

Maryland's Race to the Top

Plan for Monitoring LEAs

April 29, 2011

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Pre-Monitoring Protocols	
• Discussion.....	3
Monitoring Protocols	
<u>Monthly</u>	
• Progress Reports	5
• Monthly Meetings	6
<u>Bi-Monthly</u>	
• Race to the Top Executive Advisory Committee Meetings.....	7
<u>Quarterly</u>	
• ARRA Section 1512 Reports.....	7
<u>Semi-annually</u>	
• Stocktake Meetings.....	8
<u>Annually</u>	
• Annual Performance Report.....	8
• Desk Audits.....	10
• Audits	10
• Onsite visits.....	10
<u>Ongoing</u>	
• LEA amendments.....	11
Appendices.....	12

Introduction

The Maryland State Department of Education takes seriously its role in monitoring the LEAs' implementation of Race to the Top. We recognize that this grant is under intense scrutiny, and we will do everything we can to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and that they yield results. We established early in the process what we are calling pre-monitoring protocols. These protocols were necessary to lay the appropriate groundwork for subsequent follow-up activity once the grant funds were awarded. We believe that the combination of these pre-monitoring protocols as well as the actual monitoring protocols provide us with the internal controls that we need to successfully monitor this grant.

Pre-Monitoring Protocols

In order for an LEA to participate in the Race to the Top grant, it had to sign the original Memorandum of Understanding (see appendix 1) committing itself to all of the elements of the Maryland Race to the Top application. Once Maryland was notified that it had won a Race to the Top grant, each participating LEA had to complete an LEA Scope of Work following the established template (see appendix 2) to ensure that local plans were in alignment with the State plan. These LEA Scopes of Work included budget documentation (see appendix 3) for each of its proposed projects. The Maryland State Department of Education provided a statewide technical assistance meeting on September 14, 2010 to help LEAs understand what was expected in the LEA Scopes of Work (see appendix 4). These LEA Scopes of Work were scored against a rubric (see appendix 5) created to ensure compliance with State requirements.

Notice of Grant Award (NOGA)

Upon approval of the LEA Scopes of Work, a Notice of Grant Award (NOGA, see appendix 6) was sent to each LEA notifying it of the amount of the award by project. The entire four-year LEA allocation is issued in one grant to each of the 22 participating LEAs. Each LEA project budget is represented on a different line of the NOGA. This was deliberately designed to ensure a seamless recording of the LEA allocations and project budget expenditures.

- Current lines represent Year 1 project funds only (FY 11)
- Line 99 represents Years 2-4 project funds

- For Year 2 and beyond, amended Grants will be issued, reducing line 99 by the following year project amounts and increasing the corresponding project amounts accordingly
 - This will occur after the approval of the Master Plan Annual Updates, which include the LEA Scopes of Work and project budgets

The NOGA was accompanied by a list of assurances (see appendix 7) requiring the superintendent's signature that included the assurance of internal controls, principles of cash management, financial recordkeeping, and tracking of revenues and expenditures. While MSDE was waiting for final approval of its Scope of Work, an amendment protocol was established at the State level (see appendix 8) to allow LEAs to submit appropriate amendments and to ensure an orderly process for their consideration. Another technical assistance meeting was held on March 17, 2011 to provide guidance on the LEA Amendment process (see appendix 9).

Financial Reporting Requirements

MSDE operates on a reimbursement basis for Cash Management Improvement Act (CMIA) regulations. LEAs incur expenditures and then submit them for reimbursement. Due to the design of the LEA Race to the Top NOGAs, LEAs will submit expenditures at the project level.

- LEAs submit expenditures on a monthly basis, at the project level, through the Financial Status Report System (FSR) system
- LEAs are required to file expenditure details by category at the project level on a monthly basis through the Annual Financial Report (AFR) system
- LEAs report Full-time Equivalent (FTE) staff and vendor data quarterly for the 1512 reporting requirement
 - LEAs have been advised to include FTE data for any FTE hired with RTTT funds – including any MSDE grants from the State's 50% share.

Monitoring Protocols

MSDE has established a comprehensive plan for monitoring its LEAs. This plan includes the above initial assurances, regular stocktake meetings, regular reports, reviews, audits, and on-site visits to ensure LEA alignment with the State plan and proper implementation of the LEA Scope of Work. Each LEA has been assigned an MSDE staff person whose responsibility it is to

review amendment requests from LEAs and to maintain contact with the LEA throughout the amendment process. These liaisons will also lead on-site visit teams as appropriate (at least annually).

In addition, MSDE has established the following regular requirements as part of its monitoring plan:

Monthly Progress Reports

LEAs will submit monthly progress reports following a template established by MSDE (see appendix 10). Follow-up phone calls will be made to LEAs as necessary. These reports, in addition to all of the other measures, will allow MSDE to ascertain on a regular basis the degree to which the grant is being implemented with fidelity.

Reimbursement Process

Definitions:

AFR – Annual Financial Report System; this system has a Local School System interface and a MSDE interface.

FSR – Financial Status Report System; a subset of the AFR

FMIS – Financial Management Information System

MSDE – Maryland State Department of Education

RStars – Relational Statewide Accounting and Reporting System

MSDE's process for reimbursing expenditures reported by federal grant recipients is multidimensional. The process differentiates between a local school system and a non-local school system recipient. The entire process is referred to as the Type I payment process.

- Local school systems report expenditures on a monthly basis through the FSR; a component of MSDE's FMIS system.
- Non-Local school systems' are notified by the MSDE Accounting office of the deadline to report each month. The expenditures are submitted manually and then entered manually into the AFR.
- Deadline for monthly reporting – First work day following the 10th of each month

- After the deadline, the data is captured in a report and verified that expenditures were reported and that no negative payments are included
- The report is distributed to program staff for payment review and approval of expenditures and payment amounts. Each line must be clearly marked (checked) as approved and page must be signed. If not clearly marked the payment is not made.
- Payments are entered into the AFR as approved, declined or adjusted.
- The Accounting Office reviews the AFR payment data and submits to the State for payment. Payments are submitted no later than the last Friday of the month.

RStars

- The FSR/AFR System interfaces with RStars and the payment data is recorded in RStars.

Monthly Meetings

MSDE already conducts a series of monthly meetings across the state with various constituencies. Part of the agenda for each of these meetings will be a discussion of how the grant is progressing based on guiding questions developed for that constituency. These discussions will be similar to the stocktake meetings that USDE will conduct with MSDE twice a year. It is our belief that these meetings will allow us to keep our “ear to the ground” so that we will not be surprised at any point in the grant. The various constituencies that we meet with on a monthly basis and from whom we can receive valuable input are:

- LEA Superintendents (regular agenda item on their monthly meetings)
- LEA Assistant State Superintendents for Instruction (regular agenda item on their monthly meeting; they are deeply involved with implementation of LEA Scopes of Work)
- State Board of Education Officers (from around the State; they talk regularly with constituents)
- State Board Members (regular agenda item on State Board of Education monthly meeting agenda)

- MSDE Executive Team (members of the Executive Team travel across the State and are in LEAs often)
- Cross-divisional Team meetings (this is a subset of the Executive Team; they are the executive sponsors of MSDE Race to the Top projects, many of which interface with LEAs)
- Breakthrough Center (meets with turnaround specialists in LEAs monthly)

Bi-Monthly Meetings

Following receipt of the Race to the Top grant, Maryland slightly reorganized and reconvened its Race to the Top Executive Advisory Committee. This group meets every other month, and it includes representation from all key constituencies. It will be an invaluable group for providing additional information and conducting stocktake sessions.

