificate. Candidates must pass both the Praxis II "Social Studies: Content Knowledge" and the "Praxis II Social Studies: Analytical Essays" test. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general social studies but rather can teach any of the topical areas.

Middle school social studies teachers in New Hampshire have the option of earning an endorsement in middle level social studies. Candidates must commendably pass the Praxis II "Middle School Social Studies" test. Unfortunately, the state also allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license (see Goal 1-E).

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 612.28; .29
Praxis Testing Requirements
www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require secondary social studies teachers to pass tests of content knowledge for each social studies discipline they intend to teach.

States that allow general social studies certifications—and do not require content tests for each area—are not ensuring that these secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. New Hampshire's required assessments combine all subject areas (e.g., history, geography, economics) and do not report separate scores for each subject area. Therefore, candidates could answer many history questions, for example, incorrectly, yet still be licensed to teach history to high school students.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that it requires all middle school teachers in grades 7-8 who teach core content areas to demonstrate content knowledge by either passing the Praxis II content test or earning the equivalent of a college major in that content area.

New Hampshire also noted that it has one social studies certification so that various disciplines can reinforce one another rather than being treated entirely separately and without reference to one another. The state has addressed the need for more specialized knowledge for courses at the high school level through improvements in certification standards, which were introduced in 2007, and through the HQT interpretation of more than one subdiscipline. New Hampshire has used the equivalent of two minors to support the need for knowledge in individual socials studies disciplines as well as the expectation that all social studies teachers know the five frameworks that are reinforced by the Praxis II content test.

LAST WORD

The state's rationale for its one social studies certification is sound. However, it will be undermined if teachers have only limited knowledge of some of the included areas that they are permitted to teach.


Figure 29		OFFERS ONLY SINGLE	Offers Beneral social studies testing without adequate
	Z Z	. / 4, 2	studi,
Do states ensure that	OFFERS GENERAL SOCI ADEQUATE LICENSE WITH) cial feque
secondary social studies	SINERA SINERA SINERA	147.	'al sc ut ac
teachers have adequate	1977 1977 1978 1978	85	(tho)
subject-matter	FERS DES ZVA;	YERS VECT	γε γ
knowledge?	953	639	
Alabama			~
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			1
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	1	3	47



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Not only does Indiana ensure that its secondary social studies teachers possess adequate content knowledge of all subjects they intend to teach through both coursework and content testingbut the state's policy also does not make it overly burdensome for social studies teachers to teach multiple subjects. Other notable states include Georgia and South Dakota, which also do not offer secondary general social studies certifications.

Figure 30 Do states ensure that middle school teachers have adequate preparation to teach social studies?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia
- 2. Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Washington
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 29

1. Massachusetts does not offer a general social studies license, but offers combination licenses.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal I – Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they will be required to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should not permit special education teachers to teach on a K-12 license that does not differentiate between the preparation of elementary teachers and that of secondary teachers.
- 2. All elementary special education candidates should have a broad liberal arts program of study that includes study in mathematics, science, English, social studies and fine arts and should be required to pass a subjectmatter test for licensure that is no less rigorous than what is required of general education candidates.
- 3. The state should require that teacher preparation programs graduate secondary special education teacher candidates who are highly qualified in at least two subjects. The state should also customize a "HOUSSE" route for new secondary special education teachers to help them achieve highly qualified status in all the subjects they teach.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal I **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Rar Raised for this Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Regrettably, New Hampshire offers a K-12 special education certification, in addition to grade-specific options.

Further, New Hampshire does not ensure that its elementary special education teacher candidates are provided with a broad liberal arts program of study relevant to the elementary classroom. It also does not require that they pass the same subject-matter test as general education candidates.

New Hampshire also fails to require that secondary special education teacher candidates are highly qualified in at least two subject areas, and it does not customize a HOUSSE route for new secondary special education teachers to help them achieve highly qualified status in all subjects they teach.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire Rules Ed 507.39

RECOMMENDATION

■ End licensure practices that fail to distinguish between the skills and knowledge needed to teach elementary grades and secondary grades.

It is virtually impossible and certainly impractical for New Hampshire to ensure that a K-12 special education teacher knows all the subject matter he or she is expected to be able to teach, especially considering state and federal expectations that special education students should meet the same high standards as other students. While the broad K-12 umbrella may be appropriate for teachers of low-incidence special education students, such as those with severe cognitive disabilities, it is deeply problematic for the overwhelming majority of high-incidence special education students, who are expected to learn grade-level content.

Provide a broad liberal arts program of study to elementary special education candidates, and require that they pass the same content test as general education teachers.

New Hampshire should ensure that special education teacher candidates who will teach elementary grades possess knowledge of the subject matter at hand. Not only should the state require core-subject coursework relevant to the elementary classroom, but it should also require that these candidates pass the same subject-matter test required of all elementary teachers. Failure to ensure that teachers possess requisite content knowledge deprives special education students of the opportunity to reach their academic potential.

Ensure that secondary special education teacher candidates graduate with highly qualified status in at least two subjects, and customize a HOUSSE route so that they can achieve highly qualified status in all subjects they plan to teach.

To make secondary special education teacher candidates more flexible and better able to serve schools and students, New Hampshire should use a combination of coursework and testing to ensure that they graduate with highly qualified status in two core academic areas. A customized HOUSSE route can also help new secondary special education teacher candidates to become highly qualified in multiple subjects by offering efficient means by which they could gain broad overviews of specific areas of content knowledge, such as content-driven university courses. Such a route is specifically permitted in the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that when special education teachers deliver direct instruction in the core content areas, the state requires that they meet HQT standards—either the Praxis II or a content major equivalent—for each area. These standards differ by the grade level of the students receiving the direct instruction.

LAST WORD

To ensure that all special education students are being taught by teachers who have the requisite subject-matter knowledge, passage of a content test should be a condition of initial licensure.






T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Unfortunately, NCTQ cannot highlight any state's policy in this area. Preparation of special education teachers remains a topic in critical need of states' attention. However, it is worth noting that three states-Louisiana, Pennsylvania and Texas—will no longer issue K-12 special education certifications. Only grade-level specific options will be available to new teachers.

Figure 33 Do states require subject-matter testing for elementary special education licenses?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon⁴, Pennsylvania⁵, Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia
- 4. Although Oregon requires testing, the state allows an "alternative assessment" option for candidates who fail the tests twice to still be considered for a license.
- 5. In Pennsylvania, a candidate who opts for dual certification in elementary special education and as a reading specialist does not have to take a content test.

Figure 32

1. Beginning January 1, 2013

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal J – Assessing Professional Knowledge

The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

 The state should assess new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning by means of a pedagogy test aligned to the state's professional standards.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal J **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not require new teachers to pass a pedagogy test in order to attain licensure.

Supporting Research

http://www.ets.org/praxis/nh/requirements

RECOMMENDATION

Require that all new teachers pass a pedagogy test.

New Hampshire should verify that all new teachers meet professional standards through a test of professional knowledge.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



Twenty-three states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it additionally commends the nine states (Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Texas) that utilize their own assessments to measure pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Figure 35

Do states measure new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia
- 2. Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah⁴, Wyoming
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 4. Not required until teacher advances from a Level One to a Level Two license.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal K - Student Teaching

The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high-quality clinical experience.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require that student teachers only be placed with cooperating teachers for whom there is evidence of their effectiveness as measured by consistent gains in student learning.
- 2. The state should require that teacher candidates spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal K **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire requires candidates to participate in a culminating field-based experience for at least one semester. During this culminating field-based experience, candidates must "engage in the full range of teaching activities, roles and responsibilities encountered in the school setting."

The state also articulates that cooperating teachers must hold an experienced educator credential in either the subject area, when the class is devoted to a particular subject area, or the level, when the class is a grade-level class in which a variety of subjects are taught.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 610.05, -.07

RECOMMENDATION

■ Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

New Hampshire's requirement that cooperating teachers have advanced credentials is insufficient. In addition to the ability to mentor an adult, cooperating teachers should also be carefully screened for their capacity to further student achievement. Research indicates that the only aspect of a student teaching arrangement that has been shown to have an impact on student achievement is the positive effect of selection of the cooperating teacher by the preparation program, rather than the student teacher or school district staff.

Explicitly require that student teaching be completed locally, thus prohibiting candidates from completing this requirement abroad.

Unless preparation programs can establish true satellite campuses to closely supervise student teaching arrangements, placement in foreign or otherwise novel locales should be supplementary to a standard student teaching arrangement. Outsourcing the arrangements for student teaching makes it impossible to ensure the selection of the best cooperating teacher and adequate supervision of the student teacher and may prevent training of the teacher on relevant state instructional frameworks.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that its Task Force on Effective Teaching begins work this year on Phase II of its charge. The product from this phase will be a framework for evaluating educators using multiple measures, including student achievement. This framework will be part of a comprehensive system of teacher effectiveness. The Phase I Task Force Report, which lays the foundation for the framework, was set to release in September. When it is available, preparation programs will be able to include it in the selection process for choosing cooperating teachers.

Figure 37		× / 52
Do states require	ź	Z / Z
the elements of a	2/5	Oa / \$\frac{\fir}{\fin}}}}}}}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\fint}}}}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\fin}}}}{\frac{\fir}}}}}}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\fir}}}}}{\firac{\frac{\frac{\fir}{\fir}}}}}}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\fir}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\fir}{\fir}}}}}}{\frac{\frac{\fir}{\firint}}}}}{\frac{\frac{\fir}{\firint}}}}{\fra
high-quality student	77 88 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	
teaching experience?	SEECTED TO THE STREET TO THE S	STUDENT TEACHING LAST
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
Iowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi		
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		1
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	2	29




EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although no state has been singled out for "best practice" honors, Florida and Tennessee require teacher candidates to complete at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching, and they have taken steps toward ensuring that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

^{1.} Candidates can student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Figure 38


Is the selection of the cooperating teacher based on some measure of effectiveness?



1. Strong Practice: Florida, Tennessee

- Alabama, Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

Figure 39
Is the summative student teaching experience of sufficient length?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia⁵, Wisconsin
- 2. Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Illinois, Maine, New Mexico, Utah
- 4. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Maryland, Montana
- 5. Candidates can student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal L – Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should collect value-added data that connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. The state should collect other meaningful data that reflects program performance, including some or all of the following:
 - a. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including basic skills, subject matter and professional knowledge tests;
 - b. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests;
 - c. Satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison;
 - d. Evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching;
 - e. Five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.
- 3. The state should establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data. Programs should be held accountable for meeting these standards, with articulated consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.
- 4. The state should produce and publish on its website an annual report card that shows all the data the state collects on individual teacher preparation programs.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 40 How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation **Program Accountability Best Practice State** Florida State Meets Goal Louisiana States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Colorado 1, Georgia 1, Tennessee, Texas States Partly Meet Goal Kentucky, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina 16 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Illinois , Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia 1 22 States Do Not Meet Goal Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, NEW HAMPSHIRE, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **1**:4 **+**: 44 **↓**:3

Area 1: Goal L **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meets Goal



Raised for this Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire's approval process for its traditional and alternate route teacher preparation programs does not hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Most importantly, New Hampshire does not collect value-added data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

The state also fails to collect other objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs, and it does not apply any transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval.

Further, in the past three years, no programs in New Hampshire have been identified as low performing—an additional indicator that programs lack accountability.

Finally, New Hampshire's website does not include a report card that allows the public to review and compare program performance.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 602 Title II State Reports https://title2.ed.gov

RECOMMENDATION

Collect data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

To ensure that programs are producing effective classroom teachers, New Hampshire should consider academic achievement gains of students taught by the programs' graduates, averaged over the first three years of teaching.

■ Gather other meaningful data that reflect program performance.

In addition to knowing whether programs are producing effective teachers, other objective, meaningful data can also indicate whether programs are appropriately screening applicants and if they are delivering essential academic and professional knowledge. New Hampshire should gather data such as the following: average raw scores of graduates on licensing tests, including basic skills, subject matter and professional knowledge tests; satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison; evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching; and five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

Establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data.

Programs should be held accountable for meeting these standards, with articulated consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval after appropriate due process.

■ Publish an annual report card on the state's website.

To inform the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing, New Hampshire should present all the data it collects on individual teacher preparation programs.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that it is in the rule-making process with increased rigor based on the InTASC standards. Rules regarding program approval will include the collection of ongoing program and candidate data.

New Hampshire also asserted that the new Title II Institutional and State Report Cards include annual goals and objectives for continuous improvement, and that the federal reports are providing more empirical evidence of program quality and improvement.

Supporting Research

Ed 505.06, -.07, 610.02, 609.01

Figure 41			ADITIONA	/		NATIVE
Do states hold teach preparation progra accountable?		PARATIO	OBECINE PROCESSI		ARATION SELVENCE SEL	
	objective modern	MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR	DATA PUBLIC AVAILABLE ON	OBJECTIVE PR	MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR	DATA PUBLIC AVAILABLE ON
Alabama						1
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut						2
Delaware District of Columbia						
Florida						1
Georgia	-					
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky						1
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan						
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE						
New Jersey						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina					- F	П
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma						
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont						
Virginia						
Washington						
West Virginia Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
rryonning						
	25	5	14	17	2	10

Reported institutional data do not distinguish between candidates in the traditional and alternate route programs.


The posted data do not allow the public to review and compare program performance because data are not disaggregated by program provider.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs. The state also relies on other objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs, and it applies transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval. Florida also posts an annual report on its website.

Figure 42 Do states use student achievement data to hold teacher preparation programs accountable?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 43

Which states collect meaningful data?

