

**Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE)  
Assessment and Accountability in the Fifty States: 1999-2000**

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

This profile was verified by the staff of the New Hampshire Department of Education  
in August 2000. All information is current as of that date.

**Index:**

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

Performance Standards

Reporting Performance Data

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

**State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)**

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the assessment system as the context.*

The **New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP)** has two components:

- the first consists of K-12 curriculum frameworks that identify what students should know and be able to do at the completion of different levels of their education;
- the second uses state and local assessment tools and improvement plans to increase academic achievement.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state assessment system, including:*

- *Name of Assessment Instrument(s) or Program(s)*

New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP)

- *Grade Levels and Subjects Tested*

Students are assessed at the end of the following grades in the following subjects:

- Grade 3: English language arts and mathematics

- Grade 6: English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies
- Grade 10: English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies
- *Norm or Criterion Referenced:* Criterion
- *Matrix or Census Testing:* Census  
The state uses both a core group of common items on each test and eight individual forms of the test. All students are tested using the common items, but the eight forms also create diagnostic results for schools and districts.
- *Item Types:*
  - Multiple Choice: approximately 60% of the score (1 point each)
  - Constructed Response: approximately 40% of the score (4 points each)
  - Writing Prompt: used only in the English language arts test
- *Time of Testing:* Second and third week of May
- *High School Exit Exam:* None
- *Other Assessments:* None
- *Transitional or Final Assessment System:* Final

3. *Who designed and produced the assessment(s) used by the state? If a commercial test was used by the state, were modifications or additions made to the assessment to address state requirements or standards? If so, what did they include?*

The state hired *Measured Progress (previously known as Advanced Systems in Measurement and Evaluation, Inc.)* to develop the tests based on the curriculum frameworks. The New Hampshire Content Committees participate in the design of the questions to ensure content validity and grade-level appropriateness.

4. *What are the state requirements for local assessment, including the types of assessments and their use in areas such as reporting and accountability, as well as Title I adequate yearly progress? What grade levels and subjects are tested?*

No such requirements exist, although some districts use additional assessments voluntarily.

5. *Is the state assessment system aligned with the state standards? Are there plans for alignment, and if so, how will the assessment and standards become aligned?*

Yes, the assessment is aligned with the state curriculum framework, as required by state law.

6. *What is the state's approach for ensuring alignment and what evidence of that alignment is provided?*

The Test Development Committees within the state work with the test development contractor to make certain that each item correlates with the curriculum framework and further identify which standards each item is addressing.

7. *How is the data included in the state assessment system used?*

The state uses assessment results to provide sources of information to support local school improvement efforts and help guide decisions about curriculum, instruction, professional development, resource allocation, and staffing. Parents, school officials, and teachers are using this information to align educational programs with the curriculum frameworks. Individual student results are being combined with other information and used by teachers and parents to make education decisions.

8. *Are there changes planned for the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

Specific changes to the general assessment system are not planned at this time (*see Inclusion section for changes in the Alternative Assessment*). The state is, however, reviewing the math framework for the state, and changes in this framework may result in changes to the assessment. The science framework will be the next to be reviewed; each framework is reviewed on a five-year cycle.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of state assessment? Explain.*

The implementation of the assessment system in the state has “gone smoothly” due to support from the SBE, governor and legislature, as well as the absence of a high stakes system of rewards and sanctions tied to the test scores. Assessment results in the state are reported, but are primarily for instructional improvement purposes.

## **Inclusion Policies for Assessment**

1. *What exclusions are made in the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP? Who makes the decision about exclusion of a particular child? Does the state collect data or in other ways monitor the number and types of students excluded? Does that vary by test?*

According to the Council of Chief State School Officers *Data from the Annual Survey, State Student Assessment Programs* (Fall 1999), LEAs are allowed to exempt students with disabilities and LEP students from the state assessment. For special education students, this is determined by the IEP Committee. For LEP students, this is similarly determined by a local committee of various members from the school.

