From Defense to Strategy: A Starting Framework for the Future of New Hampshire Public Schools.



NH INSIGHTS
MAY 10, 2026

The purpose of this document is to spark a community discussion of the challenges affecting NH K-12 Education. Please feel free to make comments, and I will update the document based on everyone's feedback over time.

I hope to use this document to engage stakeholders and to start a formal project to develop a strategy to address the issues raised (if none already exist).

Problem Statement

New Hampshire's K–12 public education system is one of the state's most important long-term assets, but it is operating under growing structural pressure. The state's public schools are excellent, ranked 5th in the nation by NH Journal.

Today, several pressures are converging. Student enrollment has declined over time, but many school costs—buildings, transportation, special education, staffing, and core programming—do not fall neatly when enrollment drops. This creates rising per-pupil costs even when districts are not simply "spending more." At the same time, New Hampshire relies heavily on local property taxes to fund education, creating large differences in local capacity and increasing pressure on taxpayers, especially in communities with limited property wealth or aging populations.

Academic performance remains strong compared with many other states, but averages can hide important challenges. Student outcomes vary significantly by poverty, disability status, English language status, absenteeism, and local resources. Schools are being asked to improve academic results while also responding to student mental health needs, workforce shortages, special education obligations, transportation challenges, and growing public scrutiny.

The central problem is not that New Hampshire's public schools are broadly failing. The problem is that the state has not developed a modern, coherent strategy for sustaining high-quality public education amid declining enrollment, rising fixed costs, uneven local tax capacity, changing student needs, and intensifying political pressure. Without that strategy, school districts are left to solve statewide structural problems one local budget at a time, while the Legislature increasingly defines the debate for them.

New Hampshire needs a more honest and forward-looking approach: one that protects educational quality, improves outcomes for students who need more support, addresses long-term cost pressures, strengthens public trust, and gives local communities practical options before fiscal stress forces reactive choices.

Strategic Thesis

The purpose of this framework is to move the conversation from defense to strategy. New Hampshire does not need a public education debate built around slogans—either "schools are failing" or "nothing needs to change." It needs a disciplined assessment of what is working, what is under stress, what must improve, and what choices communities and state leaders face.

The goal is to help public schools lead with candor, evidence, and practical solutions before fiscal or political pressure forces reactive decisions.

What This Framework Is — and Is Not

Clarification	Meaning
This framework is	A starting point for a fuller public conversation about how New Hampshire can sustain and improve public education under changing conditions.
This framework is	A way to connect cost, enrollment, student outcomes, workforce, governance, and public trust into one strategic discussion.
This framework is not	An argument for preserving every existing structure exactly as it is.
This framework is not	An argument that cost, performance, or accountability concerns should be ignored.
This framework is not	A partisan document or a single-bill response; it is a problem-solving framework.

Summary of Challenge Areas

The table below groups the major challenges facing public schools into five strategic categories. A grouped view is useful because many of the pressures interact: enrollment affects facilities, facilities affect costs, costs affect taxes, taxes affect trust, and trust affects the room schools have to adapt.

Challenge Category	Specific Pressures	Strategic Implication
Demographic and Fiscal Pressures	Declining enrollment; fixed and semi-fixed costs; property tax dependence; uneven local capacity; small district scale.	Explain why per-pupil costs may rise even when districts are not simply "spending more," and identify where long-term planning is needed.
Student Needs and Outcomes	Special education; poverty and readiness; mental health and behavioral needs; chronic absenteeism; academic recovery and gaps; English language learners.	Move beyond statewide averages and focus on the students, grades, and supports where improvement is most needed.
Operational Capacity	Workforce recruitment and retention; teacher and staff compensation; administrative capacity; transportation; facilities; technology and cybersecurity; mandates and compliance.	Distinguish costs schools can control from costs driven by legal obligations, geography, labor markets, infrastructure, and student needs.
Governance and Policy Environment	Fragmented governance; political pressure and state policy change; accountability and measurement; regional cooperation barriers.	Clarify which problems can be solved locally, which require regional cooperation, and which require state action.
Public Trust and Communication	Budget season dynamics; inconsistent communication with taxpayers and families; narrow public measures of cost or performance.	Shift from annual budget defense to year-round public leadership grounded in data, tradeoffs, and progress reporting.