Quarterly Reports

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Reporting Requirements

The stimulus act funneled unprecedented increases in federal funds to states in an effort to stimulate the economy and create jobs. The influx of funds brought specific, stringent reporting requirements in an effort to provide transparency on the uses of these funds.

In Maryland, the Governor's Recovery Stat office took the lead on our statewide reporting and Maryland was one of the first states to be a centralized reporting state. In this model, all State agencies that received ARRA funds file prime reports with the Governor's Recovery Stat Office who in turn, files the official state reports with federal reporting system.

As an added layer of monitoring, the Governor's Recovery Stat office requires all prime recipients to file a draft and a final report. The draft reports are reviewed and then commented on at a cabinet-level meeting. To meet the Recovery Stat requirements, MSDE requires all of its LEA and non-LEA sub-recipients to file both a draft and final report. The sub-recipient data is included in the prime reports.

As sub-recipients, LEAs and non-Leas are required to provide FTE, vendor and infrastructure data to MSDE. Each of these pieces of data is reported at the grant level, by CFDA. The FTE data represents the number of employees who worked during the quarter and were paid with ARRA funds. The vendor data includes either the DUNs number or the vendor

name and nine-digit zip code for those vendors paid more than \$25,000 in the quarter. The infrastructure data includes the cumulative total infrastructure expenditure at the grant level.

Semi-annual Meetings

Twice a year, MSDE officials meet with three key groups. Each of these groups will provide excellent opportunities for taking stock of where we are with the Race to the Top grant. The first group is the Executive Officers. In Maryland, executive officers are those persons who supervise and evaluate principals. This group is close to the schools since they meet with principals on a regular basis. A second group is the Principals Advisory Council. This council is made of elementary, middle, and high school principals from each of our 24 LEAs, and they are recommended by the LEA superintendent. Finally, we also meet twice a year with finance officers in each LEA. These meetings will also allow us to make certain that we are never too far off track in terms of any financial issues that may arise with the grant.

Annual Performance Report

USDE, in a letter dated February 3, 2011 approved MSDE's intention to incorporate the LEA Scopes of Work into the Master Plan Annual Update process. LEAs will begin submitting for the 2011-12 school year their annual performance reports as part of their Master Plan submission (see below description). Plans are due in October of each school year. They are officially approved by the Maryland State Board of Education in December of each year. Review panels spend many hours reviewing each LEA Master Plan.

The Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act of 2002

In 2002, the General Assembly enacted the *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act* which restructured Maryland's public school finance system and increased State Aid to public schools by an estimated \$1.3 billion over six fiscal years (FY 2003-2008). As a result of this landmark legislation, Maryland adopted a standards-based approach to public school financing based on the premise that when students have access to rigorous curriculum, highly qualified teachers, and programs that employ proven strategies and methods for student learning, all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, or socioeconomic background, can achieve.

Under this approach, and consistent with the federal *No Child Left Behind Act*, the State established benchmark academic content and student achievement standards, ensures that schools and students have sufficient resources to meet those standards, and holds schools and school systems accountable for student performance.

In 2003, local school systems were required under BTE to develop a 5-year Master Plan that outlined strategies for improving student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps. Each year, an update to the plans is submitted to the Maryland State Department of Education and reviewed for sufficiency and to determine if progress is being made by individual school systems.

During the 2007 session of the Maryland General Assembly lawmakers amended Bridge to Excellence, requiring that local boards of education continue submitting updates to their comprehensive master plans in October 2008 and 2009 and to submit new 5-year comprehensive plans by October 15, 2010.

The Education Fiscal Accountability and Oversight Act of 2004

The unrestricted nature of increased State financial support to local school systems created the need for unique accountability measures. In addition to the academic accountability standards, the State must ensure that school systems have the mechanisms in place to guarantee that funds are being spent appropriately. As such, the General Assembly enacted the *Education Fiscal Accountability and Oversight Act of 2004*, that prohibits local school systems from carrying a deficit, provides specific remedial actions for systems that carry a deficit, affirms recourse should a school system not comply with the Act, and provides for an audit of each local school system by the Office of Legislative Audits.

Local school systems must illustrate alignment between their annual budget and their plans for improving student achievement. Additionally, the State Superintendent is required to file an annual report on the alignment of school system master plan and budget priorities.¹ Within the Master Plans and Annual Updates, school systems illustrate the connection between resources and priorities in several ways.

- The Executive Summary includes a budget narrative that is intended to convey overview-level information on the current status and the changes occurring in school system demographics, student performance, and fiscal resources.

¹ Section 5-401 (h) (1) and (2), Comprehensive Master Plans, of the Education Article of the Annotated Code.

- School systems submit budget-level data for the current and prior years in variance tables detailing revenue by source and planned expenditures by local master plan goals. In these documents, school systems discuss the budgetary changes in addition to the use of new funds.
- In separate attachments, school systems provide revenue, expenditure and FTE data based on revenue source and State expenditure categories.
- Finally, school systems are asked to discuss resource allocations within the content portion of the Annual Updates.

Annual Desk Audits

In addition to Master Plan review, Maryland will conduct desk audits at least annually, and more often as necessary. These desk audits will include a budget variance to ensure that LEAs are spending their funds as planned. It will also include a visual check of each LEA file to ensure that amendments are in order and have been processed properly.

Annual Financial Reports

Each Local Education Agency will file an Annual Financial Report electronically with the Maryland State Department of Education. This report is required at the grant line level and therefore will capture project level expenditure information for each fiscal year.

Annual State Audits

The auditing process goes well beyond desk audits. There is a biannual state audit cycle conducted by employees of MSDE that captures each LEA every other year, and these audits cover the previous two-year period. On an as-needed basis these audits could be conducted more frequently, if necessary. Each LEA is required to have an annual program compliance audit as directed in the OMB Circular A-133. LEAs must also file an audited Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) annually.

Annual Onsite Visits

In addition to the above annual protocols for LEAs, each LEA will have an annual onsite visit by a team from MSDE. The size of this team will vary by the size of the jurisdiction and the amount of funds each jurisdiction will receive. There will never be less than a two-person team (in the most rural LEAs). However, there will be a team of five that visits Baltimore City and Prince George's County. These onsite visits will take place in the April/May timeframe each year, except for the first year. This timeframe was chosen in order to assist the State with getting data/information needed to complete its annual performance report. Because of the late start in year 1, the visits with LEAs will be conducted by telephone; there would be little point visiting them in April/May since they have barely begun to implement their grants. The onsite visit will be based on a questionnaire (see appendix 11), similar to one we have previously used for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. It is designed to ensure that there is a properly controlled environment in which to execute the grant, an assessment of potential risks to the grant, and an understanding of the degree to which the grant is proceeding as planned and in alignment with the State grant.

Ongoing

Some of the functions that are incorporated into our overall monitoring plan will take place on an ongoing basis. We are and will continue to be in regular contact with our LEAs. This contact will increase substantially as LEAs begin to submit amendments to their Scopes of Work. The amendment process allows for flexibility while ensuring alignment with the State plan. These amendments will require ongoing conversations.

Summary

MSDE believes that it has in place appropriate controls in order to properly monitor its LEAs. These controls include the initial assurances we received from LEAs, stocktake meetings that take place monthly, quarterly, semi-annually, and annually, regular written reports, reviews, audits, onsite visits, and regular billing and payment authorization. MSDE has a long and successful history of such monitoring, and will continue to do so with rigor and fidelity to its Race to the Top grant.

Appendix 1
Memorandum of Understanding

In the preliminary Scope of Work, each participating LEA agreed to implement the State Plan in each of the areas identified below. These are considered required activities for each participating LEA.