AVERAGE RAW SCORES ON LICENSING TESTS

Alabama, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, Tennessee, West Virginia

SATISFACTION RATINGS FROM SCHOOLS

Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland¹, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington¹, West Virginia

EVALUATION RESULTS FOR PROGRAM GRADUATES

Alabama, Arizona, Delaware¹, Florida, Illiniois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont

STUDENT LEARNING GAINS

Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas

TEACHER RETENTION RATES

Arizona, Colorado, Delaware¹, Missouri, New Jersey

1. For alternate route only

What is the relationship		50/	levo"	Prova	Ceolita Ceolita
between state program	Š	DARI ditati	o application		issis mac mag mag mag mag mag mag mag mag mag mag
approval and national	55				
accreditation?	77	onal o	nala,	e not	, not i
accreditation?	STATE HAS ITS OWN	National accediation	National acceptain	While not technically remin	Soughable from accordation While not technicall, required
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona ¹					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii ¹ Idaho					
Illinois ¹					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas	-				
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					$\bar{}$
Nevada					
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio ¹					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas ¹					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	23	10	4	8	6

According to information posted on NCATE's website.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal A – Alternate Route Eligibility

The state should require alternate route programs to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. With some accommodation for work experience, alternate route programs should screen candidates for academic ability, such as requiring a minimum 2.75 overall college GPA
- 2. All alternate route candidates, including elementary candidates and those having a major in their intended subject area, should be required to pass the state's subject-matter licensing test.
- Alternate route candidates lacking a major in the intended subject area should be able to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge by passing a test of sufficient rigor.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 2: Goal A **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

The admission requirements for New Hampshire's alternate route programs are not consistently selective nor flexible to the needs of non-traditional candidates.

New Hampshire has four alternate routes: Alternative 3A, Alternative 3B, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. Candidates for Alternative 3A, 3B and 4 are not required to demonstrate prior academic performance, such as a minimum GPA, as an entrance standard for the alternate route program. Candidates for Alternative 5 must have a minimum 2.5 GPA; however, individuals who fail to meet this requirement may still qualify if all other requirements are met and the individual has graduated more than five years ago and has occupational experience totaling more than five years directly related to the area to be taught.

All alternative routes require applicants to pass a test of basic skills and demonstrate content knowledge on a subject-matter test. For Alternative 3A, 4 and 5, candidates with a master's degree are exempt from both tests; this exemption does not apply to applicants seeking certification in elementary or early childhood education.

Alternative 3B recognizes national licensure, namely that acquired by the American Board Certification for Teacher Excellence (ABCTE). ABCTE candidates are required to pass the ABCTE Test of Professional Knowledge and an ABCTE subject-area exam.

Neither Alternative 3A nor Alternative 3B requires coursework. Candidates in the Alternative 3A route must demonstrate teacher competencies through submission of a portfolio and interview with a board of examiners and must have at least three months of full-time continuous experience as an educator in the area of endorsement.

Alternative 4 applicants must complete minimal coursework requirements in the critical shortage area that they plan to teach. Alternative 5 applicants must have a major, or 30 credit hours, in the content area they plan to teach. The state does not offer a test-out option for either Alternative 4 or Alternative 5 coursework requirements.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 602 http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/beEd.htm

RECOMMENDATION

Screen all candidates for academic ability.

New Hampshire should require that candidates to its alternate routes provide some evidence of good academic performance. While the state is recognized for requiring Alternative 5 candidates to have a minimum 2.5 GPA, the standard should be higher than what is required of traditional teacher candidates, such as a GPA of 2.75 or higher. Alternatively, the state could require one of the standardized tests of academic proficiency commonly used in higher education for graduate admissions, such as the GRE.

Require all applicants to pass a subject-matter test for admission.

The state should consider requiring all candidates, including those with a master's degree in the subject, to pass a content-knowledge test. The concept behind alternate routes is that the nontraditional candidate is able to concentrate on acquiring professional knowledge and skills because he or she has strong subject-area knowledge. Teachers without sufficient subject-matter knowledge place students at risk.

Consider flexibility in fulfilling coursework requirements.

New Hampshire should consider whether it is appropriate to allow any candidate who already has the requisite knowledge and skills to demonstrate such by passing a rigorous test. The coursework requirements for the Alternative 4 route are so minimal, in some cases as little as one course, that they are essentially ineffectual in their intent.

Eliminate basic skills test requirement.

Although New Hampshire is commended for requiring all applicants to demonstrate content knowledge on a subject-matter test, the state's requirement that alternate route candidates pass a basic skills test is impractical and ineffectual. Basic skills tests measure minimum competency—essentially those skills that a person should have acquired in middle school. The state should eliminate the basic skills test requirement or, at a minimum, accept the equivalent in SAT, ACT or GRE scores.


NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire reiterated that Alternative 5 candidates must have a content major or 30 hours in the subject area prior to being eligible for an intern license. The state added that if an Alternative 5 candidate has a master's degree, then a transcript analysis is performed "to determine if there is adequate coursework in the subject area endorsement being pursued. If the coursework is incomplete the candidate would be required to take the Praxis II."

New Hampshire also asserted that it will waive the basic skills test requirement for candidates whose SAT or ACT scores demonstrate that they are in the top half of their class.



Figure 47



 Strong Practice: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island. Tennessee

too low²

 Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia, Wyoming

EXCEEDS THAT


OF TRADITIONAL

PROGRAMS1

- Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 48

Do states ensure that alternate route teachers have subject-matter knowledge?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut⁴, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois⁴, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 2. State does not require test at all, exempts some candidates or does not require passage until program completion. Alaska, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 4. Required prior to entering the classroom.

Figure 46


1. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.



The **District of Columbia** and **Michigan** require candidates to demonstrate above-average academic performance as conditions of admission to an alternate route program, with both requiring applicants to have a minimum 3.0 GPA. In addition, neither state requires a content-specific major; subject-area knowledge is demonstrated by passing a test, making their alternate routes flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

Figure 49

Do states accommodate the nontraditional background of alternate route candidates?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut⁶, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Virginia, Washington
- Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Wisconsin
- 5. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 6. Test out option available to candidates in shortage areas only.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal B – Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide streamlined preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should ensure that the amount of coursework it either requires or allows is manageable for a novice teacher. Anything exceeding 12 credit hours of coursework in the first year may be counterproductive, placing too great a burden on the teacher. This calculation is premised on no more than six credit hours in the summer, three in the fall and three in the spring.
- 2. The state should ensure that alternate route programs offer accelerated study not to exceed six (three credit) courses for secondary teachers and eight (three credit) courses for elementary teachers (exclusive of any credit for practice teaching or mentoring) over the duration of the program. Programs should be limited to two years, at which time the new teacher should be eligible for a standard certificate.
- All coursework requirements should target the immediate needs of the new teacher (e.g., seminars with other grade-level teachers, training in a particular curriculum, reading instruction and classroom management techniques).
- 4. The state should ensure that candidates have an opportunity to practice teach in a summer training program. Alternatively, the state can require an intensive mentoring experience, beginning with a trained mentor assigned full time to the new teacher for the first critical weeks of school and then gradually reduced. The state should support only induction strategies that can be effective even in a poorly managed school: intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 50 How States are Faring in Alternate Route Preparation **Best Practice State** Connecticut States Meet Goal Arkansas, Delaware 1, Georgia, New Jersey States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Florida, Maryland 1, Mississippi, Rhode Island 1, South Carolina, Virginia 11 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, California, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Nevada 1, New Mexico, New York, Ohio 1, South Dakota, West Virginia 18 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa↓, Kansas 1, Michigan 1, Minnesota 1, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming 10 States Do Not Meet Goal Hawaii, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, **NEW HAMPSHIRE**, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Vermont, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **1**:8 **+** : 42 **↓**:1

Area 2: Goal B **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not ensure that its alternate route candidates will receive streamlined preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers.

There are no specific coursework requirements outlined for Alternative Route 3A. Candidates provide evidence of competence for each required standard through a written portfolio and participation in a half-day oral examination. There is no requirement for practice teaching or induction support.

American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) candidates do not have traditional coursework requirements and do not have a practice-teaching experience or mentor.

Candidates in Alternative Routes 4 and 5 work with their school districts to develop a plan that meets New Hampshire's teacher competencies. Candidates receive a mentor for the full time they are participating in their program.

Candidates in all routes are eligible for certification upon completion of program requirements.

Supporting Research

Administrative Rules for Education 505.03; 505.04; 505.05

RECOMMENDATION

Establish coursework guidelines for all alternate route preparation programs.

The state should articulate guidelines regarding the nature and amount of coursework required of candidates. Requirements should be manageable and contribute to the immediate needs of new teachers. Appropriate coursework should include grade-level or subject-level seminars, methodology in the content area, classroom management, assessment and scientifically based early reading instruction.

■ Ensure program completion in less than two years.

New Hampshire should consider shortening the length of time it takes an alternate route teacher to earn standard certification. The route should allow candidates to earn full certification no later than the end of the second year of teaching.

Extend mentoring to all alternate route teachers.

While New Hampshire is recognized for requiring Alternates Route 4 and 5 teachers to work with a mentor, ABCTE and Alternate Route 3A teachers should also receive this support. In addition, the state should consider providing sufficient guidelines to ensure that induction is structured for new teacher success. Effective strategies include practice teaching prior to teaching in the classroom, intensive mentoring with full classroom support in the first few weeks or months of school, a reduced teaching load and release time to allow new teachers to observe experienced teachers during each school day. Alternatively, the state may want to consider providing candidates with practice-teaching opportunities prior to entering the classroom.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that "Alternatives 3A, 4, and 5 are all based on the certification standards for each endorsement. The routes allow candidates the flexibility to pursue coursework, assessment of prior knowledge, professional learning, and supervised on-the-job training with mentoring to demonstrate the evidence of competency. Students are able to complete the Alternative 4 route in less than 3 years but no more than 3 years. The Alternative 5 route must be completed in 2 years."





TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE


Connecticut ensures that its alternate route provides streamlined preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers. The state requires a manageable number of credit hours, relevant coursework, a field placement and intensive mentoring. Other notable states include Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia and New Jersey. These states provide streamlined, relevant coursework with intensive mentoring.

^{1.} Florida requires practice teaching or intensive mentoring.

² North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 52


Do states curb excessive coursework requirements?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia
- 2. Indiana, Nevada, Wyoming
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 53

Do states require practice teaching or intensive mentoring?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia
- Strong Practice: Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey, New York, West Virginia
- 3. Strong Practice: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida⁶, Maryland, Massachusetts
- Alabama, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- $5.\ North$ Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 6. Candidates are required to have one or the other, not both.



Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal C – Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from regulatory obstacles that limit its usage and providers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should not treat the alternate route as a program of last resort or restrict the availability of alternate routes to certain subjects, grades or geographic areas.
- 2. The state should allow districts and nonprofit organizations other than institutions of higher education to operate alternate route programs.
- 3. The state should ensure that its alternate route has no requirements that would be difficult to meet for a provider that is not an institution of higher education (e.g., an approval process based on institutional accreditation).

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 2: Goal C **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not limit the usage or providers of its alternate routes.

New Hampshire is commended for having no restrictions on the usage of its alternate routes with regard to subject, grade or geographic areas. Alternative Route 4 is an exception; it can only be used for certification in critical shortage areas.

The state allows a diversity of providers, including local school districts and the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE). The state is commended for structuring its programs to allow a diversity of providers. A good diversity of providers helps all programs, both university- and non-university-based, to improve.

Supporting Research

http://www.education.nh.gov/certification/documents/certiappendinstr.pdf Education Rule 505.03

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.





T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Twenty-six states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends all states that permit both broad usage and a diversity of providers for their alternate routes.

Figure 56 Can alternate route teachers teach any subject or grade anywhere in the state?





Figure 55 and 56

- 1. Alabama offers routes without restrictions for candidates with master's degrees. The route for candidates with bachelor's degrees is limited to
- 2. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 57

Do states permit providers other than colleges or universities?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 2. Strong Practice: California, Colorado, Georgia, North Carolina, Vermont⁵, West Virginia
- Alabama, Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho⁶, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi⁶, Missouri⁶, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey⁷, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina⁶, South Dakota, Utah⁶, Wyoming
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 5. Districts can run Peer Review programs only.
- 6. ABCTE is also an approved provider.
- 7. Permits school districts to provide programs without university partnerships in some circumstances.

GENUINE OR NEARLY
GENUINE ALTERNATEROUTE Offered route is disingenuous Figure 58 Alternate oute that need significant improvements Do states provide real alternative pathways to certification? Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois П Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada **NEW HAMPSHIRE** New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota¹ Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 7 25 18

Figure 58

1. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

hat are the	É			7	RSEW.	XON /			"DERS
naracteristics of	,6	Ž / 5	NED /	ځ / څ			Ĕ / Ē	10/	/ 0/
ates' alternate	15/16				් / වි	, \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		A 4	40
outes?	PREREQUISITE OF CT.	NATTER KNOW OF SUIT	AVAILABILITY OF TEC.	STREAMINED CO.	- CURSENORA RELEVANT COURSE	REASONABLE PROCRAM LE	PRACTICE NTENSIVE	BROAD USAGE] DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS
Alabama		/ <		<u></u> α				/ &a	
Alaska									
Arizona									
Arkansas									
California									
Colorado									
Connecticut					_		_	_	
Delaware									
District of Columbia									
Florida								-	
Georgia Hawaii									
Idaho									
Illinois									
Indiana									
lowa									
Kansas									
Kentucky									
Louisiana									
Maine									
Maryland									
Massachusetts									
Michigan									
Minnesota									
Mississippi									
Missouri									
Montana									
Nebraska									
Nevada									
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
New Jersey									
New Mexico									
New York									
North Carolina									
North Dakota Ohio									
Oklahoma									
Oregon									
Pennsylvania									
Rhode Island									
South Carolina									
South Dakota									
Tennessee									
Texas									
Utah									
Vermont									
Virginia									
Washington									
West Virginia									
Wisconsin									
Wyoming									

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal D – Part-Time Teaching Licenses

The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Either through a discrete license or by waiving most licensure requirements, the state should authorize individuals with content expertise to teach as part-time instructors.
- 2. All candidates for a part-time teaching license should be required to pass a subject-matter test.
- 3. Other requirements for this license should be limited to those addressing public safety (e.g., background screening) and those of immediate use to the novice instructor (e.g., classroom management training).