SWOT Analysis: New Hampshire K–12 Public Education

Before discussing solutions, it helps to step back and evaluate New Hampshire's public education system the same way businesses,

nonprofits, and governments often evaluate complex organizations: through a SWOT analysis.

SWOT stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. It is a strategic planning framework designed to separate internal capabilities from external pressures. Strengths and weaknesses are generally factors within a system's control, while opportunities and threats reflect broader trends and conditions shaping the environment around it.

The purpose of this exercise is not to label schools as "good" or "bad." It is to better understand where New Hampshire's education system is performing well, where structural challenges are emerging, and where future risks and opportunities may exist. In a debate increasingly dominated by short-term political narratives, a structured assessment can help refocus attention on long-term system design and realistic problem-solving.

Strengths	Weaknesses
• Strong overall educational performance compared with many other states; public schools are generally viewed as a major state asset. • Local control and community engagement give residents a direct voice in school budgets, priorities, and governance. • Experienced educators and local school leaders with deep community knowledge. • Smaller school environments can allow for closer relationships among students, families, and educators. • Relatively strong civic culture around town meetings, local budgeting, and public oversight. • Existing public investment in facilities, programs, and personnel provides a foundation to build from. • Potential for regional collaboration through SAUs, shared services, transportation planning, and specialized programming. • Public schools remain central community institutions, especially in smaller towns.	• Heavy reliance on local property taxes creates uneven tax burdens and uneven fiscal capacity across communities. • Limited flexibility to adjust costs when enrollment changes because buildings, transportation, staffing, and required services do not shrink neatly. • High fixed and semi-fixed cost structure, including facilities, transportation, utilities, administration, special education, and staffing. • Fragmented governance makes statewide planning difficult because responsibility is divided among the state, towns, school boards, SAUs, and voters. • Administrative scale challenges, especially in small districts that must meet the same compliance, finance, HR, reporting, and operational requirements as larger systems. • Inconsistent communication with taxpayers and families, often allowing critics or the Legislature to define the narrative. • Achievement gaps can be hidden by strong statewide averages. • Budget discussions often become reactive and tax-focused rather than strategic, long-term, and outcome-focused.

Opportunities	Threats
• Create a modern statewide strategy for sustaining high-quality education amid declining enrollment, rising costs, and changing student needs. • Improve public communication by explaining costs, outcomes, tradeoffs, and student needs year-round instead of only during budget season. • Use data more effectively to connect spending, demographics, attendance, student needs, and outcomes. • Expand regional cooperation and shared services while preserving local voice and identity. • Target academic improvement where needs are greatest, including poverty-linked gaps, absenteeism, early literacy, math recovery, special education, and student readiness. • Strengthen early learning and family supports so schools are not expected to solve readiness gaps alone. • Develop a balanced scorecard that goes beyond test scores and per-pupil spending. • Position schools as leaders in problem-solving rather than simply responding to Concord or local criticism.	• Continued enrollment decline could make per-pupil costs appear increasingly unsustainable, even when districts are managing budgets responsibly. • Legislative narratives may define schools as inefficient or underperforming if districts do not proactively explain their own data and challenges. • Property tax fatigue may reduce public willingness to support school budgets, even when needs are real. • State policy changes could shift more responsibility or cost to local districts without giving them adequate tools or transition time. • Workforce shortages may worsen, especially for teachers, specialists, paraprofessionals, bus drivers, counselors, and support staff. • Special education and student support costs may continue rising, especially in small districts with limited ability to absorb unpredictable expenses. • Political polarization around public education may make practical problem-solving harder. • A narrow “cut administration” or “shrink with enrollment” narrative may oversimplify the real cost structure and lead to poor decisions.

Strategic Implications of the SWOT

The SWOT analysis suggests that New Hampshire’s public education system starts from a position of strength, but its operating model is under pressure. The greatest risk is not a single failure point. It is the interaction of several pressures at once: declining enrollment, limited cost flexibility, dependence on property taxes, rising student needs, workforce shortages, and fragmented governance.