Elements of State Reform Plans	LEA Participation	
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	Y	
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems	Y	
(ii) Professional development on use of data	Y	
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers	Y	
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		
(i) Measure student growth	Y	
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems	Y	
(iii) Establish a rigorous evaluation process	Y	
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development	Y	
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform promotion, retention, and compensation for the equitable distribution of teachers and principals in the lowest-achieving schools	Y	
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification	Y	
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal	Y	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:		
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools	Y	
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	Y	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:		
(i) Quality professional development	Y	
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development	Y	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	Y	

Appendix 2



Maryland's Race to the Top *From National Leader to World Class* **Local Education Agency Scope of Work Plans**

OVERVIEW

The Scope of Work provides the plan for the use of funds designated for a Local Education Agency (LEA) from Maryland's Race to the Top grant. Each LEA must specify how it intends to use its allocated funds for each of the four years of the grant. The first draft of the Final Scope of Work is due to MSDE on Tuesday, November 3, 2010. Revised Scopes of Work (if necessary) are due on Wednesday, November 17.

General Guidelines

1. LEA scope of work plans must align with Maryland's Race to the Top application.
2. Each LEA plan will be different according to that LEA's specific needs.
3. Total budgeted expenditures over four years must match the total amount designated for the LEA although amounts may vary by year.
4. Budgets and accounting for all funds will follow guidelines established by MSDE.

Prohibited Expenses

According to United States Department of Education (USDE) guidance, the following are examples of unacceptable uses of funds

1. Payment of maintenance costs;
2. Stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions, or other events for which admission is charged to the general public;
3. Purchase or upgrade of vehicles;
4. Improvements of stand-alone facilities whose purpose is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities; and
5. School modernization, renovation, or repair that is inconsistent with State law.

Calendar of Important Dates

Thursday, August 19, 2010

Notice of September 14 meeting sent to superintendents

Tuesday, August 24, 2010

Notice of RTTT Award (90 day period for submission of LEA Scopes of Work begins)

Monday, August 30

Conference call with USDE – Initial Guidance to MSDE

Tuesday, August 31

Email to superintendents about what to begin thinking about

Tuesday, September 14, 2010

Technical Assistance Meeting at MSDE (LEA Teams)

- Overview of State Race to the Top Plan
- Review of Memorandum of Understanding
- Discussion of Guidelines for LEA Scopes of Work Plans
- Budgets
- Q & A

Wednesday, November 3, 2010

First Draft of Scopes of Work due to MSDE

Thursday, November 4 to Wednesday, 10, 2010

Review of First Drafts of Scopes of Work by MSDE

Thursday, November 11 to Wednesday, 16, 2010

Revisions to Scopes of Work as necessary by LEA

Wednesday, November 17, 2010

Revised Scopes of Work submitted to MSDE

Thursday, November 18 and Friday, November 19

Final Review and Approval of Scopes of Work by MSDE

Monday, November 22, 2010

MSDE submits all Final Scopes of Work to USDE.

General Criteria for Review of LEA Scopes of Work

1. Is the plan **comprehensive**, articulating a clear vision for change based on identified needs and addressing the four assurances?
2. Do the activities in the plan **align** to that vision and to activities and spirit of the State Race to the Top Plan?
3. Will the plan make a difference in **student achievement** and in **closing the achievement gap**?
4. Is the plan **collaborative**, including the full range of stakeholders?
5. How will the Scope of Work Plan be **integrated** into the LEAs Master Plan beginning with the 2011-12 school year?

Agreements in Original Memorandum of Understanding (Preliminary Scope of Work)

In the preliminary Scope of Work, each participating LEA agreed to implement the State Plan in each of the areas identified below. These are considered required activities for each participating LEA. Each participating LEA must describe in its Scope of Work Plan narrative how it will address each of these areas, in alignment with the State Race to the Top Plan.

Elements of State Reform Plans	LEA Participation	
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	Y	
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems	Y	
(ii) Professional development on use of data	Y	
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers	Y	
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		
(i) Measure student growth	Y	
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems	Y	
(iii) Establish a rigorous evaluation process	Y	
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development	Y	
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform promotion, retention, and compensation for the equitable distribution of teachers and principals in the lowest-achieving schools	Y	
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification	Y	
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal	Y	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:		
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools	Y	
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	Y	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:		
(i) Quality professional development	Y	
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development	Y	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	Y	

Additional Required Activities for all LEAs

1. Cooperate with the national and statewide evaluation of the Race to the Top program
2. Participate in Educator Instructional Improvement Academies
3. Participate in Induction Program Academies

Optional Activities in LEA Scope of Work Plans

1. Optional activities are those activities which, in addition to the required activities, the LEA determines are necessary in order to implement their Scope of Work Plans.
2. The number and kind of optional activities will vary by school system depending upon the size of their budgets and their priorities.

LEA SCOPE OF WORK PLANS

Each LEA Final Scope of Work Plan will consist of two parts.

Part I: Narrative and Action Plans

The first part of the LEA Plan will be a narrative accompanied by action plans. The narrative will be in sections, corresponding to the sections in Maryland's Race to the Top application. Please see the accompanying template that describes what is needed in each section of the narrative and action plan. LEAs should refer to the State's Plan in drafting their narratives to ensure alignment.

Each LEA must address in its narrative how these Final Scope of Work Plans will be an integral part of its LEA Comprehensive Master Plan submissions beginning with the 2011-12 school year.

Part II: Budgets

- LEAs will submit four annual budgets, a grant budget total, and a summary budget of the four years with its Final Scope of Work Plan. These budgets will be submitted on the forms found in attachment 2 using the Maryland C-1-25 Budget form and other appropriate forms. These forms capture the overall expenditures by category, but they do not capture individual project level budgets.
- Individual Project Budgets will be submitted on the MSDE Project Level budget forms. These individual project level budget forms will include a project title, the criteria of the Race to the Top application that is being addressed, a project description, and total costs for that project (see attachment 2).
- In submitting budgets, LEAs are agreeing to adhere to all budgetary/accounting guidelines, assurances, mandatory grant provisions, and other caveats provided by USDE or MSDE.
- All expenses must be reasonable and allowable.
- As with any federal grant program, budgets will be finalized after discussions between the grantees and the U.S. Department of Education, and the money will be distributed over time as the grantees meet established benchmarks.

TEMPLATE

LEA FINAL SCOPE OF WORK PLAN

Section A: State Success Factors

Narrative:

Narratives for each section of the Final Scope of Work Plan must include the specific goal(s) that the LEA commits to accomplish. These goals must also appear on the related action plans.

In addition to the goals that will appear in each section, the narrative for Section A will describe the LEA's vision for reform aligned to the State Plan. It will commit to participation in the national and statewide evaluation of the Race to the Top program. It will also describe any optional activities that it wishes to address in Section A with its funds from Race to the Top. *(Maximum of 3 pages of narrative)*

Action Plan: Following the narrative, the LEA will complete the action plan for that section. Each cell of the action plan must be addressed if an activity is listed.

- a. Activity -- Describe the activity planned for supporting the Race to the Top application so that it is clearly understandable how the funds will be spent.
- b. Correlation to State Plan -- Code the activity to the appropriate section of the State Race to the Top application
- c. Project # -- If the project has a budget attached, the LEA must assign a project number that corresponds to the number on the budget.
- d. Timeline -- Describe the timeline for the completion of the activity.
- e. Key Personnel -- List the LEA employees who will be responsible for the activity.
- e. Performance Measure -- Describe how this activity will be evaluated for implementation and effectiveness.
- f. Recurring Expense -- Indicate if this use of funds will create recurring expenses beyond the four-year scope of the funding. If the LEA indicates that there are recurring funding needs at the conclusion of the grant period, it must specify in its narrative exactly what those recurring expenses will be and propose an ongoing funding source.
- g. If the LEA intends to submit a budget for a particular activity, that activity must appear on the action plan for that section.
- h. There must be four action plans submitted for each section -- one for each year of the grant. These four action plans, where funds are allocated, should also correspond to the four budgets on the C-1-25 form.