2. *What accommodations and/or modifications are made on the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP?*

Students with disabilities may receive the following accommodations:

**Presentation**

- Oral reading of format
- Braille Edition
- Use of magnifying glass
- Large print editions
- Oral reading of directions
- Explanation, repeating or signing of directions
- Templates to reduce visual field

**Response**

- Mark in response booklet
- Use template for recording
- Point to response
- Use of typewriter, computer, word processor
- Use of Braille writer

**Setting**

- Alone in study carrel
- Individual administration
- In small groups
- At home with appropriate supervision
- In special education classes

**Timing/Scheduling**

- Extended testing time
- More breaks
- Out-of-level testing

LEP students may use the following accommodations:

**Presentation**

- Explanation of directions
- Person familiar to student administers the test

**Setting**

- Alone in study carrel
- Administer test in separate room
- In small groups

**Timing/Scheduling**

- Extended testing time
- More breaks
- Extended session over multiple days
- Out-of-level testing

**Source:** Council of Chief State School Officers *Data from the Annual Survey, State Student Assessment Programs* (Fall 1999).

Additionally, a translator may be used in the math, science and social studies assessments; this is not currently permitted in English language arts.

3. *Does the state provide assessments in languages other than English? If so, describe. In what grades and subjects?*

No such assessments are provided.

4. *Does the state provide alternative assessments for students with disabilities? If so, describe. For which students and in which subjects and at what ages?*

No such assessments are available for 1999-2000, but are set to be on line for the 2000-2001 school year. The **NHEIAP-ALT** will primarily involve a portfolio system, collecting student work over the majority of the school year, starting in October of 2000.

5. *Does the state have a goal for the inclusion of students with disabilities and/or LEP students on the statewide tests? Does the state use any strategies to encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities? LEP students?*

Although the state has not established a specific goal for the percent of students to be assessed, with the development and implementation of the NHEIAP-ALT, it is expected that almost all students will be assessed with this or the general state assessment.

6. *Are changes planned in the for the inclusion of SWD and LEP students in the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

As stated, the NHEIAP will be on line for the 2000-2001 school year.

## **Performance Standards**

1. *How many and what performance levels has the state established for its assessments?*

Each student's level of achievement is defined by one of four categories:

- Novice (200-239)
- Basic (240-259)
- Proficient (260-279)
- Advanced (280-300).

2. *Has the state set acceptable levels or targets for schools, districts or the state on tests, drop-out rates or other measures (e.g. 70% of students in Maryland pass the MSPAP)?*

The state has established no such targets, although the percentage of students scoring at each of the proficiency levels is reported.

3. *How are these performance standards calculated? What data are included in the calculations, and at what proportions (e.g. assessment results 60%, dropout and attendance rates 40%). How are the calculations made? What is the final unit of analysis for reporting school and district achievement levels (e.g. performance index, grade, category)?*

Not applicable.

4. *Are all students, schools and districts included in these performance calculations? If not, who is excluded?*

The percentage of students scoring at each proficiency level is based on 100% of the total enrollment of students.

5. *Are changes planned for the state performance standards (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

Not applicable.

6. *What proportion of schools and/or districts fail to meet acceptable levels on performance targets?*

No such levels or targets have been established, so the question is not applicable.

## **Reporting Performance Data**

1. *Describe the characteristics of the state performance data reporting system (by whom, what data, who is the audience) for each of the following levels:*

The results from the state tests are used to produce individual student proficiency reports as well as diagnostic reports at the school, district and state levels.

- *Student reports*

Each student's level of achievement is defined and reported by one of four categories: Novice, Basic, Proficient or Advanced, depending on what they know and are able to do in each subject area tested. A scaled score is also provided for each subject for each student.

- *School and District reports*

School and district-level results regarding proficiency levels of students, performance in subtopics, and performance of subgroups of students are provided by the state. Specifically, the reporting includes:

- Name of district/school
- Number of students enrolled at that grade level
- Percentage of students exempted from the assessments
- School or district mean scaled score, and

- Performance levels for each subject and grade in terms of percentages.

- *State reports*

The state report summarizes student performance across the state. As required in new legislation, the state will specifically be providing a report on the state of education in New Hampshire, in which each school and district will be rank ordered according to the mean scaled scores. A comparison of a school or district's achievement over time will also be provided (*see changes below for more detail*).

- *Title I reports*

No specific reports have been produced for Title I schools; Title I schools are included in the general reporting system.

2. *How are the data distributed? When during the year (month or time period after assessment)? To whom (students, teachers, parents, the media, the community)?*

Data are distributed in October of each year and are sent to superintendents by Measured Progress. The districts then distribute to the schools and the schools to the parents.

