

Race to the Top Progress Update – Monthly Call

Directions: In preparation for monthly calls, a State must provide responses to the questions in Part A for their overall plan, and responses to the questions in Part B for *two* application sub-criterion.

Part A: *In preparation for monthly calls, States must provide information that addresses the three questions below on the implementation of all aspects of its approved scope of work. This may include a written response. If your State already has a state-specific system to report on its progress, please work with your program officer to determine the best method of providing this information for your State.*

- What were the State’s key accomplishments and challenges this past month?

Accomplishments:

- Project 1/78 (Office of Academic Reform and Innovation) – Organized, coordinated, and participated in USDE on site visit during March 12, 13, and 14
- Project 2/1 (Program Evaluation)– The “process” phase of the evaluation of the 54 RTTT projects commenced. All projects are scheduled for evaluation. The “process” phase evaluations will be completed by 9/30/12
- Project 31/13 (Building Leadership Capacity in Low Achieving Schools) – NLNS working in collaboration with Notre Dame of Maryland University and Salisbury/UMES have developed aspiring leaders courses. EPIC, the online resource from NLNS, is a part of both courses.
- Project 35/26 (Elementary STEM Certification) – Towson University and Prince George’s County Public Schools Alternative Prep Program responded to the RFP to become members of the Elementary STEM Network.
- Project 16/20 (STEM Instructional and Career Support)—A definition of STEM and STEM Standards of Practice has been vetted across the State and will be presented to the Board Of Education for their approval in May. These standards will serve as the foundation for certification of teachers and future development of curriculum.
- Project 36/75 (U Teach Maryland). Towson University working with UTeach will be developing a STEM certification program for secondary teachers. They plan to graduate 260 students from their program. UMBC also submitted a proposal to UTeach.
- Project 51/71 (STEM – Project Lead the Way) – four potential sites identified in Baltimore City for implementation of Project Lead the Way

- Ordered VMware licenses and Dell Test/Dev systems. Order fulfillment is in process with an estimated delivery date of 4/13/2012.
- Purchase order for a 65TB SAN solution to support the entire RTTT infrastructure was issued.
- Project 4/3 (Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development)—RFP for two STEM online high school courses in Cyber-Security and Environmental Science have been reviewed by DoIT, modified, and returned to DoIT for final review. Second set of online high school STEM courses RFP is ready for review once initial RFP is approved.
- Project 14/31 (Develop and Implement State Curriculum Management System)—On 3/22/12, received DLS approval of Project Planning Request (PPR) to enable project to proceed to implementation phases. Interviews for the Oracle configuration specialist have been conducted.
- Project 15/7 (Expand Instructional Toolkit)—MDSE reviewed the third set of correlated resources in ELA, Science, Social Studies, STEM, and Math for Deliverable 1. MSDE verifying approved vs. non-approved resource counts. MSDE and MPT held meeting to plan for post-identification activity.
- Project 21/42 (Implement a Statewide System to Support Student Instructional Intervention)—RFP was updated and finally approved by DoIT on 4/3/2012.
- Project 22/6 (Develop Online Instructional Intervention Modules) — DoIT approved the RFP for publication. The RFP was published. Pre-proposal Conference will be scheduled for early April with Alan Delman, Harry Holt, and Judy Jenkins
- Project 29/48 (Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System)—Decided on a point accumulation model for teacher and principal evaluation system. Continuing to conduct market due diligence relative to available systems for procurement of a rating calculator.
- Project 30/49 (Expand Educator Information System to Accommodate Additional Data)—The project team completed the software requirements list and submitted to OIT for review.
- Project 3/2 Formative assessment: RFP pending for content
- Project 8/11 (Infrastructure) OBIEE production procurement initiated, and RFQ for definition of COBIT and ITIL proposals in review
- Project 10/28 (MLDS Training) Initiating planning for data coaching services
- Project 11/29 (LEA Technology Grants) 24 LEA proposals in review