Action Plan: Section A

LEA: _____ **Date:** _____ **Year of the Grant (circle one)** 1 2 3 4

Goal(s):

Section A: State Success Factors	Correlation to State Plan	Project #	Timeline	Key Personnel	Performance Measure	Recurring Expense: Y/N
<i>MOU Requirements: (No)</i>						
<i>Additional Required Activities:</i>						
1. Cooperate with national and statewide evaluation	(A)(2)		12/01/10 – Expiration of Grant			N
<i>Optional Activities:</i>						
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

Section B: Standards and Assessments

Narrative: The narrative for Section B will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (B)(3). It will also describe any optional activities that it wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top. (*Maximum of 3 pages of narrative*)

Action Plan: After the narrative, the LEA will complete the below action plan for Section B, following the directions provided for Section A

Action Plan: Section B

LEA: _____ Date: _____ Year of the Grant (circle one) **1** **2** **3** **4**

Goal(s):

Section B: Standards and Assessments	Correlation to State Plan	Project. #	Timeline	Key Personnel	Performance Measure	Recurring Expense: Y/N
<i>MOU Requirements: (Yes) Activities to Implement MOU Requirements</i>	(B)(3)					
1.						
2.						
3.						
<i>Optional Activities:</i>						
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

Section C: Data Systems to Support Instruction

Narrative: The narrative for Section C will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (C)(3)(i-iii). It will also describe any optional activities that it wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top. (*Maximum of 3 pages of narrative*)

Action Plan: After the narrative, the LEA will complete the below action plan for Section C, following the directions provided for Section A.

Action Plan: Section C

LEA: _____ Date: _____ Year of the Grant (circle one) 1 2 3 4

Goal(s):

Section C: Data Systems to Support Instruction	Correlation to State Plan	Project. #	Timeline	Key Personnel	Performance Measure	Recurring Expense: Y/N
<i>MOU Requirements: (Yes) Activities to Implement MOU Requirements</i>	(C)(3)(i-iii)					
1.						
2.						
3.						
<i>Optional Activities:</i>						
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders

Narrative: The narrative for Section D will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (D)(2)(i-iv); (D)(3)(i-ii); and (D)(5)(i-ii). It will commit to participation in the Educator Instructional Improvement Academies and the Induction Academies. It will also describe any optional activities that it wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top. (*Maximum of 3 pages of narrative*)

Action Plan: After the narrative, the LEA will complete the below action plan for Section D, following the directions provided for Section A.

Action Plan: Section D

LEA: _____ Date: _____ Year of the Grant (circle one) 1 2 3 4

Goal(s):

Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Correlation to State Plan	Project #	Timeline	Key Personnel	Performance Measure	Recurring Expense: Y/N
<i>MOU Requirements: (Yes) Activities to Implement MOU Requirements</i>	(D)(2)(i – iv) (D)(3)(i - ii) (D)(5)(i - ii)					
1.						
2.						
3.						
<i>Additional Required Activities:</i>						
1. Educator Instructional Improvement Academies						
2. Induction Academies						
<i>Optional Activities:</i>						
1.						
2.						

3.						
4.						
5.						

Section E: Turning Around Lowest Achieving Schools

Narrative: The narrative for Section E will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (E)(2). It will also describe any optional activities that it wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top. *(Maximum of 3 pages of narrative)*

Action Plan: After the narrative, the LEA will complete the below action plan for Section E, following the directions provided for Section A.

Action Plan: Section E

LEA: _____ Date: _____ Year of the Grant (circle one) 1 2 3 4

Goal(s):

Section E: Turning Around Lowest-Achieving Schools	Correlation to State Plan	Project #	Timeline	Key Personnel	Performance Measure	Recurring Expense: Y/N
<i>MOU Requirements: (Yes) Activities to Implement MOU Requirements</i>	(E)(2)					
1.						
2.						
3.						
<i>Optional Activities:</i>						
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

Section F: General

Narrative: The narrative for Section F will describe any optional activities that it wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top. For the purposes of this Action Plan, activities related to Section F of the State application or any of the “Priorities” may be addressed. (*Maximum of 3 pages of narrative*)

Action Plan: After the narrative, the LEA will complete the below action plan for Section F, following the directions provided for Section A.

Action Plan: Section F

LEA: _____ Date: _____ Year of the Grant (circle one) **1** **2** **3** **4**

Goal(s):

Section F: General	Correlation to State Plan	Project #	Timeline	Key Personnel	Performance Measure	Recurring Expense: Y/N
<i>MOU Requirements: (No)</i>						
<i>Optional Activities:</i>						
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

Signature Page

The signature of the LEA superintendent commits the LEA to the terms and conditions in this Final Scope of Work Plan for Race to the Top funds.

Signature of LEA Superintendent

Date:

Print Name:

Note: The following attachments were also part of this LEA Scope of Work template:

Attachment A: Grant Awards by LEA

Attachment B: Budget (C-1-25 – see appendix 3))

Race to the Top

Scope of Work Budgets Made Simple (well sort-of)

- ***Budget Portion of the Scope of Work***
 - Project Year – When?
 - There are four project years to the RTTT grant
 - Budget Object – What?
 - The standard objects of expenditure as defined in the Financial Reporting Manual for Maryland Public Schools
 - Category/Program – Where?
 - Uses of the funds based upon statutory categories and respective programs as shown on the C-1-25 Grant Budget form
- ***Budget Packet Consists of:***
 - One set of **Summary** documents – 5 pages – Using the standard MSDE C-1-25 form
 - One for each project year plus a summary that combines the whole grant
 - One or more sets of **Project** documents – three parts for each project submitted
 - One set for each project being requested
 - All three parts are contained in an Excel Workbook to be used as a template
 - Project budget document page (1 page per project)
 - Summarizes by Budget Object and Project Year
 - All data is linked to the second and third worksheets of the template
 - Project budget narrative (1 per project)
 - Provides the following information
 - Local School System
 - LEA Name
 - Project Title
 - Brief Title – should tie to the text portion of the Statement of Work
 - Project Number
 - Each project should be separately numbered
 - These numbers should be referenced in the Activities portion of the Statement of Work
 - Project description
 - Explains what the project will do and how it supports the relevant activity in the Statement of Work.
 - Lists what other non-RTTT funding sources the LEA will use in support of this project or if the project is RTTT only.

Race to the Top

Scope of Work Budgets Made Simple (well sort-of)

- Year by Year Description
 - Use this section to describe how the project varies over the life of the grant. If activities remain constant throughout all four year, please note that.
 - This should be consistent with the amounts requested by project year.
 - Project Details by Object (1 set per project)
 - Object level breakdown of how the funds will be used over the four project years
 - The amounts will automatically feed the project level summary page on the first worksheet of the template
 - Caution: For “Other” and “Property” items, please ensure that the explanation provides sufficient detail to discern what
 - Remember to not include any items noted in RTTT guidance as unallowable
- **Grant Awards**
 - The grant awards will be released by project year
 - There will be one RTTT Award for each participating LEA
 - Budget Projects will be represented by separate lines of the grant
 - **LEAs will be required to track and report costs by budget project**
- **Amendments**
 - In accordance with standard MSDE policy:
 - The Grantee must receive prior written approval from the MSDE Program Monitor for any Budgetary realignment of **\$1,000 or 15%** of total object, program or category of expenditure, **whichever is greater**. Grantee must support the request with the reason for the requested change. Budget realignments must be submitted at least 45 days prior to the end of the grant period.
 - Additionally, transfers of funding between budget projects require written approval and will result in a grant amendment transferring funding between lines.