The strategic implication is clear: schools cannot rely only on annual budget defense or broad claims of strong performance. They need a proactive strategy that explains the system’s pressures, identifies areas for improvement, and offers practical paths for adaptation.

The central question is not whether public education will change. It will. The question is whether change will be planned by schools and communities, or imposed through fiscal pressure, state policy, and public frustration.

Eight Action Elements of a New Hampshire Public Education Strategy

The problem statement and SWOT analysis suggest that New Hampshire does not need a strategy built around defending the status quo. It needs a strategy to sustain and improve public education under new conditions. The eight action elements below translate the diagnosis into a practical agenda.

Action Element	Purpose	What It Should Include
1. Adopt a Shared Public Problem Statement	Establish a shared understanding of the real challenges facing public education.	Acknowledge declining enrollment, fixed and rising costs, property tax pressure, workforce shortages, student needs, uneven outcomes, and public trust concerns.
2. Set Measurable Student Outcome Priorities	Show that the goal is not simply to protect the current system, but to improve it.	Focus on teaching and learning, curriculum quality, early literacy, math performance, student growth, graduation readiness, special education outcomes, and support for students who are falling behind.
3. Explain Cost Drivers and Fiscal Tradeoffs	Help taxpayers understand what is driving school budgets and what can realistically be changed.	Explain fixed costs, legally required services, staffing, transportation, facilities, health insurance, utilities, special education, administrative functions, and long-term cost pressures.
4. Plan for Enrollment Decline Before Crisis Decisions	Prepare for demographic change before it creates urgent, reactive choices.	Use long-term enrollment projections, building utilization studies, capital plans, class-size analysis, transportation impacts, and community impact assessments.
5. Develop Practical Regional Cooperation Options	Address small-scale cost pressures while preserving local voice where possible.	Explore shared special education programs, business office functions, HR, payroll, transportation contracts, purchasing, substitute pools, technology support, cybersecurity, and regional career and technical education.
6. Address Readiness, Attendance, and Student Support Needs	Recognize that student outcomes are shaped by conditions inside and outside the classroom.	Address chronic absenteeism, early childhood readiness, mental health, behavioral supports, family engagement, poverty-linked gaps, English language learners, and community partnerships.
7. Build an Educator and Support Staff Workforce Plan	Ensure schools can recruit and retain the people needed to serve students well.	Focus on teacher recruitment, paraprofessional stability, special education staffing, counselors, school psychologists, speech therapists, bus drivers, leadership pipelines, workload, compensation, and retention.
8. Create a Year-Round Public Trust Strategy	Shift schools from budget-season defense to public leadership.	Publish plain-language budget explanations, annual “State of Our Schools” reports, performance dashboards, enrollment updates, staffing challenges, cost-driver explanations, and progress reports on improvement efforts.

Decision Rights: Who Must Act?

A credible public education strategy must clarify who can act on which problems. Some issues can be addressed by local districts; others require regional cooperation, state policy, or community partnerships.

Strategic Question	Primary Actors	Examples
What can local districts control?	Superintendents, school boards, SAUs, budget committees, voters.	Budget explanations; local improvement plans; staffing models; curriculum implementation; public communication; local facilities planning.
What requires regional cooperation?	Neighboring districts, SAUs, municipalities, CTE centers, regional service providers.	Shared services; special education programs; transportation coordination; substitute pools; cooperative purchasing; regional CTE and workforce pathways.
What requires state action?	Legislature, Governor, NH Department of Education, state agencies.	Funding formula; adequacy aid; special education reimbursement; data systems; mandates; educator pipelines; statewide accountability and transparency.
What requires community partnership?	Families, early childhood providers, health systems, nonprofits, employers, libraries, recreation programs.	Early learning; attendance; student mental health; family engagement; workforce pathways; wraparound student supports.
What requires better public communication?	District leaders, school boards, educators, local officials, community advocates.	Plain-language budget guides; annual State of Our Schools reports; dashboards; progress updates; explanations of tradeoffs.