Background



Area 2: Goal D New Hampshire Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal Progress Since 2009



ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part time.

RECOMMENDATION

Offer a license that allows content experts to serve as part-time instructors.

New Hampshire should permit individuals with deep subject-area knowledge to teach a limited number of courses without fulfilling a complete set of certification requirements. The state should verify content knowledge through a rigorous test and conduct background checks as appropriate, while waiving all other licensure requirements. Such a license would increase districts' flexibility to staff certain subjects, including many STEM areas, that are frequently hard to staff or may not have high enough enrollment to necessitate a full-time position.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire stated that background checks are required for all educators. The state also asserted that any content expert may pursue alternative certification. "Additionally, schools are allowed to place professionals in a given field in a position for one year. The professional could choose to pursue licensure after the first year."

Supporting Research RSA 189:39-b

LAST WORD

A part-time instructor certificate would fill the gap between placing unlicensed professionals in shortterm positions and standard certification for all teachers, whether through a traditional or an alternate route. This license would allow content experts who may not be interested in teaching full time and thus are unlikely to be willing to complete a preparation program, even through an alternate route, to teach.

Figure 61 Do states offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part-time? YES No Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Mass a chusettsMichigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada **NEW HAMPSHIRE** New Jersey New Mexico New York 2 North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia 2 Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 16 35



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Arkansas offers a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time. Individuals seeking this license must pass a subject-matter test and are also required to complete specially-designed pedagogy training that is not overly burdensome.

^{1.} License has restrictions.

^{2.} It appears that the state has a license that may be used for this purpose; guidelines are vague.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal E – Licensure Reciprocity

The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should offer a standard license to fully certified teachers moving from other states, without relying on transcript analysis or recency requirements as a means of judging eligibility. The state can and should require evidence of good standing in previous employment.
- 2. The state should uphold its standards for all teachers by insisting that certified teachers coming from other states meet the incoming state's testing requirements.
- The state should accord the same license to teachers from other states who completed an approved alternate route program that it accords teachers prepared in a traditional preparation program.

Background



Area 2: Goal E **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not support licensure reciprocity for certified teachers from other states.

Regrettably, New Hampshire grants a waiver for its licensing tests to out-of-state teachers who have taught for seven years or who have received a master's degree.

Teachers with comparable out-of-state certificates are eligible for New Hampshire's standard certificate. There is no state-mandated recency requirement; however, transcripts are required for all applicants. It is not clear whether the state analyzes transcripts to determine whether a teacher was prepared through a traditional or alternate route or whether additional coursework will be required.

New Hampshire is also a participant in the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement; however, the latest iteration of this agreement no longer purports to be a reciprocity agreement among states and thus is no longer included in this analysis.

Supporting Research

Alternative 2 Regulation and Application Instructions, Ed 505.02

www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/programsupport/Certification/alternative2.htm

RECOMMENDATION

■ To uphold standards, require that teachers coming from other states meet testing requirements.

New Hampshire takes considerable risk by granting a waiver for its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher with a master's degree or seven years of experience. The state should not provide any waivers of its teacher tests unless an applicant can provide evidence of a passing score under its own standards. The negative impact on student learning stemming from a teacher's inadequate subject-matter knowledge is not mitigated by the teacher's having experience or an advanced degree.

Accord the same license to out-of-state alternate route teachers as would be accorded to traditionally prepared teachers.

New Hampshire should consider discontinuing its requirement for the submission of transcripts. Transcript analysis is likely to result in additional coursework requirements, even for traditionally prepared teachers; alternate route teachers, on the other hand, may have to virtually begin anew, repeating some, most or all of a teacher preparation program in New Hampshire.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alabama and Texas appropriately support licensure reciprocity by only requiring certified teachers from other states to meet each state's own testing requirements and by not specifying any additional coursework or recency requirements to determine eligibility for either traditional or alternate route teachers.

Figure 63 Do states require all out-of-state teachers to pass their licensure tests?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York³, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania³, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington³, Wisconsin
- 2. Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana⁴, Nebraska⁴, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia. West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Exception for teachers with National Board Certification.
- 4. No subject-matter testing for any teacher certification.

Figure 64

- 1. For traditionally prepared teachers only.
- 2. Transcript review required for those with less than 3 years experience.



Figure 65	FOUNLLY FRACHERS	;t 3te	State his policies with the policies four teachers
Do states treat out-of-sta	te 💆	tem.	with obst
teachers the same whether	er 💆	S diff	cies de te
they were prepared in a	E473	cifie ints /	, 00/1 10 01 10 01
traditional or an alternate	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	e spe reme react	e ha Itial Iman
route program?	5747	Stat equil oute	State ha Potential for alterna
Alabana	- 44 /	_ 5 /	7.0
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Virginia			
Washington			
_			
Washington			
Washington West Virginia			

Goal A – State Data Systems

The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should establish a longitudinal data system with at least the following key components:
 - a. A unique statewide student identifier number that connects student data across key databases across years;
 - b. A unique teacher identifier system that can match individual teacher records with individual student records; and
 - c. An assessment system that can match individual student test records from year to year in order to measure academic growth.
- 2. Value-added data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be considered among the criteria used to determine teachers' effectiveness.
- 3. To ensure that data provided through the state data system is actionable and reliable, the state should have a clear definition of "teacher of record" and require its consistent use statewide.

Background



Area 3: Goal A **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire has a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

New Hampshire has all three necessary elements of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. The state has assigned unique student identifiers that connect student data across key databases across years and has assigned unique teacher identifiers that enable the state to match individual teacher records with individual student records. The state also has the capacity to match student test records from year to year in order to measure student academic growth.

Supporting Research

Data Quality Campaign www.dataqualitycampaign.org

RECOMMENDATION

■ Develop a clear definition of "teacher of record."

New Hampshire has not yet established a definition of teacher of record, which is essential in order to use the student-data link for the purpose of providing value-added evidence of teacher effectiveness. To ensure that data provided through the state data system are actionable and reliable, New Hampshire should articulate a definition of teacher of record and require its consistent use throughout the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. New Hampshire added that it is working to refine its longstanding practice for assigning "teacher of record." Teacher of record is currently defined as the educator delivering direct instruction in a content area and assigning grades to that content or course.





TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends the 35 states that have a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Key

indicates that the state assigns teacher identification numbers, but it cannot match individual teacher records with individual student records.

Goal B – Evaluation of Effectiveness

The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion or specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Evaluation instruments, whether state or locally developed, should be structured to preclude a teacher from receiving a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.
- 2. Evaluation instruments should require classroom observations that focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.
- 3. Teacher evaluations should consider objective evidence of student learning, including not only standardized test scores but also classroom-based artifacts such as tests, quizzes and student work.
- 4. The state should require that evaluation instruments differentiate among various levels of teacher performance. A binary system that merely categorizes teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is inadequate.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background



Area 3: Goal B **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Bar Raised for this Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not require that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations.

The state gives local school boards the authority to set policies for teacher evaluations and gives school principals the responsibility to conduct these personnel evaluations, yet the board is silent about the content of and the expectation for these evaluations.

Supporting Research

Part Ed 303 Duties of School Boards: 303.01 (a)
Part Ed 304 Duties of School Principals: 304.01 (c)

RECOMMENDATION

Require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

New Hampshire should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion, or it should specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Whether state or locally developed, a teacher should not be able to receive a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.

Ensure that classroom observations specifically focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.

New Hampshire should not only require that its evaluations include classroom observations, but also the state should specifically articulate that these observations focus on effectiveness of instruction. The primary component of a classroom observation should be the quality of instruction, as measured by student time on task, student grasp or mastery of the lesson objective and efficient use of class time.

Utilize rating categories that meaningfully differentiate among various levels of teacher performance.

To ensure that the evaluation instrument accurately differentiates among levels of teacher performance, New Hampshire should require districts to utilize multiple rating categories, such as highly effective, effective, needs improvement and ineffective. A binary system that merely categorizes teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is inadequate.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that its Task Force on Teaching Effectiveness has defined effective teaching, and is working to develop a system of educator effectiveness, which will include a framework for teacher evaluation using multiple measures of student achievement outcomes. In addition, New Hampshire's Accountability Task Force has developed a growth model for measuring student outcomes, which will drive the achievement component of the teacher evaluation framework.

Figure 69	REQUIRES THAT STUDENT THE PREPONDERANT COORTH S	<i>≥</i> / .	/	/
Do states consider	77.87	Teacher evaluations are to be strike ment solver.	Teacher eraluations must student learning evidence of	Student achievement data
	250 F 25 E	15 are 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	rs mu iden	emt de
classroom effectiveness	7 4 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	uatio, nom,	uatio ive en	/ wew
as part of teacher	SES TI		evali, bject amin	achje ed
evaluations?	WENT PER P	acher iificar int ac	acher ude o	dent equij
	A 5 年	sign stude	indi stude	Student achie
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia ¹				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				<u>_</u>
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				_
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York	Ī		Ī	
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
				_
Wisconsin				
Wisconsin Wyoming	12	5	7	



****** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ has not singled out any one state for "best practice" honors. Many states have made significant strides in the area of teacher evaluation by requiring that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion. Because there are many different approaches that result in student learning being the preponderant criterion, all 10 states that meet this goal are commended for their efforts.

Figure 70

Using state data in teacher evaluations

States with Requirements for Student Achievement Data but Lacking Data **System Capacity**

Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, Nevada

States with Data System Capacity but No Student Achievement Requirements

Alabama, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, NEW HAMPSHIRE, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

Figure 69

^{1.} District of Columbia Public Schools requires that student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations.


Figure 71
Sources of objective evidence of student learning

Many educators struggle to identify possible sources of objective student data. Here are some examples:

- Standardized test scores
- Periodic diagnostic assessments
- Benchmark assessments that show student growth
- Artifacts of student work connected to specific student learning standards that are randomly selected for review by the principal or senior faculty, scored using rubrics and descriptors
- Examples of typical assignments, assessed for their quality and rigor
- Periodic checks on progress with the curriculum coupled with evidence of student mastery of the curriculum from quizzes, tests and exams

Figure 72

Do states require more than two categories for teacher evaluation ratings?



- Strong Practice: Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington
- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 73		Sate-designed teacher	District-designed System	District-designed Timinal Input & System	Him /
Do states direct how	Single statewise teacher	· / 5	t op 1	· / ,	ate /
eachers should be	teac	/ 1/2		, ale	nst.
	ite y	11 / 12 / 12 / 12 / 12 / 12 / 12 / 12 /		ite. / ite.	§ / 5
evaluated?	ite.	Sign Nwi	\ \frac{1}{2} \)000
	est, ttior,	, de	trict ister	'ict'.	t _{et}
	ijugi Aluč	State /	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \) istr	/ %0
	੍ਹੇ 	, , <u>e</u>		/ ~ E	No state policy
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida			1		
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho			<u> </u>		
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky			1		
Louisiana					
Maine	_				
Maryland			1		
Massachusetts					
Michigan		2			
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska			1		
Nevada					
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island		2			
South Carolina		2			
South Dakota					
Tennessee		2			
Texas		2			
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
			24		

^{1.} State approval required.

^{2.} The state model is presumptive; districts need state approval to opt out.

Goal C – Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that all teachers receive a formal evaluation rating each year.
- While all teachers should have multiple observations that contribute to their formal evaluation rating, the state should ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 74 How States are Faring in Frequency of Evaluations **Best Practice States** States Meet Goal Alabama 1, Idaho, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee 1, Washington 13 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Colorado 1, Delaware 1, Florida 1, Georgia, Indiana ♠, Minnesota ♠, New York, North Carolina 1, Ohio 1, Pennsylvania, Utah 1, Wyoming States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana 1, Maryland, Michigan 1, Nebraska, South Carolina, West Virginia States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arkansas↓, Missouri 18 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, NEW HAMPSHIRE, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **1**:13 **↓**:1 ← : 37

Area 3: Goal C **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not address the number of times teachers must be evaluated.

RECOMMENDATION

Require annual formal evaluations for all teachers.

All teachers in New Hampshire should be evaluated annually. Rather than treated as mere formalities, these teacher evaluations should serve as important tools for rewarding good teachers, helping average teachers improve and holding weak teachers accountable for poor performance.

Base evaluations on multiple observations.

To guarantee that annual evaluations are based on an adequate collection of information, New Hampshire should require multiple observations for all teachers, even those who have nonprobationary status.

■ Ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

It is critical that schools and districts closely monitor the performance of new teachers. New Hampshire should ensure that its new teachers get the support they need and that supervisors know early on which new teachers may be struggling or at risk for unacceptable levels of performance.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that its Task Force on Teaching Effectiveness has defined effective teaching, and is working to develop a system of educator effectiveness, which will include a framework for teacher evaluation using multiple measures of student achievement outcomes. In addition, New Hampshire's Accountability Task Force has developed a growth model for measuring student outcomes, which will drive the achievement component of the teacher evaluation framework.






T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although not awarding "best practice" honors for frequency of evaluations, NCTQ commends all nine states that meet this goal not only by requiring annual evaluations for all teachers, but also for ensuring that new teachers are observed and receive feedback during the first half of the school year.

Figure 76

Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?



Figures 75 and 76

- Although highly effective teachers are only required to receive a summative evaluation once every two years, the student improvement component is evaluated annually.
- 2. All District of Columbia Public Schools teachers are evaluated at least annually.