Race to the Top – Budget Questions

1. Where should LEAs attribute substitute teacher costs?

- a. If they are considered contactors receiving 1099 income, capture the costs under Contracted Services (Object 2).
- b. If they are contractual employees on LEA's payroll, capture the costs under Salaries (Object 1) and treat the related fringe benefits (FICA) in Other (Fixed) Charges (Object 4).

2. How is Indirect Cost calculated?

- a. Total costs less equipment cost times indirect cost rate.

3. Where should LEAs attribute mileage costs?

- a. Mileage cost should be charged to Other (Fixed) Charges (object 4).

4. Is Property the correct title for the Budget Object Category?

- a. Yes. This is the official title found in the Financial Reporting Manual for Maryland Public Schools. This category includes, but is not limited to, **equipment**.

5. Should an LEA list a vendor in the project budget documents?

- a. LEAs should follow all applicable procurement regulations. Do not list a specific vendor if the contract calls for a competitive bid process. In those instances, describe the type of service/product and what will be procured.

Project Budget Summary Table					
Local School System: Project Name: Associated with Criteria: Project Number:					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Salaries and Wages	-	-	-	-	-
2. Contract Services	-	-	-	-	-
3. Supplies and Materials	-	-	-	-	-
4. Other Charges	-	-	-	-	-
5. Property	-	-	-	-	-
6. Transfers (Indirect Costs)	-	-	-	-	-
7. Total Costs (lines 1-6)	-	-	-	-	-
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget object. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					

Local School System: 0
Project Title: 0
Criteria: (associated reform criteria) 0
Project Number: 0

Project Budget Narrative**Project Description:****Funding:****Year by Year Description:**

Years 1-4:

v1.2

Appendix 3

Project Name:	0
LEA:	0
Project Number:	0
Project Details by Object	

Salaries and Wages: provide a brief description of the salaries and wages included with this project. Please provide information by employee classification. If necessary, repeat the FTE table for each classification. Include the number of FTE multiplied by the annual salary for each year.

(Classification)	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
FTE	-	-			-
Salary	-	-			-
Total	-	-	-	-	-
(Classification)	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
FTE	-	-			-
Salary	-	-			-
Total	-	-	-	-	-
Total Salaries and Wages					
	-	-	-	-	-

Please provide complete details for year 1. For years 2-4, please provide an estimate of costs and also provide the basis for this estimate here.

Contract Services: expenditures for services performed by persons who are no on the LEA payroll, including equipment repair. Please provide a brief description of the contracted services included with this project. In the table below, please itemize the services provided. Add rows if necessary.

	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
item					-
item					-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

Please provide complete details for year 1. For years 2-4, please provide an estimate of costs and also provide the basis for this estimate here.

Supplies and Materials: expenditures for articles or materials which meet one or more of the conditions outlined on page 66 of the Local Financial Reporting Manual. Please provide a brief description of the supplies and materials included with this project. In the table below, please itemize the supplies and materials. Add rows if necessary.

	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
item					-
item					-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix 3

Project Name:	0
LEA:	0
Project Number:	0
Project Details by Object	

Please provide complete details for year 1. For years 2-4, please provide an estimate of costs and also provide the basis for this estimate here.

Other Charges: expenditures for employee benefits and other miscellaneous expenditures that cannot be classified elsewhere. Please provide a brief description of the other charges included in this project. In the table below, please itemize the other charges. USDE guidance requires specificity for this item. Add rows if necessary.

	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
item					-
item					-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

Please provide complete details for year 1. For years 2-4, please provide an estimate of costs and also provide the basis for this estimate here.

Property: expenditures for the acquisition of new or replacement fixed assets including equipment, vehicles, buildings, school sites, other property, to the extent allowable under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Please provide a brief description of the property expenditures included in this project. In the table below, please itemize property expenditures. USDE guidance requires specificity for this item. Add rows if necessary.

	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
item					-
item					-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

Please provide complete details for year 1. For years 2-4, please provide an estimate of costs and also provide the basis for this estimate here.

Transfers (Indirect Costs): payments to other LEAs or transfers between major fund types within the LEA. Please provide a brief description of the transfers included in this project. In the table below, please itemize the transfers. Add rows if necessary.

	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
item					-
item					-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

Please provide complete details for year 1. For years 2-4, please provide an estimate of costs and also provide the basis for this estimate here.

Total Project Costs

Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3*	Year 4*	Total
-	-	-	-	-

Appendix 3

ORIGINAL GRANT BUDGET		AMENDED BUDGET #		REQUEST DATE	
GRANT NAME	Race to the Top		GRANT RECIPIENT NAME		
MSDE GRANT #		RECIPIENT GRANT #			
REVENUE SOURCE	Federal Funds		RECIPIENT AGENCY NAME		
FUND SOURCE CODE		GRANT PERIOD	FROM _____ TO _____		

CATEGORY/PROGRAM	BUDGET OBJECT						
	01- SALARIES & WAGES	02 - CONTRACT SERVICES	03- SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	04 - OTHER CHARGES	05 - EQUIPMENT	08 - TRANSFERS	BUDGET BY CAT./PROG.
201 Administration							
Prog. 21 General Support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 22 Business Support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 23 Centralized Support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
202 Mid-Level Administration							
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin. & Supv.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
203-205 Instruction Categories							
Prog. 01 Regular Prog.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 02 Special Prog.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 03 Career & Tech Prog.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 04 Gifted & Talented Prog.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 07 Non Public Transfers							
Prog. 08 School Library Media	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 10 Guidance Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 11 Psychological Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 12 Adult Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
206 Special Education							
Prog. 04 Public Sch Instr. Prog.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin & Superv.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
207 Student Personnel Serv.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
208 Student Health Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
209 Student Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
210 Plant Operation							
Prog. 30 Warehousing & Distr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 31 Operating Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
211 Plant Maintenance							
212 Fixed Charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
214 Community Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
215 Capital Outlay							
Prog. 34 Land & Improvements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 35 Buildings & Additions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prog. 36 Remodeling	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Expenditures By Object	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Finance Official Approval				
	Name	Signature	Date	Telephone #
Supt./Agency Head Approval				
	Name	Signature	Date	Telephone #
MSDE Grant Manager Approval				
	Name	Signature	Date	Telephone #

CATEGORY/PROGRAM	BUDGET OBJECT						
	01- SALARIES & WAGES	02-CONTRACT SERVICES	03- SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	04 - OTHER Charges	05 - EQUIPMENT	08 - TRANSFERS	BUDGET BY CAT./PROG.
201 Administration							
Prog. 21 General Support							-
Prog. 22 Business Support							-
Prog. 23 Centralized Support							-
202 Mid-Level Administration							
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin. & Supv.							-
203-205 Instruction Categories							
Prog. 01 Regular Prog.							-
Prog. 02 Special Prog.							-
Prog. 03 Career & Tech Prog.							-
Prog. 04 Gifted & Talented Prog.							-
Prog. 07 Non Public Transfers							
Prog. 08 School Library Media							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 10 Guidance Services							-
Prog. 11 Psychological Services							-
Prog. 12 Adult Education							-
206 Special Education							
Prog. 04 Public Sch Instr. Prog.							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin & Superv.							-
207 Student Personnel Serv.							-
208 Student Health Services							-
209 Student Transportation							-
210 Plant Operation							
Prog. 30 Warehousing & Distr.							-
Prog. 31 Operating Services							-
211 Plant Maintenance							
212 Fixed Charges							-
214 Community Services							-
215 Capital Outlay							
Prog. 34 Land & Improvements							-
Prog. 35 Buildings & Additions							-
Prog. 36 Remodeling							-
Total Expenditures By Object	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Finance Official Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