3. *At what level(s) are data disaggregated (state, district and school levels)? For what groups are disaggregated data reported (see Internet sites for state, district and school level report cards)?*

1999-2000 was the first year that the state disaggregated by all six of the federally specified categories, including

- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Title I eligibility/Socio-economic status
- LEP Status
- Students with IEP
- Migrant status.

5. *Does trend data exist from the state assessments (example: Texas State Assessment data is available from "1996-97 on")?*

Trend data exists in grade 3 from the assessment's implementation at that level in 1993 and in grades 6 and 10 from the assessment's implementation at those levels in 1996.

6. *How are the results of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency reported? Are they included in the aggregate scores reported to the public, or disaggregated by group?*

The results from assessments taken by students with disabilities and LEP students using accommodations are included in the summary reports in the aggregate.

7. *What are the state's requirements for the use of data in school and district improvement planning?*

According to *Title 15: Chapter 193C, Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program, Section 193-C:9*, **ALL** school districts in New Hampshire are “encouraged” to develop a local education improvement and assessment plan which builds upon and complements the goals established for the NHEIAP, including:

- (a) Local assessment measures which focus on individual student performance.
- (b) Participation in the program.
- (c) The use of local and statewide assessment results to improve instruction and enhance student learning.
- (d) Methods for reporting the results of all assessment measures.

8. *Are changes planned for performance reporting (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the accountability system (Title I or in general)?*

As stated, under new legislation the state will be providing a report on the state of education in New Hampshire, in which each school and district will be rank ordered according to the mean scaled scores. Performance indicators reported will include:

- Attendance and drop-out rates.
- School environment indicators, such as safe-schools data.
- Proportion of graduating students going on to post-secondary education, military service, and the workplace.
- Performance on state tests administered and other standardized tests administered at local option.
- In addition, local districts shall report on locally developed performance indicators and assessment measures.

No later than December 1, 2000 the department of education will issue a report on the condition of education statewide and on a district-by-district and school-by-school basis. This report will include demographic and student performance data including:

- school and district performance on state tests administered,
- other standardized tests administered at local option by at least 25 percent of school districts,
- other relevant statistics.

Comparisons with state averages and with the condition of each district and school in comparison with previous years will be provided, including statewide rankings of each district and school on the state tests administered and on other standardized tests administered at local option by at least 25 percent of school districts.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of performance standards and reporting? Explain.*

As with many states with small schools, the issue has been how to report on schools with small enrollments. In schools with fewer than 40 students in a grade level, the state has

asked that performance levels be reported as trend data over multiple years as a way to avoid the identification of individual students by their scaled score.

## **State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)**

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the accountability system as the context.*

The state does not have a high stakes accountability system with rewards or sanctions for schools or districts, and has not developed performance levels for schools. Although there have been proposals for such a system presented to the state legislature, they have not been passed due to the state's long history of local control.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state accountability system? Organize the response into the following subsections:*

- *Student Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

The state does not hold students accountable for performance on the state assessment system.

- *School Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

According to the Council of Chief State School Officers *Data from the Annual Survey, State Student Assessment Programs* (Fall 1999), school accountability in New Hampshire includes only the school performance reporting system and the development of school improvement plans.

- *District Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

*Under Title 15: Chapter 193E, Adequate Public Education:*

*It is the policy of the state of New Hampshire that public elementary and secondary education shall provide all students with the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to prepare them for successful participation in the social, economic, scientific, technological, and political systems of a free government, now and in the years to come; an education that is consistent with the curriculum and student proficiency standards specified in state school approval rules and New Hampshire curriculum frameworks.*

In accordance with these requirements, each school district was required report to the department of education its data for the previous 12 months on its school and district performance indicators by April 1, 2000. Performance indicators included the following areas:

- Attendance and drop-out rates.
- School environment indicators, such as safe-schools data.
- Proportion of graduating students going on to post-secondary education, military service, and the workplace.
- Performance on state tests administered and other standardized tests administered at local option.

- In addition, local districts shall report on locally developed performance indicators and assessment measures.

No later than December 1, 2000 the department of education will issue a report on the condition of education statewide and on a district-by-district and school-by-school basis. This report will include demographic and student performance data including:

- school and district performance on state tests administered,
- other standardized tests administered at local option by at least 25 percent of school districts,
- other relevant statistics.

