State: **Maryland**

Part A: *In preparation for monthly calls, States must answer the following questions.*

1. Describe the State's key accomplishments and challenges this month.

    Accomplishments

    -   The State has completed a draft of its monitoring plan for LEAs.

    -   Hiring of key project managers

    -   Progress on Educator Effectiveness Academies

    -   Progress in establishing a relationship with Baltimore City

    Challenges

    -   Educator Effectiveness Council – The teacher and principal evaluation system continues to be a challenge. The Council is working towards recommendations that are due in June.

    -   Keeping up with reporting requirements while completing amendments and working with LEAs is an ongoing challenge.

    -   Completing MOUs with outside entities presents unique challenges.

2. Is the State on track to meet the goals and timelines associated with the activities outlined in its scope of work? If not, what strategies is the State employing in order to meet its goals?

    Even though there are specific projects that have some timeline issues, the State is on track to meet its goals.

3. How can the Department help the State meet its goals?

    The biggest help that the Department can provide is to turn around amendments quickly.

Part B: *In preparation for monthly calls, States must also answer the following questions for **two** application sub-criteria (e.g. (A)(2) and (D)(4)).*

Criteria *((B)(2); (B)(3)*

Relevant projects: *Project: 3/2 – Formative Assessments*

Project: 4/3 – Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development

Project: 5/4 - Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development for ITEEA

Project: 6/76 – Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development CTE-SREB

Project: 7/5 – World Language Pipelines

1. What methods, tools, and processes is the State using to determine the progress toward goals and the quality of implementation of the activities described in this sub-criterion?

   As with all sub-criteria, we are utilizing project management techniques for monitoring and controlling the program at the project/activity level and for determining progress towards milestones and goals.
   Microsoft Project Professional is being used to develop project level schedules. Project schedules have been detailed for 54 projects with specific activities planned for the remainder of the year. Each project manager reviews their respective project schedule with their program director to ensure that project activities, issues, risks, and concerns are discussed. The quality of implementation of the activities will be determined by our overall program evaluation that has been built into the grant.

2. Provide a narrative that demonstrates the extent of the State's progress toward its goals and alignment to the scope of work.

   Goal 3 (B)(2): Develop and Implement a set of high-quality assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards

   Project: 3/2 – Formative Assessments

   This project supports the work of the PARCC consortia that is developing summative assessments and work within Maryland to develop high-quality formative assessments to form a comprehensive assessment system. This project also supports the work in Section B3. The program and project managers will be working solely on the formative assessment systems in elementary, middle, and high school similar to staff who are currently working on the Maryland summative assessments. The staff will work closely

with local school system personnel on defining requirements to implement an online formative assessment system within each LEA. This project also enables Maryland to build a comprehensive bank of formative assessment items and tools aligned with the summative assessment system.

A project charter, concept document, and work plan have been developed to guide the work on this project. Interviews for a Formative Assessment Program Manager have occurred and the position has been offered. The eight project managers will be hired by September 30, 2011. MSDE is one of 26 states participating in the PARCC consortia collaborating to develop formative assessments. Since several of the PARCC states are also RTTT states it will be possible to pool resources and funds for a formative assessment system that could be utilized by everyone. Lastly, evaluation has begun on the scope of formative assessments and a strategy is being developed to integrate the newly developed formative assessments with adaptive testing and the item bank.

The delay in the full approval of the State Scope of Work and budget, the late start due to pending consortium startup issues, and delays in hiring impacted the early efforts to achieve milestones but those challenges have been resolved and budget amendments have been submitted that will enable us to meet targeted goals in a timely manner.

Goal 4 (B)(3): Create Cross Curricular Documents in Parallel Format

Project: 4/3 – Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development

This project will result in the development and/or revision of curriculum aligned with the Common Core Standards in mathematics, English/language arts, STEM, related on-line instructional tools and resources, formative assessments, and professional development.