Figure 77


Do states require classroom observations?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska⁴, Arkansas, Colorado⁴, Delaware, Florida⁴, Georgia, Kentucky⁴, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri⁴, Nevada⁴, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon⁴, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia⁴
- Arizona, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin
- 3. District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. For new teachers.

Figure 78

Do states require that new teachers are observed early in the year?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, Newada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia
- 2. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal D - Tenure

The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- A teacher should be eligible for tenure after a certain number of years of service, but tenure should not be granted automatically at that juncture.
- 2. Evidence of effectiveness should be the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
- The state should articulate a process, such as a hearing, that local districts must administer in considering the evidence and deciding whether a teacher should receive tenure.
- 4. The minimum years of service needed to achieve tenure should allow sufficient data to be accumulated on which to base tenure decisions; five years is the ideal minimum.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background



Area 3: Goal D **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal Bar Raised for this Goal Progress Since 2009





ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not connect tenure decisions to evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Teachers in New Hampshire are awarded tenure automatically after a five-year probationary period, absent an additional process that evaluates cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Supporting Research

S.B. 196, amending New Hampshire Code Section 189:14-a

RECOMMENDATION

End the automatic awarding of tenure.

The decision to grant tenure should be a deliberate one, based on consideration of a teacher's commitment and actual evidence of classroom effectiveness.

- Ensure evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
 - New Hampshire should make evidence of effectiveness, rather than the number of years in the classroom, the most significant factor when determining this leap in professional standing.
- Articulate a process that local districts must administer when deciding which teachers get

New Hampshire should require a clear process, such as a hearing, to ensure that the local district reviews a teacher's performance before making a determination regarding tenure.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire was helpful in providing NCTQ with the facts necessary for this analysis. The state added that it also requires districts to have a teacher evaluation policy.

polici Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon	y year	years	years		
Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina Morth Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Illinois					
Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Maryland					
Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Montana Nebraska Nevada New HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Nebraska					
Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
NEW HAMPSHIRE New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
New York					
North Carolina			-		
North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma					
Ohio Oklahoma					
Oklahoma \Box					
			1		
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					2
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah 🗌					
Vermont					
Virginia 🗌					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					

Figure 80

Teachers may also earn career status with an average rating of at least effective for a four-year period and a rating of at least effective for the last two years.

^{2.} Teachers who receive two years of ineffective evaluations are dismissed.





T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Michigan has increased its probationary period to five years and requires that evidence of effectiveness be the primary criterion in awarding tenure.

Figure 82 How are tenure decisions made?




Figure 81

- 1. No state-level policy; however, the contract between DCPS and the teachers' union represents significant advancement in the area of
- 2. The state has created a loophole by essentially waiving student learning requirements and allowing the principal of a school to petition for career-teacher status.

Goal E – Licensure Advancement

The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should base advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license on evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- 2. The state should not require teachers to fulfill generic, unspecified coursework requirements to advance from a probationary to a nonprobationary license.
- The state should not require teachers to have an advanced degree as a condition of professional licensure.
- 4. Evidence of effectiveness should be a factor in the renewal of a professional license.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background



Area 3: Goal E **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Raised for this Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire's requirements for licensure advancement and renewal are not based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

In New Hampshire, to advance from a Beginning Educator Certificate to an Experienced Educator Certificate, teachers are required to have at least three years' full-time teaching experience.

New Hampshire does not include evidence of effectiveness as a factor in the renewal of a professional license. Teachers must renew their licenses every three years. New Hampshire teachers employed by a public school, or a private school covered by the New Hampshire Master Plan for professional development, need to complete the program created by their local professional development committee. All other teachers must complete 75 hours of approved continuing education credits in the previous three years for renewal.

Supporting Research

http://www.education.nh.gov/certification/index.htm

RECOMMENDATION

- Require evidence of effectiveness as a part of teacher licensing policy.
 - New Hampshire should require evidence of teacher effectiveness to be a factor in determining whether teachers can renew their licenses or advance to a higher-level license.
- Discontinue licensure requirements with no direct connection to classroom effectiveness.

While targeted requirements may potentially expand teacher knowledge and improve teacher practice, New Hampshire's general, nonspecific coursework requirements for license advancement and renewal merely call for teachers to complete a certain amount of seat time. These requirements do not correlate with teacher effectiveness.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire asserted that its administrative rules governing professional development requirements for license renewal require that activities link to school and district goals as well as the individual's endorsement area. Job-embedded professional learning is encouraged and the approved activities should link to the goals contained in the Individual Professional Development Plans. Plans are to be based on data regarding student performance at the school and classroom level.

Supporting Research

Ed 512

Figure 84	OBECTIVE EVIDENCE OF	9	Consideration Bisen to teacher	re is
Do states require teache	rs &	Some objective evidence of		Performance not considered
to show evidence of	S PC	7. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	iven t	om er
effectiveness before	FVID FSS/	tive s	fon g	
conferring professional	TVEN.	objec _s	iderat mang 'to cl) object
licensure?	FECT	ective /	t tie	John J
	- E	/ /	~ 6	/ &
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois ¹				
Indiana				
Iowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland ²				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	3	3	11	34




T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Rhode Island is integrating certification, certification renewal and educator evaluation. Teachers who receive poor evaluations for five consecutive years are not eligible to renew their certification. In addition, teachers who consistently receive 'highly effective' ratings will be eligible for a special license designation.

Figure 85

Do states require teachers to earn advanced degrees before conferring professional licensure?




- 1. Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, New York and Oregon all require a master's degree or coursework equivalent to a master's degree
- 2. Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Tennessee
- 3. Alabama, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio. South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia
- 4. Strong Practice: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

- 1. Illinois allows revocation of licenses based on ineffectiveness.
- 2. Maryland uses some objective evidence through their evaluation system for renewal, but advancement to professional license is still based on earning an advanced degree.

Figure 86


Do states require teachers to take additional, nonspecific coursework before conferring or renewing professional licenses?



- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 2. Strong Practice: California, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island

Figure 87

Do states award lifetime professional licenses?



- 1. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal F – Equitable Distribution

The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

The state should make the following data publicly available:

- 1. An "Academic Quality" index for each school that includes factors research has found to be associated with teacher effectiveness, such as:
 - a. percentage of new teachers;
 - b. percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once;
 - c. percentage of teachers on emergency credentials;
 - d. average selectivity of teachers' undergraduate institutions; and
 - e. teachers' average ACT or SAT scores;
- The percentage of highly qualified teachers disaggregated by both individual school and by teaching area;
- The annual teacher absenteeism rate reported for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school;
- 4. The average teacher turnover rate for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school, by district and by reasons that teachers leave.

Background



Area 3: Goal F **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Providing comprehensive reporting may be the state's most important role for ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers among schools. New Hampshire does not report school-level data that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

New Hampshire does not collect or publicly report most of the data recommended by NCTQ. The state does not provide a school-level teacher quality index that demonstrates the academic backgrounds of a school's teachers and the ratio of new to veteran teachers. New Hampshire also does not report on teacher absenteeism or turnover rates.

New Hampshire does report on the percentages of highly qualified teachers and teachers with three years or less teaching experience. These data are reported for each school in the states' highly qualified teacher plan, but have not been updated since December 2006.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire's Highly Qualified Teacher Plan (Nov 06) http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/nh.pdf
New Hampshire's Equity Plan (Jan 07) http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/nhep.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Use a teacher quality index to report publicly about each school.

A teacher quality index, such as the one developed by the Illinois Education Research Council, with data including teachers' average SAT or ACT scores, the percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once, the selectivity of teachers' undergraduate colleges and the percentage of new teachers, can shine a light on how equitably teachers are distributed both across and within districts. New Hampshire should ensure that individual school report cards include such data in a manner that translates these factors into something easily understood by the public, such as a color-coded matrix indicating a school's high or low score.

Publish other data that facilitate comparisons across schools.

New Hampshire should collect and report other school-level data that reflect the stability of a school's faculty, including the rates of teacher absenteeism and turnover.

Provide comparative data based on school demographics.

Providing comparative data for schools with similar poverty and minority populations would yield an even more comprehensive picture of gaps in the equitable distribution of teachers.

Ensure that data are current.

It is important to keep data updated and current in order to provide the public with an accurate picture of teacher distribution across schools in districts. New Hampshire should update the data it reports on the percentage of highly qualified teachers, as the state has not done so since 2006.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

102 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 NEW HAMPSHIRE

Figure 89	4V NV EX FOR EACH SCHOOL	/	PERCEIVINGE OF ME.	·s /	/	/	
Do states publicly	25,0	PROCENTAGE OF TEAC.	%	CHER.	ANNUAL TURNOVER	TEACHER ABSENTEES	RATE
report school-level	2 Z Z Z C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	. / 🖔	\$	PERCENTAGE OF HIGH		\\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\	Weis
data about teachers?	V OF S					' / 'L'N';	Ī
data about teachers.				7 Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z		485	
	10 1 × 1 × 1 × 1 × 1 × 1 × 1 × 1 × 1 × 1		ENT	CEN,	VCA.	HER	
	4 E S Z \	ENE E	PERC	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \	/ 🔻 /	ZZ .	
Alabama							
Alaska							
Arizona							
Arkansas							
California							
Colorado							
Connecticut							
Delaware							
District of Columbia							
Florida							
Georgia							
Hawaii							
Idaho							
Illinois							
Indiana							
lowa							
Kansas							
Kentucky							
Louisiana							
Maine							
Maryland							
Massachusetts							
Michigan Minnesota							
Mississippi							
Missouri							
Montana							
Nebraska							
Nevada							
NEW HAMPSHIRE							
New Jersey	- n						
New Mexico		$\overline{\Box}$			$\overline{\Box}$	$\overline{}$	
New York							
North Carolina							
North Dakota							
Ohio							
Oklahoma							
Oregon							
Pennsylvania							
Rhode Island							
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas							
Utah							
Vermont							
Virginia							
Washington							
West Virginia Wisconsin							
Wyoming							
vvyorimig							
	0	18	10	41	6	5	



No state has an outstanding record when it comes to public reporting of teacher data that can help to ameliorate inequities in teacher quality. However, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island and South Carolina report more school-level data than other states.

Ideally, percentage of new teachers and percentage of teachers on emergency credentials would be incorporated into a teacher quality index.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal A - Induction

The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-needs schools.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should ensure that new teachers receive mentoring of sufficient frequency and duration, especially in the first critical weeks of school.
- Mentors should be carefully selected based on evidence of their own classroom effectiveness and subject-matter expertise. Mentors should be trained, and their performance as mentors should be evaluated.
- 3. Induction programs should include only strategies that can be successfully implemented, even in a poorly managed school. Such strategies include intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers.

Background



Area 4: Goal A **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not require a mentoring program or any other induction support for its new teachers.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that a high-quality mentoring experience is available to all new teachers, especially those in low-performing schools.

New Hampshire should ensure that all new teachers—and especially any teacher in a low-performing school—receive mentoring support, especially in the first critical weeks of school.

Set specific parameters.

To ensure that all teachers receive high-quality mentoring, the state should specify how long the program lasts for a new teacher, who selects the mentors and a method of performance evaluation.

Require induction strategies that can be successfully implemented, even in poorly managed schools.

To ensure that the experience is meaningful, New Hampshire should guarantee that induction includes strategies such as intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area and a reduced teaching load and/or frequent release time to observe other teachers.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. New Hampshire also noted that the state's task force on teaching effectiveness will issue recommendations in its upcoming report. The report will be delivered to the State Board of Education and the Professional Standards Board for policy recommendations.


106 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 NEW HAMPSHIRE

igure 91 Po states have policies that articulate the	MENTORING FOR ALL NEW	MENTORING OF SUFFICE.	MENTORING PROLITION BEGINNING PROLITION	CARFU SUCTION	MENTORS MUCE.	MENTONSPROGRAM.	MENTOR IS COM.	USE OF A MARETY OF EFFECTIVE
	, FOR	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \						TABLET STATES
lements of effective	S. W.C	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\		SELECT N	ls M	SS/PR) \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	\ \frac{40}{2} \
nduction?	MENTC TEACHER	MENTO FREQUEN	MENTO, BEGINNIII	CAREFUL	MENTO	MENTO BE EVALU	MENTO	USE OF NVDUCT
Alabama								
Alaska								
Arizona								
Arkansas								
California								
Colorado								
Connecticut Delaware								
District of Columbia								
Florida								
Georgia								
Hawaii								
Idaho								
Illinois								
Indiana								
lowa								
Kansas								
Kentucky								
Louisiana	$\overline{\Box}$	$\overline{}$		$\overline{}$	$\overline{}$		$\overline{}$	_
Maine								
Maryland				$\overline{}$				
Massachusetts								
Michigan								
Minnesota								
Mississippi								
Missouri								
Montana								
Nebraska								
Nevada								
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
New Jersey								
New Mexico								
New York								
North Carolina								
North Dakota								
Ohio								
Oklahoma								
Oregon								
Pennsylvania								
Rhode Island								
South Carolina								
South Dakota								
Tennessee								
Texas								
Utah								
Vermont								
Virginia								
Washington								
West Virginia Wisconsin								
VVISCOLISITI								
Wyoming								



South Carolina requires that all new teachers, prior to the start of the school year, be assigned mentors for at least one year. Districts carefully select mentors based on experience and similar certifications and grade levels, and mentors undergo additional training. Adequate release time is mandated by the state so that mentors and new teachers may observe each other in the classroom, collaborate on effective teaching techniques and develop professional growth plans. Mentor evaluations are mandatory and stipends are recommended.

Figure 92
Do states have policies that articulate the elements of effective induction?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia
- Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Nevada, New Hampshire, Vermont, Wyoming

Goal B - Professional Development

The state should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance.
- 2. The state should direct districts to align professional development activities with findings from teachers' evaluations.

