

Race to the Top Progress Update

July, 2011

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

- Conducted technical assistance training for LEA representatives to complete 2011-12 SOW
- Established review process and review teams for Master Plan/SOW
- Amendment was approved by USDE to extend timeline for Maryland Statewide System of Evaluation for one year
- Conducted technical assistance for 7 school systems piloting educator evaluation systems. Sample student growth models were shared with the pilot LEAs
- Completed 10 of the 11 scheduled Educator Effectiveness Academies

Challenges

- Receiving deliverables from USM for program evaluation for years 2, 3, and 4. Meeting with USM to define. Expect by July 31, 2011
- Clarifying and defining how LEA projects will be evaluated. Meeting with USM to define deliverables. Expect by July 31, 2011.
- MOU with NMSI and UTeach cannot be signed until amendment is approved by USDE. Awaiting amendment approval
- No LEAs submitted applications for sub-grants to hire international teachers. Communicating with LEAs to identify reasons. Anticipate that it is a budget issue within LEAs. Difficult to maintain programs in present fiscal climate in LEAs.
- None of the identified lowest-achieving schools in Breakthrough Zones received 21st Century grant for 2011-12. Must decide what to do with coordinator's position
- No schools have been identified in Prince George's County as restart charter schools. One school has been identified in Baltimore City. Revising amendment for project #44

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?
Yes, pending approval of amendments, the goals in the approved scope of work will be achieved.
3. How can the Department help the State meet its goals?
Awaiting word from USDE regarding the submission of the technical assistance request focused student growth measures as it applies to the educator evaluation system.

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 (e.g. A): D

Sub-criterion (e.g. A2): 1 and 4

Relevant projects:

- #13 Building Leadership Capacity in Low Achieving Schools
- #26 Elementary STEM Certification
- #49 Educator Information System to Accommodate Additional Data
- #73 Teach for Maryland

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. Project managers review 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.

Maryland will be reviewing our results against our action plans in the application to measure our success with the projects in section D1 and D4. We anticipate no problems.

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

D1 Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals

- Laws and regulations regarding alternative routes to certification
Regulations are firmly in place to support alternative preparation of teachers, with a fully developed and implemented State Program Approval process that requires adherence to the same standards and guidelines recognized by NCATE and the Maryland State Board

of Education in all of its teacher preparation programs. Since 2005, when these regulations were put in place, more than 2000 individuals have received initial certification through Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs (MAAPP).

- Alternative routes for teachers

As noted above, MAAPPs have become an integral part of the teacher education community and completers of programs serve an ongoing and critical need in Maryland. Alternate routes are fully developed, monitored and assessed and data are collected from each program annually, with cyclical peer Site State Program Review entering the third year of implementation. Only four programs of the original 19 approved programs have yet to undergo review, and all that have undergone review have met standards.

- Alternative routes for principals

While there is little to no use of the option of the Resident Principal Certificate in Maryland, the use of which would be considered the truly alternate route, the partnership between New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS), local school systems, and three universities functions as an innovative, and alternative means for principals to receive training to lead particularly in high-needs school districts (Project #13). NLNS provides modular training highly focused on training for challenging school settings that will be absorbed into traditional leadership programs leading to administrative certification. Programs also include a mentored principal internship.

- Addressing educator shortages

Due to the faltering economy, current shortages are limited to very specialized areas of need. However, addressing both the number and quality of teachers in the STEM areas of certification continues to be a high priority. The Elementary STEM project #26 addresses the need for elementary programs to assume the responsibility for training teachers highly skilled in both a revised pedagogical approach and deepened content acquisition. Seven universities and twelve local school systems are engaged in this work. MAAPPs continue, through 14 programs in six local school systems, to fill shortages in targeted areas.

D4 Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs

- Linking student growth to all preparation programs, publish data, and use data in program approval

The Governor's Educator Effectiveness Task Force has submitted a recommendation to the governor and the Maryland State Board of Education for a draft evaluation system. Five pilot programs are engaged as of the fall of 2011, and the final approval is pending based at least in part on the outcomes of the pilot processes. The results from this pilot and the statewide pilot, as well as the ongoing statewide system of evaluation, will be fed back to IHEs to help them improve their teacher and principal preparation programs.

- Expand preparation and credential options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals

While a final definition of the "effective teacher" is still in its infancy, one project is bringing together the force of the Breakthrough Center, five universities and three local school systems to make revisions to teacher education programs that will prepare teachers especially to teach in high-poverty, high-minority schools (Project #73). The work is well on the way to establishing best practices in the field by examining promising practices and research findings, and adapting these practices and learning through intensive professional development school clinical practice and program design.

- Project #49, Educator Information Systems to Accommodate Additional Data, is also included in D4. Project #49 was included in our June report but here is an update.

Recognizing the importance of aligning student growth with principal and teacher effectiveness, Maryland will design and implement a process to enhance the Educator Information System (EIS) to include teacher and principal evaluation and professional development data aligned with the P-12 Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) to connect student growth with teacher and principal effectiveness. This emphasis on teacher and principal accountability, as it relates to student growth, necessitates major changes to EIS in order to facilitate access to this new data set to make employment related decisions.

Pursuant to the expansion of the current CRM based system, the project team has completed requirements gathering. A series of Joint Application Development (JAD) sessions were conducted with Local Education Agencies (LEA) to collect their input relative to the expansion of the system and to secure end-user buy in and commitment to the project's objectives. Results of these sessions were sent to the LEAs. In order begin technical analysis relative to the design and implementation of the new system, a Task Order Request for Proposal (TORFP) was completed to hire a contractual resource. A review of the current production environment was conducted to define architectural requirements for building a parallel environment in preparation for future testing and development activities. System requirements were submitted to initiate the procurement process. Additionally, the O&M vendor created an ERWIN/Visio Database schema/model of the EIS. This Database schema/ model will aid in expanding the EIS longitudinal capabilities. A concept proposal document has been completed and submitted. . The amendment submitted to USDE in April to move prorated contractual funding amount from year one to years two, three, and four has been approved by USDE.

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

Maryland feels that the quality of implementation has been excellent. Much of the work in these two criteria is in the out years of the grant.

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?

None that we can anticipate at this point in time.

Evaluation: Performance and progress to date (choose one)

Problematic (1) Weak (2) Adequate (3) Strong (4) **Advanced (5)**