Supt./Agency Head Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

MSDE Grant Manager Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

CATEGORY/PROGRAM	BUDGET OBJECT						
	01- SALARIES & WAGES	02-CONTRACT SERVICES	03- SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	04 - OTHER Charges	05 - EQUIPMENT	08 - TRANSFERS	BUDGET BY CAT./PROG.
201 Administration							
Prog. 21 General Support							-
Prog. 22 Business Support							-
Prog. 23 Centralized Support							-
202 Mid-Level Administration							
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin. & Supv.							-
203-205 Instruction Categories							
Prog. 01 Regular Prog.							-
Prog. 02 Special Prog.							-
Prog. 03 Career & Tech Prog.							-
Prog. 04 Gifted & Talented Prog.							-
Prog. 07 Non Public Transfers							
Prog. 08 School Library Media							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 10 Guidance Services							-
Prog. 11 Psychological Services							-
Prog. 12 Adult Education							-
206 Special Education							
Prog. 04 Public Sch Instr. Prog.							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin & Superv.							-
207 Student Personnel Serv.							-
208 Student Health Services							-
209 Student Transportation							-
210 Plant Operation							
Prog. 30 Warehousing & Distr.							-
Prog. 31 Operating Services							-
211 Plant Maintenance							
212 Fixed Charges							-
214 Community Services							-
215 Capital Outlay							
Prog. 34 Land & Improvements							-
Prog. 35 Buildings & Additions							-
Prog. 36 Remodeling							-
Total Expenditures By Object	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Finance Official Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

Supt./Agency Head Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

MSDE Grant Manager Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

CATEGORY/PROGRAM	BUDGET OBJECT						BUDGET BY CAT./PROG.
	01- SALARIES & WAGES	02-CONTRACT SERVICES	03- SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	04 - OTHER Charges	05 - EQUIPMENT	08 - TRANSFERS	
201 Administration							
Prog. 21 General Support							-
Prog. 22 Business Support							-
Prog. 23 Centralized Support							-
202 Mid-Level Administration							
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin. & Supv.							-
203-205 Instruction Categories							
Prog. 01 Regular Prog.							-
Prog. 02 Special Prog.							-
Prog. 03 Career & Tech Prog.							-
Prog. 04 Gifted & Talented Prog.							-
Prog. 07 Non Public Transfers							
Prog. 08 School Library Media							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 10 Guidance Services							-
Prog. 11 Psychological Services							-
Prog. 12 Adult Education							-
206 Special Education							
Prog. 04 Public Sch Instr. Prog.							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin & Superv.							-
207 Student Personnel Serv.							-
208 Student Health Services							-
209 Student Transportation							-
210 Plant Operation							
Prog. 30 Warehousing & Distr.							-
Prog. 31 Operating Services							-
211 Plant Maintenance							
212 Fixed Charges							-
214 Community Services							-
215 Capital Outlay							
Prog. 34 Land & Improvements							-
Prog. 35 Buildings & Additions							-
Prog. 36 Remodeling							-
Total Expenditures By Object	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Finance Official Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

Supt./Agency Head Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

MSDE Grant Manager Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

CATEGORY/PROGRAM	BUDGET OBJECT						
	01- SALARIES & WAGES	02-CONTRACT SERVICES	03- SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	04 - OTHER Charges	05 - EQUIPMENT	08 - TRANSFERS	BUDGET BY CAT./PROG.
201 Administration							
Prog. 21 General Support							-
Prog. 22 Business Support							-
Prog. 23 Centralized Support							-
202 Mid-Level Administration							
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin. & Supv.							-
203-205 Instruction Categories							
Prog. 01 Regular Prog.							-
Prog. 02 Special Prog.							-
Prog. 03 Career & Tech Prog.							-
Prog. 04 Gifted & Talented Prog.							-
Prog. 07 Non Public Transfers							
Prog. 08 School Library Media							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 10 Guidance Services							-
Prog. 11 Psychological Services							-
Prog. 12 Adult Education							-
206 Special Education							
Prog. 04 Public Sch Instr. Prog.							-
Prog. 09 Instruction Staff Dev.							-
Prog. 15 Office of the Principal							-
Prog. 16 Inst. Admin & Superv.							-
207 Student Personnel Serv.							-
208 Student Health Services							-
209 Student Transportation							-
210 Plant Operation							
Prog. 30 Warehousing & Distr.							-
Prog. 31 Operating Services							-
211 Plant Maintenance							
212 Fixed Charges							-
214 Community Services							-
215 Capital Outlay							
Prog. 34 Land & Improvements							-
Prog. 35 Buildings & Additions							-
Prog. 36 Remodeling							-
Total Expenditures By Object	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Finance Official Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

Supt./Agency Head Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

MSDE Grant Manager Approval

Name

Signature

Date

Telephone #

Appendix 4

Agenda
Race to the Top
LEA Technical Assistance Meeting
Tuesday, September 14, 2010, 1:30 – 4:30 PM
Conference Rooms 6 & 7

- 1:30 Greetings – Dr. Nancy Grasmick, State Superintendent
1:40 Maryland's Race to the Top Application
- Race to the Top Overview, Section A: – Jim Foran
 - Section B: Standards and Assessments – Colleen Seremet
 - Section C: Data Systems – Leslie Wilson
 - Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders: -- Colleen Seremet, Jim Foran, Jean Satterfield
 - Sections E: Turning Around Low-Achieving Schools: Ann Chafin
 - Section F: Charter Schools -- Ann Chafin
 - Competitive Priority (STEM) – Colleen Seremet
- 2:30 Scope of Work Plans (including original MOU) – Jim Foran
3:15 Budgets – Steve Brooks
4:00 Question and Answer



**Maryland's Race to the Top
Reviewer's Guide
Local Education Agency Scope of Work Plans**

October 2010

OVERVIEW

The Scope of Work provides the plan for the use of funds designated for a Local Education Agency (LEA) from Maryland's Race to the Top grant. Each LEA must specify how it intends to use its allocated funds for each of the four years of the grant. In general, the LEA Scope of Work plans must align with the Maryland's Race to the Top application. Each LEA plan will be unique, based on that LEA's specific needs. Additionally, total budgeted expenditures over four years must match the total amount designated for the LEA (although amounts may vary by year) and budgets and accounting for all funds must follow guidelines established by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). The first draft of the Final Scope of Work is due to MSDE on Tuesday, November 3, 2010. Revised Scopes of Work (if necessary) are due on Wednesday, November 17.

In the preliminary Scope of Work, each participating LEA agreed to implement the State Plan in each of the areas identified below. These are considered required activities for each participating LEA. Each participating LEA must describe in its Scope of Work Plan narrative how it will address each of the Sections in alignment with the State Race to the Top Plan. These requirements, entitled "Elements of a State Reform Plan" are present on page four.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Reviewers will receive the following for each LEA:

- Section A - Executive Summary
- Section B – Narrative, Action Plan, and Budget, as appropriate.
- Section C – Narrative, Action Plan, and Budget, as appropriate.
- Section D – Narrative, Action Plan, and Budget, as appropriate.
- Section E – Narrative, Action Plan, and Budget, as appropriate.
- Section F – Narrative, Action Plan, and Budget, as appropriate.