A program manager and STEM coordinator have been hired. In addition, English/language arts, math, and STEM specialists have been hired. A gap analysis was completed and presented to the Maryland State Board of Education. On-line STEM course content discussions are in process. An IT Project Manager has been identified and will be working with the STEM specialist to design processes to advance course development. Conducting a requirements analysis for the on-line STEM course is linked to Project 31, the Curriculum Management System. The timeline for STEM on-line course development is aggressive. Finally, the Curriculum Framework Development is scheduled to be presented to the Maryland State Board of Education in May.

The delay in the full approval of the State scope of work and budget, and delays in hiring impacted the early efforts to achieve milestones but those challenges have been resolved

and budget amendments have been submitted that will enable us to meet targeted goals in a timely manner.

Project: 5/4 - Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development for ITEEA

The intent of this initiative is to provide funding to support the adoption of internationally benchmarked standards aligned to the Common Core, model course guides, and end-of-course assessments available from International Technology and Engineering Educators Association (ITEEA) STEM Center for Teacher and Learning (STEM-CTL) to increase students' technology literacy. This project will make available to all LEAs the resources necessary to implement highly rigorous, technology education programs aligned to the Common Core.

The project team has met both the project year one goal (13 participating local school systems) and project year two goals (16 participating school systems). As a result of increased school participation, a program and budget amendment have been submitted outlining the updated project targets and shifting funds for project years two, three, and four. All school systems have administered the pre-assessment and the resulting data have been distributed to each teacher, school, and school system. Professional development is scheduled for June 23 to June 29 at Reservoir High in Howard County and August 8 to August 12 at North Caroline High in Caroline County. Registration for these sessions commenced on April 1, 2011. The project team anticipates that 60 teachers will participate in the training. Curriculum development is scheduled to begin in May and will conclude prior to the summer professional development. Four professional development trainers have been contracted to develop curriculum and conduct the summer training.

Project: 6/76 – Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development CTE-SREB

MSDE will participate in the Southern Regional Education Board's (SREB) multi-state consortium to develop curricula, instructional materials, assessments, and professional development to provide more students with relevant and challenging CTE/STEM programs of study.

The project manager has been working with the design team and curriculum writers to complete the development of Course I projects as planned. Monthly conference calls with SREB and other partner-states who are working on similar projects have been conducted to assist in the overall development of CTE curriculum and assessments. Gathering feedback and revising the draft projects has required more time than originally anticipated in the second quarter causing an adjustment in the overall timeframe for third quarter activities. The Design Team is scheduled to reconvene in May 2011.

Project: 7/5 – World Language Pipelines

Maryland's competitive edge depends on the preparation of graduates who are highly skilled in STEM and proficient in languages other than English as measured on internationally benchmarked assessments. Maryland will collaborate with LEAs to plan and implement World Language Pipelines, beginning with articulated Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi K-5 programs and Spanish dual language programs. Teacher committees will be convened to write and translate STEM curriculum models that can be used statewide and guide the development of online courses in STEM content for world language teachers.

Arabic and Chinese World Language specialists have been hired. Research has been conducted and school visitations have occurred in preparation for the development of STEM modules and on-line courses for teachers. The LEA project application was prepared, approved, and distributed to superintendents, assistant superintendents, and World Language supervisors. The deadline for LEA applications is May 2, 2011. Review teams have been identified and scoring rubrics have been designed for the application review process to identify participating LEAs. Early indications are that eight LEAs will apply for sub-grants. The participating LEAs will be identified by May 20, 2011.

Identifying and hiring language specialists has been a challenge but has been achieved.

3. What is the State's assessment of the quality of implementation to date?

Maryland feels that the quality of implementation to date has been excellent.

4. If the State is not on track with the goals, timelines and quality of implementation outlined in the scope of work, why not, and what strategies is the State employing in order to meet its goals?

NA

5. What are the potential obstacles and/or risks that could impact the State's ability to achieve its goals?

Evaluation: Performance and progress to date (choose one)
Problematic (1)   Weak (2)   Adequate (3)   Strong (4)   Advanced (5)***