Comparisons with state averages and with the condition of each district and school in comparison with previous years will be provided, including statewide rankings of each district and school on the state tests administered and on other standardized tests administered at local option by at least 25 percent of school districts.

3. *What methods of measuring progress are used in the state accountability system?*

Not applicable.

4. *Are all students included in calculating the measures of progress? If not, who is excluded (probe on inclusion of SWD and LEP students)?*

Not applicable.

5. *How do the general state accountability system and the system of accountability for Title I schools compare? Are they the same, or different? How?*

The state does not have a general accountability system, but has just proposed a new definition of adequate yearly progress for Title I schools (*see Title I section*).

6. *Are subgroup performance results used as an indicator in the calculation of state accountability measures? If so, how? To identify schools or districts in need of improvement? For recognition and rewards?*

Not applicable; the state does not have indicators under an accountability system.

7. *Are charter and/or non-public schools included in the accountability system? If so, how?*

Although the state does not have a structured accountability system, the state does have a performance reporting system. Charter schools must also report to the state and the public in the following ways:

- Each charter school will provide one copy of its annual report to the state board and to its local school board; the report must also be available to any person who expressly requests it.
- A charter school must provide an annual financial audit and report to the state board and the school board complying with any current format and *content requirements*

*imposed upon a public school.* The report must include the number of pupils served by the school and their respective tuition rates and a discussion of progress made towards the achievement of the school's academic and other goals set forth in its charter.

- A summary version of any annual and periodic reports required in this chapter must be provided to the parent or guardian of each pupil enrolled at a charter school and made available to the legislative body.

8. *Are changes planned for the state accountability system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

Not applicable; the state does not have an accountability system with sanctions and rewards.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of accountability? Explain.*

Although there have been proposals for the development of an accountability system presented to the state legislature, they have not been passed due to the state's long history of local control.

## **Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts**

1. *How are schools and districts identified as low performing? Using what criteria? Do the identification processes and/or criteria differ for Title I and non-Title I schools?*

Not applicable.

2. *Does the district or the state decide whether a school is low performing? If the district is involved in the process, how much discretion do they have?*

Not applicable.

3. *What types of assistance are provided to these schools and districts by the state?*

According to *Title 15: Chapter 193C, Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program, Section 193-C:9*, there is established within the department of education a local education improvement assistance program. The department is to use funds appropriated for this program to provide technical assistance and training to school districts in developing and implementing local education improvement and assessment plans based on assessment results. Funds are also to be utilized to support school districts in the use of local and statewide assessment results to improve instruction and enhance student learning, and to identify and implement methods and models of instruction that have proven to be effective in helping students reach the educational standards identified in the New Hampshire curricular framework.

4. *Who provides the state assistance?*

To provide technical assistance and training to school districts in developing and implementing local education improvement and assessment plans, the department uses grants or contracts with institutions of higher education, regional consortia, and private businesses.

5. *Does support to Title I and all low performing schools and districts differ? Is support generally provided for all schools and districts, or are services specifically designed to help those that are low performing?*

The general state system does not have a formalized system for identifying or supporting low performing schools. The Title I Office has, however, offered technical assistance to schools upon request and offered grant money to the few schools identified by districts as in need of improvement.

6. *Has the state established a set of criteria and/or a process for getting schools and districts out of low performing status? If so, what do they include?*

Not applicable.

7. *Once a school or district is identified as low performing, what types of plans must it prepare? Who are they submitted to once completed? How do they differ from other planning documents?*

According to *Title 15: Chapter 193C, Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program, Section 193-C:9*, **ALL** school districts in New Hampshire are “encouraged” to develop a local education improvement and assessment plan which builds upon and complements the goals established for the NHEIAP, including:

- (a) Local assessment measures which focus on individual student performance.
- (b) Participation in the program.
- (c) The use of local and statewide assessment results to improve instruction and enhance student learning.
- (d) Methods for reporting the results of all assessment measures.

8. *Are changes planned for the state system of identifying and assisting low performing schools or districts (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

Not applicable; the state does not have and is not currently planning to develop a general accountability system which would identify low performing schools.

## Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

1. *What criteria are included in the definition of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts under Title I?*

In New Hampshire, it is important to note that the SDE refers to this yearly improvement as *Acceptable* Yearly Progress or AYP. The AYP definition is based on the results of the New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP) that is administered to all public school students at the end of grades 3, 6, and 10.

2. *What are the definitions of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts?*

At present, the state has a proposal before the United States Department of Education for review with a new definition of AYP. Currently, the state operates AYP as a district-driven system in which districts determine how to define AYP on a district by district basis, using NHEIAP as part of this system. The districts have been setting indicators of progress and then measuring the schools against those indicators. Schools not meeting the indicators have not been making AYP; not making AYP for two consecutive years has meant that a school is defined as in need of improvement.

The proposal before the USDOE would create a new system based on a three-year rolling average, coupled with statewide assessment data. In order to determine a **Three Year Average of the school's set of Scaled Score (TYA-SS)**, the system must take into account participation levels for each content area over the three years. Thus, the TYA-SS is the average scaled score of all scores assigned at that grade level over the three years in the content areas tested at that grade. New Hampshire's definition would use a weighted average (i.e. weighted average by participation of the mean scaled scores in the four content areas) of the all four content areas (where applicable) over the previous 3 years.

See *question 3* below for the process and specific AYP definition as proposed.

3. *What is the process for identifying those schools and districts that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools? If the districts plays a role, does the state provide guidance on local criteria?*

The proposal the state developed and submitted to the USDOE includes a two-tier process in order to identify those schools that are the most in need of improvement. The process is as follows:

### **Tier I: School Performance Designations**

All Title I participating schools with more than ten children tested at any grade level would be classified using the percentage of students at the combined Basic, Proficient and Advanced levels (weighted average coupled across all content areas tested):

School Classification	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 10
High Performing	at least 85%	at least 65%	at least 65%
Low Need	at least 70%	at least 50%	at least 50%
Moderate Need	at least 60%	at least 40%	at least 40%
High Need	less than 60%	less than 40%	less than 40%

If the plan is approved, all Title I participating schools will be held accountable for at least one grade level of the test. Primary level schools (K-2) will be held accountable using the scores from those third grade students that attended their school.

## **Tier II. Comparison of NHEIAP Scores to Determine Progress**

A school's yearly progress quotient will be determined in the following manner:

- Comparing three-year average of scaled scores (TYA-SS) between this year's three-year average and last year's three year average;
- Calculating a school's gain or loss, and
- Identifying results as:

**Improving:** the yearly gain in TYA-SS is greater than or equal to 1.5 points,

**Stable:** the yearly gain in TYA-SS is greater than -1.5 points but less than +1.5 points, or

**Declining:** the yearly gain in the TYA-SS is less than or equal to -1.5 points.

A school is making Acceptable Yearly Progress (AYP) if:

1. It becomes or remains a High Performing School,
2. It is either an improving or stable Low Need School
3. It is an improving or stable Moderate Need School
4. It is an improving or stable High Need School.

A school is *not* making Acceptable Yearly Progress (AYP) if:

1. It is a declining Low Need School
2. It is a declining Moderate Need School
3. It is a declining High Need School
4. It is a stable High Need School whose TSA-SS drops between 0 to -1.5
5. It is a stable Moderate Need School or stable High Need School whose TSA-SS drops by more than 2.5 points in any two year period.

An Exemplary School is a High Performing School whose annual progress is classified as "improving" for three years in a row. Exemplary Schools will serve as models and will provide support to others schools, especially schools in need of improvement to assist such schools in meeting the State's student performance standards. The State will set aside Title I funds to allow Exemplary Schools to act as mentors to needy schools.

4. *What are the criteria and processes for identifying schools and districts in need of improvement under Title I? What plans must be prepared? How can a school or district get out of Program Improvement? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools?*

The LEA, using the data that the State will provide, will identify all schools that have not made Acceptable Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years as **Schools in Need of Improvement**. However, before identifying a school as needing improvement, an LEA must provide the school with an opportunity to review the data on which such identification is based. If the school believes that its identification for school improvement is in error for statistical or other substantive reasons, the school may provide evidence to the LEA to support its belief. The LEA, once presented with the evidence, can determine to identify or not identify the school.