- Project 17/32 (Item Test Bank) RPF in review
- Project 18/33 (Adaptive Test System) RFPs in review
- Project 12/60 (Data Exchange) MFT procurement contract with AG
- Project 13/61 (Data Warehouse) P20 data map and gap progressing, P20 database structure design initiated; MHEC higher education data logical data structure design completed and physical database being created; Data dictionary for cross-application testing received from NC and installed – testing to begin
- Project 54/79 (Statewide Transcript System) Granting process initiated for LEAs implementing the etranscript system; 4 LEAs in installation phase, and 9 LEAs are in development phase

Challenges:

- Project 53/44 (Charter Schools) – a new program manager needs to be selected
 - Project 1/78 (Office of Academic Reform and Innovation) – Continue to seek candidates for the RTTT accountant position
 - Project 15/7 (Expand Instructional Toolkit)—MPT to make improvements in how it produces Deliverable 3 Algebra PD course content.
 - Project 21/42 (Implement a Statewide System to Support Student Instructional Intervention) - The project is 3 months behind schedule as a result of the lengthy DoIT RFP review and approval process. The project team will accelerate project execution so as to bring the project back on track.
 - Ongoing challenge of the timeline for implementation of a new evaluation system while also implementing a new curriculum based on the Common Core State Standards and the rollout of the new assessments from PARCC. This is complicated by our own high school graduation tests. These issues are a major topic of discussion with superintendents and our State Board of Education.
2. Is the State on track to meet the goals and timelines associated with the activities outlined in its approved scope of work? If not, what strategies is the State employing in order to meet its goals?

Yes, the State is on track to meet the goals and timelines associated in their scope of work.

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

- Is there a way USDE can assist with the ongoing problem of having to administer two assessments (NCLB and PARCC) in 2014-15?
- At one point in time, State leads had asked if USDE could assist from a national level in communication more broadly about reform in general and Race to the Top in particular. Such messaging could provide needed support for statewide efforts.

**Race to the Top
Progress Update – Monthly Call**

Part B: *In preparation for monthly calls, States must submit written responses to the following questions for two application sub-criteria (e.g. (A)(2) and (D)(4)).¹ All responses in this section should be tailored to the goals and projects associated with this sub-criterion.*

Application sub-criterion:² (A)(2)

STATE's goals for this sub-criterion:

- Provide effective oversight of the Race to the Top grant
- Ensure an effective program evaluation

Relevant projects:

1/78 Office of Academic Reform and Innovation
2/1 Program Evaluation

1. What is the extent of the State's progress toward meeting the goals and performance measures and implementing the activities that are included in its approved scope of work for this sub-criterion?

Project 1/78: Office of Academic Reform and Innovation

Since our last report in mid-January 2012, we have made progress in several areas.

We completed the USDE onsite visit during the week of March 12, 2012. Executive sponsors, project directors, and project managers provided detailed information about their respective projects and responded to questions from representatives from USDE.

Onsite visits to all 22 LEAS were scheduled during the month of March. Each LEA superintendent received a letter describing the purpose and procedures. In addition, the superintendent received a copy of the "LEA Onsite Monitoring Questionnaire." Completed questionnaires were returned to MSDE by April 16, 2012. Teams of two to four individuals from the Division of Academic Reform and Innovation will be facilitating the onsite visits. At this time, team members are reviewing the completed questionnaires, the LEA scope of work, and the LEA monthly reports to identify additional questions to be discussed during the onsite visits. The

¹ On each monthly call, program officers and states should work together to select two sub-criteria for the following month.

² All highlighted fields will be pre-populated by the Department Program Officer prior to State completion.

LEAs will provide evidence/documentation of success during the visit that reflect their work in each of the four assurance areas and each project. LEA Liaisons will complete a summary report at the conclusion of the onsite visit. The summary will be in narrative form addressing each of these areas: overall progress, progress on each project, and fiscal oversight. In addition, a score of 1 to 4, based on the agreement among team members, will be designated for each project. A score of 1 will indicate “on-track with high quality” to a score of 4 which will indicate “substantially off-track and significant quality concerns requiring urgent and decisive action.” The summary reports are to be completed by June 30, 2012.