Background



Area 4: Goal B **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not have state-level policy that connects professional development to teachers' evaluations.

RECOMMENDATION

- Require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance. In order to increase their effectiveness in the classroom, teachers need to receive feedback on strengths and areas that need improvement identified in their evaluations. As such, New Hampshire should require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their classroom performance.
- Ensure that professional development is aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations. Professional development that is not informed by evaluation results may be of little value to teachers' professional growth and aim of increasing their effectiveness in the classroom. New Hampshire should ensure that districts utilize teacher evaluation results in determining professional development needs and activities.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state noted that the administrative rule, Ed 512, governing the Professional Development Master Plan is under revision. Learning Forward's new Standards for Professional Learning will help to frame modification of the rules. One goal in this revision process is to strengthen the link between evaluation systems and professional development. This linkage is a strong component of the School Improvement Grant evaluation systems that are already being implemented and will help to inform future policy changes in New Hampshire.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Ten states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, Louisiana is commended for clearly articulating that the feedback provided to a teacher in a post-observation conference must include a discussion of a teacher's strengths and weaknesses.

Figure 94 Do teachers receive feedback on their evaluations?




- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma
- 3. Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Utah
- 4. Alabama, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin



Figure 96

Do states require that teacher evaluations inform professional development?



- Strong Practice: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Wyoming
- 2. Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Texas
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi⁴, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Viiginia, Washington, West Viiginia, Wisconsin
- 4. Mississippi requires professional development based on evaluation results only for teachers in need of improvement in school identified as at-risk.

Goal C - Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- While the state may find it appropriate to articulate teachers' starting salaries, it should not require districts to adhere to a state-dictated salary schedule that defines steps and lanes and sets minimum pay at each level.
- 2. The state should discourage districts from tying additional compensation to advanced degrees. The state should eliminate salary schedules that establish higher minimum salaries or other requirements to pay more to teachers with advanced degrees.
- 3. The state should discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective. The state should eliminate salary schedules that require that the highest steps on the pay scale be determined solely be seniority.

Background



Area 4: Goal C **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not address local salary requirements, seemingly giving local districts the authority for pay scales and eliminating barriers such as state salary schedules and other regulations that control how districts pay teachers.

RECOMMENDATION

■ Discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees.

While still leaving districts the flexibility to establish their own pay scale, New Hampshire should articulate policies that definitively discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees, in light of the extensive research showing that such degrees do not have an impact on teacher effectiveness.

Discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective.

Similarly, New Hampshire should articulate policies that discourage districts from determining the highest steps on the pay scale solely by seniority.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida and Indiana allow local districts to develop their own salary schedules while preventing districts from focusing on elements not associated with teacher effectiveness. In Florida, local salary schedules must ensure that the most effective teachers receive salary increases greater than the highest annual salary adjustment available. Indiana requires local salary scales to be based on a combination of factors and limits the years of teacher experience and content-area degrees to account for no more than one-third of this calculation.

Figure 98 What role does the state		Sets minimum salay	□ DSTRICTS SET SALARY
What role does the state	E 0.	/sale	7,5%
olay in deciding teacher	ndul.	\ \mu_	25.
pay rates?	ⁿⁱ nii Sche		
	**************************************	\ \frac{s}{H} \ \	STR HED
	Sets minimum sələry schedule	rg /	477
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
Calarada			
Colorado ¹			-
Connecticut Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas	Ī	Ē	
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio Oklahoma			
Oregon Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island ²			-
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			_
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
-	16	8	27
	.0	5	

^{1.} Colorado gives districts the option of a salary schedule, a performance pay policy or a combination of both.

 $^{{\}bf 2}.$ Rhode Island requires that local district salary schedules are based on years of service, experience and training.

Figure 99	REQUIES PERCOMANCE	y ≥ /	Requires compensation
Do states discourage	J. S. W.	Z S	Sati _{li}
districts from basing	F. F.		(o)
teacher pay on advance	4 55 1		
degrees?			/ Jijes Venn
ocgrees:	# 5 Z	(ea) istri	Requ or ac
	- -	Leaves pay to district discress.	/ '&
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii Idaho			
Illinois Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island		1	
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas		2	
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	3	32	16

^{1.} Rhode Island requires local district salary schedules to include teacher "training".

^{2.} Texas has a minimum salary schedule based on years of experience. Compensation for advanced degrees is left to district discretion.

Goal D – Compensation for Prior Work Experience

The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should encourage districts to compensate new teachers with relevant prior work experience through mechanisms such as starting these teachers at an advanced step on the pay scale. Further, the state should not have regulatory language that blocks such strategies.

Background



Area 4: Goal D **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not encourage local districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience. However, the state does not seem to have regulatory language blocking such strategies.

RECOMMENDATION

New Hampshire does not meet this goal.

While still leaving districts with the flexibility to determine their own pay scales, New Hampshire should encourage districts to incorporate mechanisms such as starting these teachers at a higher salary than other new teachers. Such policies would be attractive to career changers with related work experience, such as in the STEM subjects.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


New Hampshire recognized the factually accuracy of this analysis. New Hampshire noted that there are no state regulations to limit individual districts from providing additional compensation for prior work experience. The local district contracts may give the superintendent the authority to place new hires on an appropriate step on the salary schedule.



North Carolina compensates new teachers with relevant prior-work experience by awarding them one year of experience credit for every year of full-time work after earning a bachelor's degree that is related to their area of licensure and work assignment. One year of credit is awarded for every two years of work experience completed prior to earning a bachelor's degree.

Figure 101

Do states direct districts to compensate teachers for related prior work experience?



- 1. Strong Practice: California, Delaware, Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, Washington
- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal E - Differential Pay

The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage subject areas.
- 2. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in high-need schools.
- 3. The state should not have regulatory language that would block differential pay.

Background



Area 4: Goal E **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire neither supports differential pay by which a teacher can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects nor offers incentives to teach in high-needs schools. However, the state has no regulatory language that would directly block districts from providing differential pay.

RECOMMENDATION

Support differential pay initiatives for effective teachers in both subject shortage areas and high-needs schools.

New Hampshire should encourage districts to link compensation to district needs. Such policies can help districts achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


Figure 103		HIGH NEED SCHOOLS	/	SHORTAGI SUBJECT	■ /
Do states provide				AREAS	
incentives to teach in		, 5		, 5	
high-need schools	74/	, (enes	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \	(enes	
or shortage subject	KEV		REV		boot
areas?	DIFFERENTIAL	/ ueo	DIFFERENTIAL	/ ueo	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
Alabama		Loan Forguleness		Coan Forgiveness	■ No support
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut ¹					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland ²					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada NEW HAMPSHIRE					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota ³					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont			4		
Virginia					
Washington West Virginia					
West Virginia Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
11,50111116	24	7	47		
	21	7	17	11	17

- Connecticut offers mortgage assistance and incentives to retired teachers working in shortage subject areas.
- Maryland offers tuition reimbursement for teacher retraining in specified shortage subject areas and offers a stipend for alternate route candidates teaching in shortage subject areas.
- 3. South Dakota offers signing bonuses and scholarships to fill shortages in high-need schools.
- Shortage subject area differential pay is limited to the Middle School Teacher Corps program.



Georgia supports differential pay by which teachers can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects. The state is especially commended for its new compensation strategy for math and science teachers, which moves teachers along the salary schedule rather than just providing a bonus or stipend. The state also supports differential pay initiatives to link compensation more closely with district needs and to achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers. Georgia's efforts to provide incentives for National Board Certification teachers to work in high-need schools are also noteworthy.

Figure 104 Do states support differential pay for teaching in high need schools and shortage subjects?



- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas,
- 2. Colorado, Hawaii, Maryland, North Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Idaho, Pennsylvania, Utah
- 4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia

Goal F – Performance Pay

The state should support performance pay but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support performance pay efforts, rewarding teachers for their effectiveness in the classroom.
- 2. The state should allow districts flexibility to define the criteria for performance pay provided that such criteria connect to evidence of student achievement.
- 3. Any performance pay plan should allow for the participation of all teachers, not just those in tested subjects and grades.

Background



Area 4: Goal F **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not support performance pay. The state does not have any policies in place that offer teachers additional compensation based on effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION

■ Support a performance pay plan that recognizes teachers for their effectiveness.

Whether it implements the plan at the state or local level, New Hampshire should ensure that performance pay structures thoughtfully measure classroom performance and connect student achievement to teacher effectiveness. The plan must be developed with careful consideration of available data and subsequent issues of fairness.

■ Consider piloting performance pay in a select number of school districts.

This would provide an opportunity to discover and correct any limitations in available data or methodology before implementing the plan on a wider scale.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. New Hampshire pointed out that it leaves personnel policy decisions up to local districts. State policy does not block a district's ability to implement performance pay.

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

An increasing number of states are supporting performance pay initiatives. Florida and **Indiana** are particularly noteworthy for their efforts to build performance into the salary schedule. Rather than award bonuses, teachers' salaries will be based in part on their performance in the classroom.

igure 106	PERFORMANCE FACTORES	PERCONANCE BOW	Performance pay Permi	/ρω /	Does not support Performance pay
o states support	Y.	/ 🖁	Performance pay perm.		red ii.
erformance pay?	4.0	f_{BO}^{F}	[] []	hest.	Does not support
	2 4 8 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9	\$ / \$ 8			
	934	. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	71 Page 2	e-sp.	s lugi
	PER NTO TT	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	lour lour	Stat.	. J ge J
	/	4 4	/ ~ £	/ <u>~ 6</u>	Does not support
Alabama					-
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					-
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota	_				
Mississippi					
Missouri			ī		
Montana				$\overline{\Box}$	
Nebraska ¹					
Nevada					
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	3	4	12	5	27

^{1.} Nebraska's initiative does not go into effect until 2016.

Goal G – Pension Flexibility

The state should ensure that pension systems are portable, flexible and fair to all teachers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. Participants in the state's pension system should have the option of a fully portable pension system as their primary pension plan by means of a defined contribution plan or a defined benefit plan that is formatted similar to a cash balance plan.
- 2. Participants in the state's pension system should be vested no later than the third year of employment.
- 3. Defined benefit plans should offer teachers the option of a lump-sum rollover to a personal retirement account upon termination of employment that includes, at minimum, the teacher's contributions and accrued interest at a fair interest rate. In addition, withdrawal options from either defined benefit or defined contribution plans should include funds contributed by the employer.
- 4. Defined benefit plans should allow teachers to purchase time for unlimited previous teaching experience at the time of employment. Teachers should also be allowed to purchase time for all official leaves of absence, such as maternity or paternity leave.

Background



Area 4: Goal G New Hampshire Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire only offers a defined benefit pension plan to its teachers as their mandatory pension plan. This plan is not fully portable, does not vest until year 10, and does not provide any employer contribution for teachers who choose to withdraw their account balances when leaving the system. It also limits flexibility by restricting the ability to purchase years of service.

Teachers in New Hampshire also participate in Social Security, so they must contribute to the state's defined benefit plan in addition to Social Security. Although retirement savings in addition to Social Security are good and necessary for most individuals, the state's policy results in mandated contributions to two inflexible plans, rather than permitting teachers options for their state-provided savings plans.

Vesting in a defined benefit plan guarantees a teacher's eligibility to receive lifetime monthly benefit payments at retirement age. Nonvested teachers do not have a right to later retirement benefits; they may only withdraw the portion of their funds allowed by the plan. New Hampshire's vesting at 10 years of service is very late and limits the options of teachers who leave the system prior to this point.


Many teachers will leave the system before they reach 10 years of service. Teachers in New Hampshire who choose to withdraw their contributions upon leaving only receive their own contributions plus interest. This means that those who withdraw their funds accrue no benefits beyond what they might have earned had they simply put their contributions in basic savings accounts. Further, teachers who remain in the field of education but enter another pension plan (such as in another state) will find it difficult to purchase the time equivalent to their prior employment in the new system because they are not entitled to any employer contribution.

New Hampshire limits teachers' flexibility to purchase years of service. The ability to purchase time is important because defined benefit plans' retirement eligibility and benefit payments are often tied to the number of years a teacher has worked. New Hampshire's plan allows teachers to purchase unlimited time for previous teaching experience, which is very generous. However, the state's plan does not allow teachers to purchase time for approved leaves of absence, which is a tremendous disadvantage to any teacher who needs to take a leave for paternity or maternity care, or for other personal reasons.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire Retirement System, Plan Details http://www.nhrs.org/Members/PlanDetails.aspx New Hampshire Retirement System, Notices http://www.nhrs.org/Members/Notices.aspx

RECOMMENDATION



New Hampshire should offer teachers for their mandatory pension plan the option of either a defined contribution plan or a fully portable defined benefit plan, such as a cash balance plan. A well-structured defined benefit plan could be a suitable option among multiple plans. However, as the sole option, defined benefit plans severely disadvantage mobile teachers and those who enter the profession later in life. Because teachers in New Hampshire participate in Social Security, they are required to contribute to two defined benefit-style plans.

■ Increase the portability of its defined benefit plan.

If New Hampshire maintains its defined benefit plan, it should allow teachers that leave the system to withdraw employer contributions. The state should also allow teachers to purchase time for approved leaves of absence and decrease the vesting requirement to year three. A lack of portability is a disincentive to an increasingly mobile teaching force.

Offer a fully portable supplemental retirement savings plan.

If New Hampshire maintains its defined benefit plan, the state should at least offer teachers the option of a fully portable supplemental defined contribution savings plan, with employers matching a percentage of teachers' contributions.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

The New Hampshire Retirement System did not respond to repeated requests to review NCTQ's analyses related to teacher pensions.

Accrued Liability: The value of a pension plan's promised benefits calculated by an actuary (actuarial valuation), taking into account a set of investment and benefit assumptions to a certain date.