Each school identified as needing improvement must:

- Develop or revise its Title I school plan in consultation with parents and the LEA, in ways that have the greatest likelihood of improving the performance of participating children in meeting the State's student performance standards.
- Submit its new or revised Title I school plan to the LEA for approval; and
- Implement the changes in its school plan during the first year immediately following identification

Each school identified as needing improvement must, as part of its Title I school plan, improve the skills of its staff by providing effective professional development activities. A school, using funds from any source, must:

- Devote to professional development activities, over two consecutive years, an amount equivalent to at least 10 percent of the funds received by the school under Title I, Part A during one fiscal year; or
- Otherwise, demonstrate that the school is effectively carrying out professional development activities

Schools no longer need to be identified as schools in need of improvement if they make acceptable yearly progress for two of the three years following identification.

The proposed definition for a *district* in need of improvement is as follows: Districts will be designated as in need of improvement when more than sixty percent of its Title I participating schools have been identified as in need of improvement. For each LEA identified the State, if requested, shall make available technical assistance or other assistance available to support improvement efforts identified. Such technical assistance may be provided directly by the SEA or by an institution of higher education, a private non-profit organization, and educational service agency, a comprehensive regional assistance center or other entities.

5. *What types of assistance are provided to those in need of improvement under Title I?*

Similar to the system currently in place, the proposal under review by the UDSOE states that for each school identified, the LEA (and the State, if requested) will make available technical assistance or other assistance as the school develops and implements the school's new or revised plan. LEAs may petition the State Title I office for monetary support to provide a support system for identified schools. LEAs also have flexibility in how they allocate Title I funds to provide support to identified schools.

After providing technical assistance, and taking other remediation measures, an LEA may take corrective action, at any time, against a school identified for improvement, but, during the third year following identification, must take such action in benefit of any school that still fails to make adequate yearly progress. Corrective actions may include such actions as withholding funds; interagency collaborative agreements between the school and other public agencies to provide health, counseling, and other social services; revoking authority for a school to operate a schoolwide program; decreasing decision-making authority; reconstituting the school staff; and authorizing students to transfer, including transportation to other public schools served by Title I in the district. The LEA may refrain from taking corrective actions for one additional year if the failure can be attributed to extenuating circumstances.

6. *Who provides the assistance?*

Under the proposal to the USDOE, technical assistance may be provided directly by the LEA or by an institution of higher education, a private non-profit organization, and educational service agency, a comprehensive regional assistance center or other entities.

7. *Have waivers played a role in this process?*

Waivers were not identified as playing a role.

8. *Are there future plans for the state system for schools or districts receiving Title I funding (proposed or enacted and to be implemented) or for the definition of adequate yearly progress? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

The plan described above is still under review by the USDOE and has not been implemented; its implementation is the future plan for the state Title I Office. NHEAIP test data from the spring of 2000 will be considered baseline data for all Title I participating schools with 10 or more students tested in language arts and mathematics. NHEIAP test results taken in the spring of 2001 will provide the state with Year 1 data. At that time the state will be able to calculate a school's progress as improving, stable or declining and determine which schools made or did not make AYP. NHEIAP test data from the spring of 2002 will provide Year 2 data. The state will then be able for a second consecutive year to identify those schools that did not make AYP and are identified as schools in need of improvement.

9. *Is there alignment between Title I and non-Title I systems for adequate yearly progress?*

The state generally has not been in the practice of identifying schools or districts as low performing outside of Title I.

10. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of Title I? Explain.*

Since NHEIAP is administered at three-fixed grade levels: 3, 6, and 10, the cohort of students tested changes each year. As a result, performance on the NHEIAP assessments will vary year to year since a different group of students is being tested. This issue is compounded by the fact that New Hampshire schools are often very small with small numbers of students tested at each grade level. These small numbers make it difficult, according to the state, to craft a definition “with merit.” It is this issue that was the impetus for the state to develop AYP based on running three-year averages (weighted by appropriate student enrollment and participation levels).

## **Contact Information**

### **Assessment and Accountability**

William B. Ewert,  
Assessment Team Manager  
New Hampshire Department of Education  
101 Pleasant Street  
Concord, NH 03301-3860  
(603) 271-2298  
wewert@ed.state.nh.us

### **Title I**

Dorothy Fair  
State Title I Director  
New Hampshire Department of Education  
101 Pleasant Street  
Concord, NH 03301-3860  
(603) 271-3301  
dfair@ed.state.nh.us