The Core Team has begun to address sustainability issues/needs. Executive sponsors and project managers are identifying those projects in which the endeavor, or at least some portion of the endeavor, needs to continue beyond October 1, 2014. An estimate of potential costs is being identified. Sustaining beyond 2014 will require commitment of State dollars through the MSDE operating budget. Decisions need to be considered now for future budget planning.

Several projects have been moved to Jim Foran who will now serve as the Executive Sponsor for those projects. This move helps streamline reporting structures while helping to ensure coherence and collaboration among all projects. Donnell Josiah is now the program director for Project 29/48, Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System, and reports to Jim. Projects 8/11 (Develop the Overall Technology Infrastructure to Support RTTT Initiatives), 9/27 (Accessing and Using State Data Dashboards), 10/28 (MultiMedia Training), 11/29 (LEA System Application Upgrades and Infrastructure Upgrades), 12/60 (Expansion of LDS for Data Exchange), 13/61 (Enhancement to LDS to Develop P20 and Workforce Data Warehouse Center), 54/79 (Implement Statewide Centralized Student Transcript System) will continue to be directed by Rob London, but Jim will serve as the Executive Sponsor.

We have also addressed two other needs – communication and financial management. A former LEA superintendent was hired to maintain communication with LEAs regarding RTTT initiatives. In an effort to build understanding of the impact of RTTT, Jim recently presented at the statewide Common Ground Conference. Attendees included LEA executive leadership and teachers. Jim’s presentation focused on the current status of RTTT with particular emphasis on the RTTT technology initiatives related to instructional planning, delivery, intervention, and assessment. It was shared in the “language” of the users. In addition, we have identified candidates for the financial management positions and will be conducting interviews within the

next couple of weeks. These individuals will enable us to more closely monitor and provide technical assistance to project directors, project managers, and the LEAs.

Project 2/1: Program Evaluation

Significant progress has been made since our last report.

The evaluation of the RTTT projects will occur in three phases – process/product, utilization, and impact. The phases overlap and projects may exit and enter each of the phases at different times. The “process/product” phase of evaluation was initiated in March. The CAIRE Leadership Team conducted a technical assistance session for all project managers and executive sponsors to explain the goal of each of the three phases and provide an overview of the specific process and procedures for the process evaluation phase. (Please see attachment A, “Process Goals and Objectives Established in MSDE/USM MOU”). The attachment was shared and reviewed during the technical assistance session. The evaluation interviews commenced on April 4, 2012 and will conclude by September 26, 2012. Two, two-hour interviews are conducted each week by a CAIRE team with the project managers and project directors of the projects scheduled for that week. Within a week of the scheduled interviews, a draft evaluation summary report is completed and shared with the project manager, project director, and executive sponsor. Once finalized, the evaluation report is filed in the Kazoo RTTT public file. To date, the project managers and directors have found the process to be beneficial. We will be receiving a quarterly review of the evaluations that have been conducted. After September 30, 2012, a consolidated evaluation report will be submitted by CAIRE to the Core Team. During this fiscal year, there are some projects that will also complete the utilization phase of the evaluation process.

CAIRE has also completed and submitted to MSDE the following: a qualitative review of LEA monthly reports identifying successes, themes, and possible risks; a satisfaction survey of participants in the 2011 Educator Effectiveness Academy; a mid-year summary report. CAIRE will also be completing an evaluation of a sample of school transition plans developed and finalized by school teams following participation in the 2011 Educator Effectiveness Academy. Some of the schools in two LEAs have not been responsive to the request for the transition plans. That issue is being resolved by the State superintendent with the superintendents in those two LEAs so that the CAIRE review of the transition plans can occur as quickly as possible. The CAIRE Team has met with the EEA Planning Team to develop procedures for evaluating the

2012 summer academies and procedures for a quicker turnaround of the data so that it can be used for planning subsequent academies.