The goal of the review is for LEAs to have a *fully developed response* for each section. If the response provided by the LEA is *partial* or *limited*, the review team will reach consensus on clarification questions aimed at eliciting a fully developed response. The narrative response for each section is limited to three pages. Please refer to the rubric template, which describes what is needed in each section of the narrative and action plan.

Each cell of the Action Plan will describe the following:

- a. Activities;
- b. Correlation to the State plan;
- c. Project numbers , if applicable
- d. Timelines;
- e. Key Personnel;
- f. Performance measures; and
- g. Recurring expenses.

Elements of State Reform Plans		LEA Participation	
Section A. Executive Summary of Final Scope of Work			
A. State Success Factors – An executive summary (narrative) outlines the LEA’s vision for reform that must be aligned to the State’s Race to the Top (RTTT) program. The LEA should identify its needs, goals, stakeholder involvement, STEM, and proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap. The summary will also describe the following: 1) integration of the Final Scope of Work Plans as part of its LEA Comprehensive Master Plan submission beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, and 2) LEA’s cooperation with national and statewide evaluations of RTTT.		Y	
Required Elements			
Section B. Standards and Assessments			
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments		Y	
Section C. Data Systems to Support Instruction			
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:			
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems		Y	
(ii) Professional development on use of data		Y	
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers		Y	
Section D. Great Teachers and Leaders			
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:			
(i) Measure student growth		Y	
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems		Y	
(iii) Establish a rigorous evaluation process		Y	
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development		Y	
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform promotion, retention, and compensation for the equitable distribution of teachers and principals in the lowest-achieving schools		Y	
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification		Y	
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal		Y	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:			
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools		Y	
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas		Y	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:			
(i) Quality professional development		Y	
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development		Y	
Section E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools			
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools		Y	
Section F. General (Optional)			
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools.			

It is the responsibility of the reviewer to ensure that each component within the Action Plan is present. Reviewers will circle *Yes* or *No* on the rubric and review teams will generate clarification questions in instances where information is not present or where further clarification of presented information is needed. There is no page limitation for the Action Plans accompanying the narrative in each section.

Reviewers are also responsible for ensuring that all budgets are clearly aligned with the section Narrative and Action Plan and contain no prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines. Examples of prohibited expenses include:

1. Payment of maintenance costs;
2. Stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions, or other events for which admission is charged to the general public;
3. Purchase or upgrade of vehicles;
4. Improvements of stand-alone facilities whose purpose is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities; and School modernization, renovation, or repair that is inconsistent with State law.

BUDGETS

Each LEA Scope of Work must include a completed C-125 workbook. The C-125 workbook includes five spreadsheets; a summary as well as one for each project year. The Summary C-125 should represent the LEA's combined budgets for all projects identified in all sections for the entire four-year grant period. A separate C-125 for each year of the grant should represent all the project budgets in all sections for that grant year. There should be one C-125 for each year of the grant period.

Reviewers must evaluate each LEA C-125 workbook to ensure the following:

1. The total amount requested in the summary C-125 form matches the participating LEA's allocation of the 50% share of the RTTT funds.
2. The four project year C-125 forms add to the summary form.
3. Each of the project budgets aggregate to the C-125 by project year.

LEAs must submit a Project Budget for each project identified in any section of the LEA Scope of Work. The project budgets must be numbered and the project number should be identified in the respective Section Action Plan. The Project Budget Workbook contains three spreadsheets; the Project Summary Budget, the Project Budget Narrative, and the Project Details by Object.

- The ***Project Summary Budget*** captures all the items identified in the Project Details by Object sheet.
- The ***Project Budget Narrative*** captures the essence of the project and its connection to the section priorities and the LEA Scope of Work.
- The ***Project Details by Object*** captures the itemized expenditures planned for the project.

Reviewers must evaluate the Project Budget Workbook to ensure the following:

1. Each budget's project number is noted in the respective Action Plan.
2. Each budget in the Action Plan is identified as recurring or non-recurring.
3. Each project's budget corresponds to the timeline of the action items in the Action Plan.
4. The Project Budget Narrative provides a comprehensive description of the purpose of the project and its alignment with the section goals and the LEA Scope of Work.
5. Project totals are calculated accurately across rows and down columns in both the Project Summary Budget and Project Details by Object.
6. All necessary calculations are itemized in the Project Details by Object.
7. Indirect Costs, if any, are calculated and applied correctly. Reviewers will receive specific training on this procedure.
8. Costs are identified the appropriate Object. Reviewers will receive specific training on this procedure.

IMPORTANT DATES

Date	Activity
Wednesday, November 3, 2010	First Draft of Scopes of Work due to MSDE
Thursday, November 4 to Wednesday, 10, 2010	Review of First Drafts of Scopes of Work by MSDE
Thursday, November 11 to Wednesday, 16, 2010	Revisions to Scopes of Work as necessary by LEA
Wednesday, November 17, 2010	Revised Scopes of Work submitted to MSDE
Thursday, November 18 and Friday, November 19	Final Review and Approval of Scopes of Work by MSDE
Monday, November 22, 2010	MSDE submits all Final Scopes of Work to USDE.

Thank you for contributing your time and talent by participating in the review of RTTT LEA Scope of Work plans. Your involvement in this process will assist MSDE in implementing the Race to the Top grant, and moving forward with Maryland's third wave of reform.

SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State Success Factors: The Executive Summary must address each of the following SIX grant components:

- 1) LEA's vision for reform aligned to the State's Race to the Top (RTTT) program
- 2) LEA's identified needs and goals,
- 3) Stakeholder involvement,
- 4) Proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap.
- 5) Integration of these Final Scope of Work Plans as part of its LEA Comprehensive Master Plan submission beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, and
- 6) LEA's cooperation with national and statewide evaluations of RTTT.

Executive Summary Rubric Page Limitation - Up to three pages.

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEAs' vision for reform is <u>substantially aligned</u> to the State's Race to the Top program. (Component 1)	<input type="checkbox"/> The Executive Summary is <u>partially aligned</u> to the State Race to the Top program.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Executive Summary is <u>minimally aligned</u> , if aligned at all, to the State Race to the Top program.
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA <u>thoroughly identified</u> its needs, goals, and stakeholder involvement. The goals are <u>clear and measurable</u> . (Components 2 and 3)	<input type="checkbox"/> The description of the LEA's needs, goals, and stakeholder involvement is <u>somewhat unclear</u> . Not all goals are <u>clear and measurable</u> . (Components 2 and 3).	<input type="checkbox"/> The Executive Summary <u>minimally describes</u> , or is <u>missing information</u> on one or more of Components 2 and 3.
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap are <u>robust and full of potential</u> . (Component 4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap are <u>vaguely discussed</u> and <u>somewhat disconnected</u> . (Comp. 4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap are <u>weak and lack potential for success</u> . (Comp. 4)
<input type="checkbox"/> The Executive Summary <u>concisely demonstrates</u> how this Scope of Work will be included in the Master Plan in 2011-2012 and the <u>LEA's willingness to cooperate</u> with national and statewide evaluations of RTTT. (Components 5-6)	<input type="checkbox"/> The Executive Summary <u>vaguely discusses</u> how Components 5-6 are addressed in the Scope of Work.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Executive Summary <u>lacks specificity</u> as to how this Scope of Work will address Component 5-6.
<input type="checkbox"/> The C-125 Workbook <u>accurately allocates</u> the LEA's share of RTTT funds across the four year grant	<input type="checkbox"/> The C-125 Workbook <u>somewhat accurately</u> allocates the LEA's share of RTTT funds across the four	<input type="checkbox"/> The C-125 Workbook <u>does not accurately</u> allocate the LEA's share of RTTT funds across the

period.	year grant period.	four year grant period.
Reviewer's Comments and Clarification Questions:		

SECTION B. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS: (B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments.