Actuarial Valuation: In a pension plan, this is the total amount needed to meet promised benefits. A set of mathematical procedures is used to calculate the value of benefits to be paid, the funds available and the annual contribution required.

Amortization Period: The gradual elimination of a liability, such as a mortgage, in regular payments over a specified period of time.

Benefit Formula: Formula used to calculate the amount teachers will receive each month after retirement. The most common formula used is (years of service x final average salary x benefit multiplier). This amount is divided by 12 to calculate monthly benefits.

Benefit Multiplier: Multiplier used in the benefit formula. It, along with years of service, determines the total percentage of final average salary that a teacher will receive in retirement benefits. In some plans, the multiplier is not constant, but changes depending upon retirement age and/or years of service.

Defined Benefit Plan: Pension plan that promises to pay a specified amount to each person who retires after a set number of years of service. Employees contribute to them in some cases; in others, all contributions are made by the employer.

Defined Contribution Plan: Pension plan in which the level of contributions is fixed at a certain level, while benefits vary depending on the return from investments. Employees make contributions into a tax-deferred account, and employers may or may not make contributions. Defined contribution pension plans, unlike defined benefit pension plans, give the employee options of where to invest the account, usually among stock, bond and money market accounts.

Lump-sum Withdrawal: Large payment of money received at one time instead of in periodic payments. Teachers leaving a pension plan may receive a lump-sum distribution of the value of their pension.

Normal Cost: The amount necessary to fund retirement benefits for one plan year for an individual or a whole pension plan.

Pension Wealth: The net present value of a teacher's expected lifetime retirement benefits.

Purchasing Time: A teacher may make additional contributions to a pension system to increase service credit. Time may be purchased for a number of reasons, such as professional development leave, previous out-of-state teaching experience, medical leaves of absence or military service.

Service Credit/Years of Service: Accumulated period of time in years or partial years for which a teacher earned compensation subject to contributions.

Supplemental Retirement Plan: An optional plan to which teachers may voluntarily make tax-deferred contributions in addition to their mandatory pension plans. Employees are usually able to choose their rate of contribution up to a maximum set by the IRS; some employers also make contributions. These plans are generally in the form of 457 or 403(b) programs.

Vesting: Right an employee gradually acquires by length of service to receive employer-contributed benefits, such as payments from a pension fund.

Sources: Barron's Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms, Seventh Edition; California State Teachers' Retirement System http://www.calstrs.com/Members/Defined%20Benefit%20Program/glossary.aspx; Economic Research Institute, http://www.eridlc.com/resources/index.cfm?fuseaction=resource.glossary

Figure 109		Defined benefit plan with	stined /	CHOIC OF DEFINED RE.	ő / s
What type of pension	Defined benefit 2.	Vino with			DEFINED CONTRIBUTION
systems do states offer	7	rian Olan	liene 	/ G	
teachers?	Jefi,	i lefti]	DEF.	* / 6 \
toderrors.	1 ber	d be	/plar	70,00	\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
	fine	Pefine	Hybrid plan	TO T	4V C
	å	/ 48 /			727
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California ²					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana ³					
Iowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina	Ц				
North Dakota					
Ohio ⁴					
Oklahoma					
Oregon ⁵					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina ⁶					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah ⁷					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington ⁸					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming	Ш				
	25	17	4	4	1




T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alaska provides a fair and flexible defined contribution pension plan for all teachers. This plan is also highly portable, as teachers are entitled to 100 percent of employer contributions after five years of service. South Dakota's defined benefit plan has some creative provisions, which makes it more like a defined contribution plan. Most notably, teachers are able to withdraw 85 percent of their employer contributions after three years of service. In addition, Florida, Ohio, South Carolina and Utah are noteworthy for offering teachers a choice between a defined benefit or hybrid plan and a defined contribution plan.

- 1. A hybrid plan has components of both a defined benefit plan and a defined contribution plan.
- 2. California offers a small cash balance component but ended most of the funding to this portion as of January 1, 2011.
- 3. Indiana also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 4. Ohio also offers the option of a hybrid plan and offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 5. Oregon also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 6. South Carolina also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 7. Utah offers a choice between a defined contribution or a hybrid plan.
- 8. Washington offers a choice between a defined benefit or a hybrid plan.

Figure 110

Do states offer teachers an option other than a nonportable defined benefit plan?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alaska, Florida, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington
- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado³, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii³, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Although not fully portable, the state's defined benefit plan has some notable portability provisions.

Figure 111

- 1. For teachers who join the system on or after January 1, 2012.
- 2. Florida's defined benefit plan does not vest until year eight; teachers vest in the state's defined contribution plan after one year.
- 3. For teachers who join the system on or after July 1, 2012.
- 4. Ohio's defined benefit plan does not vest until year five; teachers vest in the state's defined contribution plan after one year.
- Oregon offers a hybrid plan in which teachers vest immediately in the defined contribution component and vest in the defined benefit component after five years.
- 6. South Carolina's defined benefit plan does not vest until year five; teachers vest immediately in the state's defined contribution plan.
- 7. Based on Washington's Plan 2. The state also offers a hybrid plan in which teachers vest immediately in the defined contribution component and vest in the defined benefit component after 10 years.


gure 111 ow many years before	teachers ves	t?		
	3 YEARS OR LESS	4 to 5 years	6 to 9 years	10 years
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware ¹				
District of Columbia				
Florida ²				
Georgia Hawaii³				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				-
lowa ³				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York North Carolina				
North Carolina North Dakota				
North Dakota Ohio⁴				
Oklahoma				
Oregon ⁵				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina ⁶				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington ⁷				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	3	29	3	16

Figure 112		Only their Own	~ /	Their own contribution	Pc / NC	
		/	Their own contribution plus interes	ۇ. / ي	Putton inpoyer on at the Novel of the Novel	
What funds do states p		ş /	ntrib.	ons /gnt	N. T. S.	
teachers to withdraw f	rom 5	• / ,	" CO, "Itrij			
their defined benefit p	lans 👸				\$ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\	157
if they leave after	s tha Tibut		ir ov	eiro fig		•
five years? ¹	Less than their	100	Their own con		1,403	
Alabama			, ,			
Alaska ²						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California ³						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida						
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho Illinois						
Illinois						
lowa ⁴						
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana	$\overline{}$				- i	
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan⁵						
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada ⁶ NEW HAMPSHIRE						
New Jersey						
New Jersey						
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio ⁷						
Oklahoma						
Oregon ⁸						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina ⁹						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas Utah ¹⁰						
Vermont Virginia						
Washington ¹¹						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
, 3	4	5	34	6	1	
	•				•	

- States' withdrawal policies may vary depending on a teacher's years of service. Year five is used as a common point of comparision.
- As of July 1, 2006, Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan to new members, which allows teachers leaving the system after five years to withdraw 100 percent of the employer contribution.
- California has a defined benefit plan with a small cash balance component, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions and any employer contributions plus earnings from their cash balance component, regardless of their actions regarding their defined benefit account.
- 4. Once vested, lowa teachers may withdraw an employer match equal to one-thirtieth of their years of service. Effective July 1, 2012 teachers vest at seven years of service, so a teacher leaving at year five would not be entitled to any employer contribution.
- 5. Michigan only offers a hybrid plan. Exiting teachers may withdraw their own contributions and accrued earnings immediately and the employer contributions to the defined contribution component once vested at year four. Michigan teachers may withdraw their own contributions and accrued interest from the defined benefit component but may not withdraw the employer contribution.
- 6. Most teachers in Nevada fund the system by salary reductions or forgoing pay raises and thus do not have direct contributions to withdraw. The small mintority that are in a contributory system may withdraw their contributions plus interest.
- 7. Ohio has two other pension plans. Ohio's defined contribution plan allows teachers with at least one year of service who are leaving the system to withdraw 100 percent of the employer contribution. Exiting teachers with at least five years of experience in Ohio's combination plan may withdraw their employee-funded defined contribution component and the present value of the benefits offered in the defined benefit component.
- 8. Oregon only has a hybrid retirement plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions plus earnings from their defined contribution component; they still receive the employer-funded defined benefit payments at retirement age.
- South Carolina also has a defined contribution plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw 100 percent of their contributions and employer contributions, plus earnings.
- 10. Utah offers a hybrid pension plan, which only has employee contributions when the costs exceed the guaranteed employer contribution. When costs are less than the employer contribution, the excess is contributed to the employee account and refundable after vesting.
- 11. Washington also has a hybrid plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions plus earnings from their defined contribution component; they still receive the employer-funded defined benefit payments at retirement age.

Figure 113

Do states permit teachers to purchase time for previous teaching experience?¹



- Purchasing time does not apply to defined contribution plans. In states that offer multiple plans or a hybrid plan, the graph refers to the state's defined benefit plan or the defined benefit component of its hybrid plan. Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan and is not included.
- Strong Practice: California, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah
- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Hawaii, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oregon

Figure 114

Do states permit teachers to purchase time for leaves of absence?¹



- Purchasing time does not apply to defined contribution plans. In states that offer multiple plans or a hybrid plan, the graph refers to the state's defined benefit plan or the defined benefit component of its hybrid plan. Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan and is not included.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, South Dakota
- 3. Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
- Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia,

Goal H - Pension Sustainability

The state should ensure that excessive resources are not committed to funding teachers' pension systems.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should ensure that its pension system is financially sustainable, without excessive unfunded liabilities or an inappropriately long amortization period.
- Mandatory employer and employee contribution rates should not be unreasonably high, as they reduce teachers' paychecks and commit district resources that could otherwise be spent on salaries or incentives.

Background



Area 4: Goal H **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

As of June 30, 2010, the most recent date for which an actuarial valuation is available, New Hampshire's pension system for teachers is 58.5 percent funded and has a 26-year amortization period. This means that if the plan earns its assumed rate of return and maintains current contribution rates, it would take the state 26 years to pay off its unfunded liabilities. While its amortization period meets regulatory benchmarks, New Hampshire's funding level is too low. The state's system is not financially sustainable according to actuarial benchmarks.

In addition, New Hampshire commits excessive resources toward its teachers' retirement system. The current employer contribution rate of 10.7 percent is too high, in light of the fact that districts must also contribute 6.2 percent to Social Security. While this rate allows the state to pay off liabilities within a 26-year period, it does so at great cost, precluding New Hampshire from spending those funds on other, more immediate means to retain talented teachers. Formerly, districts pay 7.49 percent and the state pays 3.21 percent of the employer contribution rate; however, this cost-sharing provision was eliminated as of July 1, 2011. Districts may still receive some aid from the state, as recent legislation authorized the state to spend \$3.5 million toward political subdivisions' employer contributions for teachers, police and firefighters for fiscal year 2012. The mandatory employee contribution rate to the defined benefit plan of 7 percent is reasonable.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire Retirement System, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 http://www.nhrs.org/documents/NHRS2010CAFR.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

■ Ensure that the pension system is financially sustainable.

The state would be better off if its system was over 95 percent funded to allow more protection during financial downturns. However, New Hampshire should consider ways to improve its funding level without raising the contributions of school districts and teachers. In fact, the state should work to decrease employer contributions. Committing excessive resources to pension benefits can negatively affect teacher recruitment and retention. Improving funding levels necessitates, in part, systemic changes in the state's pension system. Goals 4-G and 4-I provide suggestions for pension system structures that are both sustainable and fair.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

The New Hampshire Retirement System did not respond to repeated requests to review NCTQ's analyses related to teacher pensions.






TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

South Dakota, Tennessee and Wisconsin provide financially sustainable pension systems without committing excessive resources. The systems in these states are fully funded without requiring excessive contributions from teachers or school districts.

Figure 117 Are state pension systems financially sustainable?1



- 1. Cannot be determined for Michigan or Utah, which recently opened new systems.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alaska, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana⁴, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Based on Indiana's current plan only.

Figure 116

- 1. The amortization period is set to be under 30 years; however, the amortization period is not determined because the state is not meeting its annual required contribution.
- 2. Michigan opened a new system in July 2010.
- 3. Utah opened a new system in July 2011.

Figure 118

Real Rate of Return

The pension system funding levels reported here are based on each state's individual actuarial valuation, which use a series of varying assumptions. One of these assumptions concerns rate of return, which greatly affects a system's funding level. If investment returns fall short of assumptions, the fund will have a deficit; if returns are greater than expected, the fund will have a surplus. Higher assumed rates involve more risk, while rates closer to inflation (typically in the 3-5 percent range) are safer.

Most state pension funds assume a rate between 7.5 percent and 8.25 percent. A state using a 7.5 percent rate will report a lower funding level than if it had used 8.25 percent, even though its liabilities remain the same. Many states report that they do meet or exceed an eight percent rate of return over the life of the plan.

However, some economists argue that states' assumed rates of return are too high, and should instead be closer to four percent. They caution that the risk associated with states' higher rates is borne by taxpayers, with the result that tax rates rise to fund pension deficits. A rate closer to four percent would make the vast majority of the nation's pension systems less than 50 percent funded. In light of the current market situation, the debate over the rate of return is particularly timely. With no current consensus by experts or policymakers, NCTQ used states' self-reported numbers rather than recalculate all funding levels based on a standard rate of return. Considering how many states' systems NCTQ found in questionable financial health without using the lower rates some economists prefer, it is clear this is an issue that demands policymakers' attention.

Figure 119

Figure 119

How well funded are state pension systems?