Recently, CAIRE leadership meet with Bob Glascock, coordinator of the Breakthrough Center, to discuss the design of a formative assessment process for the Breakthrough Center projects so that judgments can be made regarding the success and impact of those projects in turning around low performing schools. The evaluation design will focus on questions at three levels. How effective is the organization of the Cross Functional Team in identifying system/school needs and delivering services to school systems/schools? To what degree has the Breakthrough Center impacted systemic changes to effect change at the school system level? To what degree has the Breakthrough Center enabled targeted schools to bring about turnaround change that positively impacts student achievement? Based on the initial conversations, CAIRE will develop a proposal for designing and implementing a formative evaluation process of the Breakthrough Center initiative that will first be shared with Jim Foran and then others for feedback and finalization. CAIRE has also conducted a review of this fiscal year budget to ensure that monies that have been allocated will be fully expended.

2. What methods, tools, and processes is the State using to determine the progress toward the goals and performance measures and the quality of implementation of the activities described for this application sub-criterion?

We utilize 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 projects with specific activities planned for years two, three, and four. The project managers review their project schedules with their program director monthly to ensure that project activities, issues, risks, and concerns are resolved. Project managers are responsible for maintaining up-to-date project schedules as they relate to percentage of activities completed and changes in the duration for completing tasks. Monthly reports are also submitted by the project manager.

The RTTT Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss progress and address any risks that have arisen. Working with the Office of Budget, we have also developed a process for monthly reviews of project budgets involving our finance manager, program directors, and project

managers. Project managers meet with program directors bi-weekly or monthly to discuss progress, identify risks and discuss strategies that have been or will be taken to address obstacles, review budgets, and identify actions that will be taken to move the project forward. The Core Team also meets bi-weekly to discuss progress and address risks by deciding upon actions that need to be taken to resolve any concerns or issues. LEAs submit monthly progress reports to the LEA liaisons. Any needs or issues that arise are addressed immediately by the LEA liaisons. On April 30, 2012, we will conduct our first onsite visit to an LEA. By the first week of June, all LEA onsite visits will have concluded.

The project manager for Project 2/1, Program Evaluation, meets monthly with the CAIRE Leadership Team to discuss progress and address any risks/obstacles that may endanger progress. On as needed basis, the CAIRE Leadership Team and the RTTT Leadership Team meet to develop future plans and address any issues. We receive a monthly deliverables report from CAIRE that delineates the status of deliverables, other completed tasks, and work to be completed the next month. We have a list of proposed project deliverables through November 2012. That list will be updated as we approach the next fiscal year. If the need arises, issues are elevated to the Core Team for resolution.

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

Excellent

3. If the State is not on track to meet the goals, performance measures, timelines and quality of implementation related to this sub-criterion as outlined in its approved scope of work, why not, and what strategies is the State employing in order to meet goals and performance measures?

Yes, we are on track to meet the goals, performance measures, and timelines established in our scope of work.

4. What are the obstacles and/or risks that could impact the State's ability to meet its goals and performance measures related to this sub-criterion?

There are no obstacles or risks that have not or are not being mitigated in some manner so that we are able to meet our goals and performance measures in this sub-criterion.

Evaluation: Based on the responses to the previous question, evaluate the State's performance and progress to date for this sub-criterion (choose one)

Red (1) Orange (2) Yellow (3) Green (4)³

³ Red – substantially off-track and/or has significant quality concerns; urgent and decisive action is required; Orange –off-track and/or there are quality concerns; many aspects require significant attention; Yellow –generally on-track and of high or good quality; only a few aspects require additional attention; Green – on-track with high quality.

Race to the Top Progress Update – Monthly Call

Part B: *In preparation for monthly calls, States must submit written responses to the following questions for two application sub-criteria (e.g. (A)(2) and (D)(4)).⁴ All responses in this section should be tailored to the goals and projects associated with this sub-criterion.*

Application sub-criterion:⁵ (F)(2)

STATE's goals for this sub-criterion:

- Develop a partnership with two school systems to convert schools in restructuring to charter schools

Relevant projects:

53/44 Charter Schools

1. What is the extent of the State's progress toward meeting the goals and performance measures and implementing the activities that are included in its approved scope of work for this sub-criterion?

The partnership between the charter school restart and the high performing charter schools is on track. The restart school, Furman Templeton, has attended all technical assistance sessions provided by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). Templeton has agreed to participate in the Quality Standards Pilot Program and attended the orientation session held on February 9, 2012. We have encountered some challenges in the recruitment of additional low performing schools to participate in the restart partnership initiative; therefore, it is not progressing as quickly as expected due to decision-making delays within participating school systems. To address this challenge, MSDE has requested recommitment letters from these LEAs to be received no later than April 30, 2012. Receipt of these letters will then help us to decide how to proceed with this initiative.

The Charter School Quality Standards Pilot Program was launched with seven participating schools. A training and orientation session was held for these schools and they were provided with copies of the resource guide as well as with a facilitator's guide that they would use with their school's leadership team. The piloting schools were provided with a template of an action plan that was to be submitted once their school's

⁴ On each monthly call, program officers and states should work together to select two sub-criteria for the following month.

⁵ All highlighted fields will be pre-populated by the Department Program Officer prior to State completion.

leadership team for the pilot was selected. Each school's team would be representative of their key stakeholders. The pilot started successfully and will now be concluded before June 30, 2012. The last leadership session to be held at each of the participating schools will focus on completing the team's final summary of the work completed and make recommendations for their school development plan.

The model for the quality standards self assessment has been selected and work is on the way to develop the actual protocols, guides, and accompanying tools. A draft template of *Standard E- Charter School Leadership and Governance assessment tool* will be tested during a site visit to a charter school located in St. Mary's County. Authorizer representatives will use the template to obtain information from the school's governance team and discuss their results and feedback during their next LEA Charter School Liaison's Meeting in June. The results of this initial testing will then serve to inform further development of the assessment process. The progress made on this initiative has been excellent. We hope to have our standards and accompanying resource guide published by the end of July for distribution to all stakeholders during the month of August 2012. A symposium focused on launching Quality Standard C- Student Learning and Achievement will take place on May 8, 2012.

Maryland's work to strengthen authorizer practices and processes continues to make excellent progress. A meeting held on February 10, 2012 focused on authorizer responsibilities. Our April 13, 2012 meeting with authorizer representatives engaged participants in studying the principles of authorizing and led them through an assessment of their current practices against authorizing standards. This study will then progress to exploring the practices of charter school approval, best practices related to performance contracting, and then study the alignment among these practices, the model frameworks, and the Charter School Quality Standards. As mentioned previously, a May 4, 2012 meeting will involve a visit to a charter school, learning more about charter school governance and serve to model the use of the Charter School Quality Standards in authorizer processes. The alignment of all the authorizer model frameworks is now in draft form. These drafts will be presented to authorizer representatives during a June 8, 2012 meeting for review and discussion. Revisions will be made as needed and the documents will then be published and distributed to all school systems in Maryland by the October 2012.

2. What methods, tools, and processes is the State using to determine the progress toward the goals and performance measures and the quality of implementation of the activities described for this application sub-criterion?

We utilize 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 projects with specific activities planned for years two, three, and four. The project manager reviews her project schedule with her program director monthly to ensure that project activities, issues, risks, and concerns are resolved. Project managers are responsible for maintaining up-to-date project schedules as they relate to percentage of activities completed and changes in the duration for completing tasks. Monthly reports are also submitted by the project manager.

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

Despite the fact that the project manager resigned in January 2012, the project has been implemented with fidelity by State Charter School Director until a new project manager can be named.

4. If the State is not on track to meet the goals, performance measures, timelines and quality of implementation related to this sub-criterion as outlined in its approved scope of work, why not, and what strategies is the State employing in order to meet goals and performance measures?
Project 53/44 is on track.

5. What are the obstacles and/or risks that could impact the State's ability to meet its goals and performance measures related to this sub-criterion?

We have encountered some challenges in the recruitment of additional low performing schools to participate in the restart partnership initiative; therefore, it is not progressing as quickly as expected due to decision-making delays within participating school systems. To address this challenge, MSDE has requested recommitment letters from these LEAs to be received no later than April 30, 2012. Receipt of these letters will then help us to decide how to proceed with this initiative.