	Funding Level
Alaska ¹	N/A
District of Columbia	118.3%
Washington	116%
New York	103.2%
Wisconsin	99.8%
South Dakota	96.3%
Delaware	96%
North Carolina	95.9%
Indiana ²	94.7%
Tennessee	90.6%
Wyoming	87.5%
Georgia	87.2%
Florida	86.6%
Utah	85.7%
Oregon	83.2%
Texas	82.9%
Nebraska	82.4%
Iowa	80.8%
Virginia	80.2%
Arizona	79%
Idaho	78.9%
Michigan	78.9%
Minnesota	78.5%
California	78%
Missouri	77.7%
Pennsylvania	75.1%
Alabama	74.7%
Arkansas	73.8%
Nevada	71.2%
North Dakota	69.8%
South Carolina	67.8%
	66.5%
Vermont	
Maine	65.9%
New Mexico	65.7%
Maryland	65.4%
Montana	65.4%
Colorado	64.8%
Mississippi	64.2%
Massachusetts	63%
Connecticut	61.4%
Hawaii	61.4%
Kentucky	61%
Ohio	59.1%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	58.5%
New Jersey	57.6%
Oklahoma	56.7%
Kansas	56%
Louisiana	54.4%
Illinois	48.4%
Rhode Island	48.4%
	46.5%

^{1.} Alaska has only a defined contribution pension system.

Indiana's current plan is 94.7 percent funded. However, when the current plan is combined with its closed plan, the funding level drops to 44.3 percent.

Figure 120
What is a reasonable rate for pension contributions?

- 4-7 percent each for teachers and districts in states participating in Social Security
- 10-13 percent each for teachers and districts in states not participating in Social Security

Analysts generally agree that workers in their 20's with no previous retirement savings should save, in addition to Social Security contributions, about 10-15 percent of their gross income in order to be able to live during retirement on 80 percent of the salary they were earning when they retired. While the recommended savings rate varies with age and existing retirement savings, NCTQ has used this 10-15 percent benchmark as a reasonable rate for its analyses. To achieve a total savings of 10-15 percent, teacher and employer contributions should each be in the range of 4-7 percent. In states where teachers do not participate in Social Security, the total recommended retirement savings (teacher plus employer contributions) is about 12 percent higher to compensate for the fact that these teachers will not have Social Security income when they retire. In order to achieve the appropriate level of total savings, teacher and employer contributions in these states should each be in the range of 10-13 percent.

Sources:

http://www.schwab.com/public/schwab/resource_center/expert_insight/retirement_strategies/planning/how_much_should_you_save_for_retirement_play_the_percentages.html
https://personal.vanguard.com/us/insights/retirement/saving/set-retirement-goals


Figure 121

- 1. The employer contribution rate includes the contributions of both school districts and state governments, where appropriate.
- 2. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years. Some school districts in Georgia do not contribute to Social Security.
- 3. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years.
- 4. Michigan opened a new system in July 2010 and employer contributions are not yet reported.
- New Jersey reports its contributions as a flat dollar amount, and a percentage could not be calculated.
- 6. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years. Most, but not all, school districts in Rhode Island contribute to Social Security.
- 7. The contribution rate is set to decrease in 2012.



Figure 122


Do states require excessive contributions to their pension systems?



- Strong Practice: Alaska, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey⁵, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 3. Michigan⁶
- 4. Arizona, Hawaii, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island
- 5. While not excessive, the employer and state contribution are quite low. The most recent total employer contribution was only 5.4 percent of the actuarially-determined annual required contribution.
- 6. Employer contribution rates to Michigan's new system have not yet been reported.

Figure 123

- 1. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years.
- Teachers contribute 9.4 percent to the defined benefit component and are automatically enrolled to contribute 2 percent to the defined contribution component; teachers may change the latter rate.
- 3. The contribution rate is set to increase in 2012 and decrease in 2014.
- 4. Teachers share in the employer contribution through salary reductions or foregoing equivalent pay raises.
- 5. For teachers hired after July 1, 2011, the contribution ranges from 7.5-12.3 based on a variety of factors.
- 6. Teachers in the hybrid plan must make a mandatory contribution if the employer contribution does not cover system costs.
- 7. For the defined benefit plan; the rate varies for the defined contribution plan from a minimum of 5 percent.



Area 4: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal I – Pension Neutrality

The state should ensure that pension systems are neutral, uniformly increasing pension wealth with each additional year of work.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The formula that determines pension benefits should be neutral to the number of years worked. It should not have a multiplier that increases with years of service or longevity bonuses.
- 2. The formula for determining benefits should preserve incentives for teachers to continue working until conventional retirement ages. Eligibility for retirement benefits should be based on age and not years of service.

Background



Area 4: Goal I **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire's pension system is based on a benefit formula that is not neutral, meaning that each year of work does not accrue pension wealth in a uniform way until teachers reach conventional retirement age, such as that associated with Social Security.

Teachers' retirement wealth is determined by their monthly payments and the length of time they expect to receive those payments. Monthly payments are usually calculated as final average salary multiplied by years of service multiplied by a set multiplier (such as 1.5). Higher salary, more years of service or a greater multiplier increases monthly payments and results in greater pension wealth. Earlier retirement eligibility with unreduced benefits also increases pension wealth, because more payments will be received.

To qualify as neutral, a pension formula must utilize a constant benefit multiplier and an eligibility time-table based solely on age, rather than years of service. Basing eligibility for retirement on years of service creates unnecessary and often unfair peaks in pension wealth, while allowing unreduced retirement at a young age creates incentives to retire early. Plans that change their multipliers for various years of service do not value each year of teaching equally. Therefore, plans with a constant multiplier and that base retirement on an age in line with Social Security are likely to create the most uniform accrual of wealth.

New Hampshire's pension plan does not utilize a constant benefit multiplier, regardless of years of service. For teachers ages 60 to 64, their benefit equals their average final compensation multiplied by their years of service divided by 60 (1.66 percent multiplier). For teachers ages 65 and older, their benefit is the product of their average final compensation and years of service, divided by 66 (1.515 percent multiplier). Therefore, teachers who retire at a later age, and on average receive benefits for a shorter period of time, will receive lower monthly payouts resulting in a lower total pension wealth even if they worked the same number of years. The state explains the variation in multipliers as a way to increase pension payments for teachers who retire before they reach Social Security retirement age; however, the multipliers are permanent throughout retirees' lives and therefore greatly affect their total pension wealth.

The state does base unreduced retirement benefits on age, rather than years of service. All teachers who entered the pension system prior to July 1, 2011, may retire at age 60; however, this means that teachers are receiving unreduced retirement benefits well before Social Security retirement age. All teachers who entered the system on or after July 1, 2011, may not retire with unreduced benefits until age 65. While this does not fully align with Social Security retirement age, it is much closer. However, the state's timetable for early retirement with reduced benefits is based on years of service, causing further unequal treatment. Only teachers with 30 years of service may apply for early retirement. These policies may encourage effective teachers to retire earlier than they might otherwise, and they also fail to treat equally those teachers who enter the system at a later age and give the same amount of service.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire Retirement System, Plan Details http://www.nhrs.org/Members/PlanDetails.aspx New Hampshire Retirement System, Notices http://www.nhrs.org/Members/Notices.aspx

RECOMMENDATION

Utilize a constant benefit multiplier to calculate retirement benefits for all teachers, regardless of years of service.

Each year of service should accrue equal pension wealth. New Hampshire should use a pension formula that treats each year of service equally.

■ End early retirement eligibility based on years of service.

New Hampshire should change its practice of only allowing teachers with certain years of service to retire early with reduced benefits. If retirement at an earlier age is offered to some teachers with reduced benefits, it should be offered to all teachers equally regardless of years of service.


Align eligibility for retirement with unreduced benefits with Social Security retirement age. New Hampshire allows teachers to retire before conventional retirement age. As life expectancies continue to increase, teachers may draw out of the system for many more years than they contributed. This is not compatible with a financially sustainable system (see Goal 4-H).

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

The New Hampshire Retirement System did not respond to repeated requests to review NCTQ's analyses related to teacher pensions.

Figure 125

Do states base retirement eligibility on age, which is fair to all teachers?¹




- 1. This only refers to determining retirement eligibility, not retirement benefits.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alaska, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey
- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 126

- 1. All calculations are based on a teacher who starts teaching at age 22, earns a starting salary of \$35,000 that increases 3 percent per year, and retires at the age s/he is first eligible for unreduced benefits. The calculations use states' current benefit formulas and do not include cost of living increases. The final average salary was calculated as the average of the highest three years of salary, even though a few states may vary from that standard. Age 65 was used as a point of comparision because it is the miminum eligibility for unreduced Social Security benefits.
- 2. Does not apply to Alaska's defined contribution plan.
- 3. Minnesota provides unreduced retirement benefits at the age of full Social Security benefits or age 66, whichever comes first.
- California's formula has many options for retirement. A teacher with 40 years of experience at age 62 would reach Califorina's maximum allowable multiplier of 2.4 percent.
- 5. Age 60 is the earlier teachers hired on or after July 1, 2012 may retire. Teachers hired prior to this point may retire at age 55.
- Massachusetts's formula has many options for retirement. A teacher with 35 years
 of experience at age 57 would reach Massachusetts's maximum allowable benefit
 of 80 percent.

Figure 126 How much do states	S Total amount in benefits paid retirement until age 65 me of	fanlest etirenen a a kascha- who saned fesching at age 22 may fecelve unteduced benas
oay for each teacher	it in L om t til ege	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
that retires with	her fi ther fi thuni	strein her w s at a
unreduced benefits at	otal a r teac emer	farlie teac, achin
an early age?¹	retii /	, 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Alaska ²		
Illinois	JU U	07
Maine	\$0	65
Minnesota ³	\$0	66
NEW HAMPSHIRE	\$0	65
New Jersey	\$0	65
Washington	\$0	65
Tennessee	\$238,654	52
Michigan California⁴	\$289,187 \$310,028	60 62
Indiana	\$310,028	55
Hawaii ⁵	\$317,726	60
Kansas	\$337,385	60
Oregon	\$361,536	58
North Dakota	\$385,583	60
Oklahoma	\$385,583	60
Maryland	\$413,808	56
Wisconsin	\$416,007	57
Rhode Island	\$430,013	59
New York	\$440,819	57
Texas	\$443,421	60
South Dakota	\$447,707	55
Virginia	\$468,982	56
Louisiana	\$481,979	60
Florida	\$485,257	55
Vermont	\$486,832	56
Montana	\$518,228	47
Connecticut	\$520,009	57
Utah	\$520,009	57
lowa	\$551,428	55
Idaho	\$551,743	56
North Carolina	\$568,555	52
South Carolina	\$577,142	50
Nebraska	\$577,687	55
West Virginia	\$577,687	55
Delaware	\$577,927	52
District of Columbia Massachusetts ⁶	\$585,737	52
	\$594,296	57
Georgia	\$624,786	52
Mississippi Alabama	\$624,786 \$625,747	52 47
Colorado	\$650,011	57
Pennsylvania	\$650,011	57
Wyoming	\$655,506	54
Arizona	\$664,340	55
Arkansas	\$681,789	50
Ohio	\$687,265	52
New Mexico	\$734,124	52
Nevada	\$780,983	52
Missouri	\$789,343	51
Kentucky	\$791,679	49
,	, , , , ,	

Figure 127
What kind of multiplier do states use to calculate retirement benefits?¹



- 1. Alaska has a defined contribution plan, which does not have a benefit multiplier.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wyoming



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alaska offers a defined contribution pension plan that is neutral, with pension wealth accumulating in an equal way for all teachers for each year of work. In addition, Illinois, Minnesota and New Jersey offer a defined benefit plan with a formula multiplier that does not change relative to years of service and does not allow unreduced benefits for retirees below age 65. Illinois and New Jersey are further commended for ending their previous practices of allowing teachers to retire well before Social Security age without a reduction in benefits.

Figure 128

Double-Dipping: Cure the Disease, Not the Symptom

Benefit recipients in teacher pension plans have recently been under scrutiny for "double-dipping," when individuals receive a pension and salary at the same time. This can occur when teachers reach retirement eligibility, yet wish to keep working without losing pension wealth. Teachers can retire, start receiving their monthly benefits and then return to teaching. The restrictions on a teacher's ability to return to work vary from state to state. Policies can include waiting periods, limitations on earnings or restrictions to working in difficult-to-fill positions.

Some descriptions portray teachers working while collecting their pensions as greedy or somehow taking advantage, when in fact they are just following the system that is in place. When a teacher reaches retirement eligibility in a defined benefit system, her pension wealth peaks and, after that, wealth accrual slows or even decreases because every year a teacher delays retirement, she loses a year of pension benefits. For example, if a teacher could retire with 60 percent of her salary at age 56, then every year she teaches past that point she is, in effect, working for only 40 percent of her pay because she is not receiving her pension. This puts relatively young teachers and the districts who wish to retain them in a difficult position. Districts want to keep effective teachers in schools, but the financial reality for teachers is hard to pass up.

Retirees returning to work are also an issue for defined benefit pension system funding because contributions are not being made to the system that would be made if those positions were held by non-retirees. This adds to the funding imbalances that many states' defined benefit systems face.

Some states have created Deferred Retirement Option Plans (DROP) in which retirees can have their benefits placed in a savings account while they return to work and, once they retire again, they can receive the lump sum in their DROP accounts and resume their monthly benefits.

Returning to work would not be a large policy issue if systems did not allow teachers to retire with unreduced benefits at such relatively young ages and if pension wealth accrual were more neutral. An effective teacher should be able to keep teaching and at the same time know that her pension wealth will not erode. More systemic fixes—like the ones outlined in the *Yearbook*—are needed. Calls to prohibit double-dipping are not addressing the real problem.