The project manager left in January 2012. We have been working diligently to identify a new project manager to continue to implement this project successfully. In the interim, the State Charter School Director has been working with project consultants to ensure that goals and timelines are met. It is possible that this change might impact budget

expenditures and project deliverables. An amendment may be forwarded before the end of this project year to mitigate these challenges ensuring the continued success of this project.

Evaluation: Based on the responses to the previous question, evaluate the State's performance and progress to date for this sub-criterion (choose one)

Red (1) Orange (2) Yellow (3) **Green (4)**⁶

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours (annually) per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (34 CFR 75.720, 75.730-732; 34 CFR 80.40 and 80.41). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0011.

⁶ Red – substantially off-track and/or has significant quality concerns; urgent and decisive action is required; Orange –off-track and/or there are quality concerns; many aspects require significant attention; Yellow –generally on-track and of high or good quality; only a few aspects require additional attention; Green – on-track with high quality.

Attachment A

PROCESS GOALS AND OBJECTIVES ESTABLISHED IN MSDE/USM MOU

Collaborate with MSDE to design and implement an evaluation system that will examine each RTTT project and/or group of projects through three lenses:

- A *process and product* lens, examining the development and implementation of the processes, systems, professional development, and new products developed and delivered to educators;
- A *utilization* lens, examining how materials were used by various stakeholder groups;
- An *impact* lens, examining the relationship between implementation of RTTT strategies and expected outcomes (e.g., student achievement, college readiness).

OVERVIEW OF CAIRE RTTT PROJECT EVALUATIONS

Goal #1 – Determine if project is on schedule, per grant	Goal #2 – Determine if project dependencies are defined and being managed	Goal #3 – Determine if stakeholders are involved	Goal #4 – Determine what project documentation is available	Goal #5 – Determine if issues raised during governance activities have been addressed?
<p>Measureable objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify methodology used for scheduling project tasks • Identify methodology for monitoring project’s progress • Determine if project is expected to end on date originally planned 	<p>Measureable objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine dependencies within project • Determine interdependencies among other projects • Identify methodology used to monitor the impact of dependencies. 	<p>Measureable objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify project stakeholders • Identify how stakeholders have been involved • Identify how stakeholders are being informed about project’s progress/status 	<p>Measureable objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify documentation expectations • Identify whether or not expectations were met 	<p>Measureable objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify project related issues raised • Determine how issues were resolved and documented
<p>Performance Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current project schedule 	<p>Performance Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project schedule or other planning documents 	<p>Performance Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication plan or other planning documents 	<p>Performance Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation expectations established by MSDE or external governance groups (e.g., DoIT, USDE) 	<p>Performance Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of governance activities

<p>Starter questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you have a project schedule? 2. Is the project schedule up to date? 3. Do you anticipate any difficulties in completing the project as scheduled? 	<p>Starter questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you have any project dependencies? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within project • External projects 2. How are dependencies documented? 	<p>Starter questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who are your stakeholders? 2. Which of these stakeholders have been involved in your project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If so, how? 	<p>Starter questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What documents are you expected to prepare? 2. Where are these documents stored? 3. Are there any documentation expectations that you are not able to meet? 	<p>Starter questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What oversight groups discussed the project during the review period? 2. What issues were discussed? 3. How were the issues documented?
<p>Primary information source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager 	<p>Primary information source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager 	<p>Primary information source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager 	<p>Primary information source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager 	<p>Primary information source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager
<p>Content of CAIRE report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers • Evidence (if presented) • Observations/summary of findings • Risks • Recommendations (optional) 	<p>Content of CAIRE report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers • Evidence (if presented) • Observations/summary of findings • Risks • Recommendations (optional) 	<p>Content of CAIRE report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers • Evidence (if presented) • Observations/summary of findings • Risks • Recommendations (optional) 	<p>Content of CAIRE report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers • Evidence (if presented) • Observations/summary of findings • Risks • Recommendations (optional) 	<p>Content of CAIRE report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers • Evidence (if presented) • Observations/summary of findings • Risks • Recommendations (optional)