146 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 NEW HAMPSHIRE

Goal A – Licensure Loopholes

The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Under no circumstances should a state award a standard license to a teacher who has not passed all required subject-matter licensing tests.
- If a state finds it necessary to confer conditional or provisional licenses under limited and exceptional circumstances to teachers who have not passed the required tests, the state should ensure that requirements are met within one year.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 129 How States are Faring on Closing Licensure Loopholes **Best Practice States** Colorado, Illinois 1, Mississippi, New Jersey States Meet Goal Nevada, New Mexico, South Carolina, Virginia 13 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Kentucky 1, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma 1, Rhode Island 1, Utah 1, West Virginia States Partly Meet Goal Iowa, Wyoming States Meet a Small Part of Goal Michigan, Vermont 26 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, **NEW HAMPSHIRE**, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **1**:5 : 46 **↓**:0

Area 5: Goal A **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire allows new teachers who have not met licensure requirements to teach under an intern license, which is valid for three years. Teachers can qualify to teach under an intern license by working through Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 pathways to certification, and they do not have to take required subject-matter tests until the end of the three years for which the intern certificate is valid.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire Code, Chapter Ed. 500: 504.03; 505.04; 505.05 http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rules/state_agencies/ed500.html

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that all teachers pass required subject-matter licensing tests before they enter the classroom.

All students are entitled to teachers who know the subject matter they are teaching. Permitting individuals who have not yet passed state licensing tests to teach neglects the needs of students, instead extending personal consideration to adults who may not be able to meet minimal state standards. New Hampshire should ensure that all teachers pass licensing tests— an important minimum benchmark for entering the profession—before entering the classroom.

Limit exceptions to one year.

There might be limited and exceptional circumstances under which conditional or emergency licenses need to be granted. In these instances, it is reasonable for a state to give teachers up to one year to pass required licensing tests. New Hampshire's current policy puts students at risk by allowing teachers to teach on an intern license for three years without passing required licensing tests.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, and New Jersey require all new teachers to pass all required subject-matter tests as a condition of initial licensure.

Figure 130 Do states still award emergency licenses?1



- 1. Not applicable to Montana and Nebraska, which do not require subject matter testing.
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁵, Ohio⁵, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin
- 4. Strong Practice: Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia
- 5. License is renewable, but only if licensure tests are passed.

Figure 131

- 1. Iowa only requires subject-matter testing for elementary teachers.
- 2. Montana does not require subject-matter testing.
- 3. Nebraska does not require subject-matter testing.
- 4. There is a potential loophole in Utah, as alternate route teachers appear able to delay passage of subject-matter tests.
- 5. Wyoming only requires subject-matter testing for elementary and social studies teachers.

How long can new tea				
practice without passii	ng	/	/	J'ears or more (or unspecified)
licensing tests?	No DEFERRAL		$\Box \phi_{to_2/\epsilon^{abs}}$	inor inor
	FFER	/ /sa	\ \frac{\sqrt{a}}{s}	750/ 7960
	40	p to	/ o _t o	3. Je. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.
Alabama	<	/ 2.	7	7 79
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California		$\overline{\Box}$		
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa ¹				
Kansas				Ц
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				_
Missouri				
Montana ²				一百
Nebraska ³				
Nevada				
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah ⁴				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming ⁵				
	9	14	8	18

Goal B – Unsatisfactory Evaluations

The state should articulate consequences for teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations, including specifying that teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations should be eligible for dismissal.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require that all teachers who receive a single unsatisfactory evaluation be placed on an improvement plan, whether or not they have tenure.
- The state should require that all teachers who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations or two unsatisfactory evaluations within five years be formally eligible for dismissal, whether or not they have tenure.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 5: Goal B **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

New Hampshire does not have a policy regarding teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations.

RECOMMENDATION

Require that all teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations be placed on improvement plans.

New Hampshire should adopt a policy requiring that teachers who receive even one unsatisfactory evaluation be placed on structured improvement plans. These plans should focus on performance areas that directly connect to student learning and should list noted deficiencies, define specific action steps necessary to address these deficiencies and describe how and when progress will be measured.

■ Make eligibility for dismissal a consequence of unsatisfactory evaluations.

Teachers who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations or have two unsatisfactory evaluations within five years should be formally eligible for dismissal, regardless of whether they have tenure. New Hampshire should adopt a policy that ensures that teachers who receive such unsatisfactory evaluations are eligible for dismissal.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 133	MPROVEMENT PLANAFER	ELICIBLE FOR DISMISSAL AFTER	_ /	/ (2
What are the	ZF.	0 X X X	ž /	No articulated consequences
consequences for	P. 24.	15 / SMS] Other consequences	nbəş _l
teachers who receive	V547	N54)	Juen _U	/°07 _{Pe}
	VEN.	LE FO)nseç	ulate
unsatisfactory	Z Z Z Z		ابور ر	artic_
evaluations?	42	\	6	/ %
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho			1	
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts			2	
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				3
Missouri				
Montana	Щ			
Nebraska			4	
Nevada			4	
NEW HAMPSHIRE				_
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York North Carolina		5		
North Carolina North Dakota		L,		
Ohio			6	
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
, ,	27	17	•	17
	27	17	8	17


- Teachers could face nonrenewal based on evaluation results, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal after multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- While results of evaluations may be used in dismissal decisions, there are no specific criteria for a teacher's eligibility for dismissal.
- 3. Improvement plans are only used for teachers in identified "Schools At Risk." Those same teachers are also eligible for dismissal for multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- 4. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal.
- 5. Teachers in low performing schools can be dismissed after one negative rating.
- 6. Local school boards must include procedures for using evaluation results for the removal of poorly performing teachers.

***** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Illinois and Oklahoma both require that teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations be placed on improvement plans. Teachers in Illinois are then evaluated three times during a 90-day remediation period and are eligible for dismissal if performance remains unsatisfactory. In addition, new legislation in Illinois allows districts to dismiss a teacher without going through the remediation process if that teacher has already completed a remediation plan but then receives an unsatisfactory rating within the next three years. Oklahoma's improvement plan may not exceed two months, and if performance does not improve during that time, teachers are eligible for dismissal.

Figure 134

Do states specify that all teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations are eligible for dismissal?



- Strong Practice: Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington
- 2. Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho³, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada⁴, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Teachers could face nonrenewal based on evaluation results, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal after multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- 4. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal.

Goal C – Dismissal for Poor Performance

The state should articulate that ineffective classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and ensure that the process for terminating ineffective teachers is expedient and fair to all parties.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should articulate that teachers may be dismissed for ineffective classroom performance.
- 2. A teacher who is terminated for poor performance should have an opportunity to appeal. In the interest of both the teacher and the school district, the state should ensure that this appeal occurs within a reasonable time frame.
- 3. There should be a clear distinction between the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed for classroom ineffectiveness and the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed or facing license revocation for felony or morality violations or dereliction of duties.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 5: Goal C **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

In New Hampshire, tenured teachers who are terminated may appeal multiple times. After receiving written notice of dismissal, the teacher has 10 days to request a hearing, which must occur within 15 days. The school board must then issue its opinion within 15 days of the close of the hearing. The aggrieved teacher may then—within 10 days—file an additional appeal with the state board, which must issue a final decision within 15 days of the petition for review. Alternately, the teacher can request arbitration under the terms of a collective bargaining agreement. The grievance procedures that apply to arbitration can be bargained locally.

New Hampshire does not explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal, nor does the state distinguish the due process rights of teachers dismissed for ineffective performance from those facing other charges commonly associated with license revocation, such as a felony and/or morality violations. The process is the same regardless of the grounds for cancellation. The state's new legislation requires that grounds for "nonrenomination or nonreelection" be decided by local school boards.

Supporting Research

New Hampshire Statute 189:13, 189:14a; 189:14b SB 196

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that teachers terminated for poor performance have the opportunity to appeal within a reasonable time frame.

New Hampshire should consider streamlining its process even more by disallowing multiple appeals. Further, the state should consider only permitting appeals through the state board, as the grievance procedures for arbitration can be locally bargained, which means that there is no assurance that such an appeal will occur within a reasonable time frame.

- Specify that classroom ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.
 - Rather than leaving it up to local school boards, New Hampshire should explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal so that districts do not feel they lack the legal basis for terminating consistently poor performers.
- Distinguish the process and accompanying due process rights between dismissal for classroom ineffectiveness and dismissal for morality violations, felonies or dereliction of duty.

While nonprobationary teachers should have due process for any termination, it is important to differentiate between loss of employment and issues with far-reaching consequences that could permanently impact a teacher's right to practice. New Hampshire should ensure that appeals related to classroom effectiveness are only decided by those with educational expertise.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis.






TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Oklahoma clearly articulates that teacher ineffectiveness in the classroom is grounds for dismissal and has taken steps to ensure that the dismissal process for teachers deemed to be ineffective is expedited. Teachers facing dismissal have only one opportunity to appeal.

Figure 137 Do states allow multiple appeals of teacher dismissals?



- 1. Strong Practice: Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Wisconsin
- 2. Teachers in these states revert to probationary status following ineffective evaluation ratings, meaning that they no longer have the due process right to multiple appeals: Colorado, Indiana, Tennessee
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois⁵, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. District of Columbia, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada⁶, Utah, Vermont
- 5. The teacher is responsible for the cost of the second appeal.
- 6. Though a teacher returns to probationary status after two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings, the state does not articulate clear policy about its appeals process.

- 1. It is left to districts to define "inadequacy of classroom performance."
- 2. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not articulated that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.
- 3. Dismissal policy includes dismissal for unsatisfactory evaluations, but the state's evaluation system does not measure teacher effectiveness (see Goal 3-B).

Goal D – Reductions in Force

The state should require that its school districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off when a reduction in force is necessary.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should require that districts consider classroom performance and ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 5: Goal D **New Hampshire** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

In New Hampshire, new legislation ensures that seniority is not the sole factor used by districts to determine which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force. However, the state does not require that teacher performance be among the considered factors.

Supporting Research

SB 196

RECOMMENDATION

Require that districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off during reductions in force.

New Hampshire can still leave districts flexibility in determining layoff policies, but it should do so within a framework that ensures that classroom performance is considered.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Hampshire was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis.

Figure 139	,	/ 4
Do states prevent	1521	107
districts from basing	કું	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \
layoffs solely on "last	74 DER	/ 5 %
in, first out"?	PERFORI SE CONSI	SENORITY CANNOT HEDECIDING FACTO
Alabama	9 /	
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi		
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	11	17



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Colorado, Florida and Indiana all specify that in determining which teachers to lay off during a reduction in force, classroom performance is the top criterion. These states also articulate that seniority can only be considered after a teacher's performance is taken into account.


Figure 140 Do districts have to consider performance in determining which teachers are laid off?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio³, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Tenure is considered first.

Figure 141

Do states prevent districts from overemphasizing seniority in layoff decisions?



- 1. Strong Practice: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Missouri⁶, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio⁶, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Strong Practice: Idaho, Utah
- 3. Hawaii, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin⁷
- 4. California, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon
- 5. Alabama, Alaska⁶, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia⁶, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts⁶, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska⁶, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
- 6. Nontenured teachers are laid off first.
- 7. Only for counties with populations of 500,000 or more and for teachers hired before 1995.

Board of Directors

Barbara O'Brien, Chair

Senior Fellow, The Piton Foundation

Stacey Boyd

Chief Executive Officer, The Savvy Source for Parents

Chester E. Finn, Jr.

President. The Thomas B. Fordham Institute

Ira Fishman

Managing Director, NFL Players Association

Marti Watson Garlett

Founding Dean of the Teachers College, Western Governors University Former Vice President, Academic Programs and Professional Licensure, Laureate Education, Inc.

Henry L. Johnson

Former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education Consultant, Center for Results, Learning Forward Donald N. Langenberg

Chancellor Emeritus, University System of Maryland

Clara M. Lovett

President Emerita, Northern Arizona University

Carol G. Peck

Former President and Chief Executive Officer, Rodel Charitable Foundation of Arizona Former National Superintendent of the Year

John L. Winn

Florida Education Commissioner, Retired

Kate Walsh

President, National Council on Teacher Quality

Advisory Board

• Steven J. Adamowski, Connecticut State Board of Education • Sir Michael Barber, Pearson • Roy E. Barnes, former Governor, State of Georgia • McKinley A. Broome, Woodholme Elementary School • Cynthia G. Brown, Center for American Progress • David Chard, Southern Methodist University • Andrew Chen, EduTron • Jean Clements, Hillsborough Classroom Teachers Association • Celine Coggins, Teach Plus • Pattie Davis, Fairview Middle School • Jo Lynne DeMary, Virginia Commonwealth University • Michael Feinberg, The KIPP Foundation • Michael Goldstein, The Match School, Massachusetts • Eric A. Hanushek, The Hoover Institution • Joseph Hawkins, Westat • Frederick M. Hess, American Enterprise Institute • Paul T. Hill, Center on Reinventing Public Education • E.D. Hirsch, Core Knowledge Foundation • Michael Johnston, Colorado State Senate • Barry Kaufman, BK Education Consulting Services • Frank Keating, former Governor, State of Oklahoma • Joel I. Klein, News Corporation • Martin J. Koldyke, Academy for Urban School Leadership • Wendy Kopp, Teach For America • James Larson, Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School • Tom Lasley, Edvention • Amy Jo Leonard, Turtle Mountain Elementary School • Deborah M. McGriff, NewSchools Venture Fund • Ellen Moir, New Teacher Center • Robert N. Pasternack, Voyager Expanded Learning • Michael Podgursky, University of Missouri-Columbia • Michelle Rhee, StudentsFirst • Stefanie Sanford, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation • Audrey Soglin, Illinois Education Association • Daniel Willingham, University of Virginia • Suzanne Wilson, Michigan State University

National Council on Teacher Quality

1420 New York Avenue, NW • Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-393-0020 Fax: 202-393-0095 Web: www.nctq.org

Subscribe to NCTQ's blog PDQ
Follow NCTQ on Twitter and Facebook

NCTQ is available to work with individual states to improve teacher policies.

For more information, please contact:

Sandi Jacobs Vice President sjacobs@nctq.org 202-393-0020