Narrative: The narrative for Section B will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)(B)(3). It will also describe any optional activities that the LEA wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top.

Section B: Standards and Assessments Narrative Rubric
Page Limitation: Up To Three Pages.

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for Section B Standards and Assessments is <u>substantially aligned</u> to MOU requirements in the State's Race to the Top program and references STEM, as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative adequately describes and includes <u>some but not all</u> of the required components for this section of the Race to the Top program.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative description is <u>incomplete</u> , more than one of the required components <u>are missing</u> for this section of the Race to the Top program.
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section <u>clearly reflects a correlation</u> of the LEA's Standards and Assessment Action Plan, and to LEAs optional activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>somewhat reflects a correlation</u> to the LEAs Standards and Assessment Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>does not reflect a correlation</u> to the LEA's Standards and Assessment Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA's goals for Standards and Assessments are <u>clear, measurable, and substantially aligned</u> to the State's plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA's goals for Standards and Assessments are <u>unclear</u> , not all goals <u>are measurable</u> , and not all goals <u>are aligned</u> to the state plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA <u>did not identify</u> its goals for Standards and Assessments under this section.

Section B: Standards and Assessments – Action Plan

Following the Narrative, the LEA will complete the action plan for that section. Each cell of the action plan must be addressed if an activity is listed.

- f. Activity -- Describe the activity planned for supporting the Race to the Top application so that it is clearly understandable how the funds will be spent.
- g. Correlation to State Plan – Code the activity to the appropriate section of the State Race to the Top application
- h. Project # -- If the project has a budget attached, the LEA must assign a project number that corresponds to the number on the budget.
- i. Timeline -- Describe the timeline for the completion of the activity.

- ## ACTION PLAN BUDGET

- ## Section B: Action Plan Rubric
- ### No Page Limitation

I	II	III
a. <u>Activity</u>	YES NO	
b. <u>Correlation to State Plan</u>	YES NO	
c. <u>Project #</u>	YES NO	
d. <u>Timeline</u>	YES NO	
e. <u>Key Personnel</u>	YES NO	
f. <u>Performance Measure</u>	YES NO	
g. <u>Recurring Expense</u>	YES	

	NO	
Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<p>➤ <u>Budget</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets in this section are clearly aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some, but not all project budgets in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</u></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some project budgets in this section are not aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</u></p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>clearly articulate</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative accurately and in detail; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets contain no prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top guidelines.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>generally discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets contain no prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>do not discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are not allocated across objects; and project budgets <u>contain some</u> prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>
Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:		

Section C. Data Systems to Support Instruction: (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction: (i) Use of local instructional improvement systems; (ii) Professional development on use of data; (iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers.

Narrative: The narrative for Section C will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (C)(3). It will also describe any optional activities that the LEA wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top.

Section C: Data Systems to Support Instruction Narrative Rubric
Page Limitation: Up To Three Pages.

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section on <u>Data Systems to Support Instruction</u> is substantially aligned to the MOU requirements in the State's Race to the Top program. STEM is referenced, as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section <u>generally aligns</u> with MOU Requirements and to the State's Race to the Top program.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Data Systems to Support Instruction Narrative <u>does not align</u> completely or not at all with the State's Race to the Top program.
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section on Data Systems <u>clearly reflects a correlation</u> to the State RTTT Plan, to this Section's Action Plan, and to LEAs optional activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>somewhat reflects a correlation</u> to the LEAs Data Systems to Support Instruction Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>does not reflect a correlation</u> to the LEA's Data Systems to Support Instruction Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.
<input type="checkbox"/> The goals for Data Systems to Support Instruction <u>are clear, measurable, and substantially aligned</u> to the State's plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA's goals for Data Systems and Support are <u>unclear</u> , not all goals <u>are measurable</u> , and not all goals <u>are aligned</u> to the state plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA <u>did not identify</u> its goals for Data Systems and Support under this Section.

Section C: Data Systems to Support Instruction – Action Plan

Following the narrative, the LEA will complete the action plan for that section. Each cell of the action plan must be addressed if an activity is listed.

- Activity -- Describe the activity planned for supporting the Race to the Top application so that it is clearly understandable how the funds will be spent.
- Correlation to State Plan – Code the activity to the appropriate section of the State Race to the Top application
- Project # -- If the project has a budget attached, the LEA must assign a project number that corresponds to the number on the budget.
- Timeline -- Describe the timeline for the completion of the activity.
- Key Personnel – List the LEA employees who will be responsible for the activity.
- Performance Measure – Describe how this activity will be evaluated for implementation and effectiveness.
- Recurring Expense -- Indicate if this use of funds will create recurring expenses beyond the four-year scope of the funding. If the LEA indicates that there are recurring funding needs at the conclusion of the grant period, it must specify in its narrative exactly what those recurring expenses will be and propose an ongoing funding source.

ACTION PLAN BUDGET

- If the LEA intends to submit a budget for a particular activity, that activity must appear on the action plan for that section.

Section C: Data System to Support Instruction Action Plan Rubric No Page Limitation

REVIEWER DIRECTIONS: Column I describes what readers should expect to see. Circle in Column

II Yes or No. If the answer is no or information is missing, provide comments or questions in Column III.		
I	II	III
a. <u>Activity</u>	YES NO	
b. <u>Correlation to State Plan</u>	YES NO	
c. <u>Project #</u>	YES NO	
d. <u>Timeline</u>	YES NO	
e. <u>Key Personnel</u>	YES NO	
f. <u>Performance Measure</u>	YES NO	
g. <u>Recurring Expense</u>	YES NO	
Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<p>➤ <u>Budget</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets in this section are clearly aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some, but not all project budgets</u> in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some project budgets in this section are not aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>clearly articulate</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative accurately and in detail; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets contain no prohibited expenses as</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>generally discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are allocated across</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>do not discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are not allocated across objects; and project budgets <u>contain some</u> prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>

stipulated in the Race to the Top guidelines.	objects; project budgets contain no prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines	
Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:		

Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance,

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals, and

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals.

Narrative: The narrative for Section D will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (D)(2-5), the LEA's participation in Educator Instructional Improvement Academies, and its participation in Induction Program Academies. It will also describe any optional activities that the LEA wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top.

Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders Narrative Rubric

Page Limitation: Up To Three Pages

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Great Teachers and Leaders Section is <u>substantially aligned</u> to the MOU requirements in the State's Race to the Top program. STEM is referenced, as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section on Great Teachers and Leaders <u>generally aligns</u> with MOU requirements and to the State's Race to the Top program.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Great Teachers and Leaders Narrative <u>does not align</u> completely or not at all with the State's Race to the Top program.
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section on Great Teachers and Leaders <u>clearly reflects a correlation</u> to the State RTTT Plan, to this Section's Action Plan, and to LEAs optional activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>somewhat reflects a correlation</u> to the LEAs Great Teachers and Leaders Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>does not reflect a correlation</u> to the LEA's Great Teachers and Leaders Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.

d. <u>Timeline</u>	YES	
	NO	
e. <u>Key Personnel</u>	YES	
	NO	
f. <u>Performance Measure</u>	YES	
	NO	
g. <u>Recurring Expense</u>	YES	
	NO	
Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<p>➤ <u>Budget</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets in this section are <u>clearly aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some, but not all project budgets</u> in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some project budgets</u> in this section are <u>not aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>clearly articulate</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative accurately and in detail; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets <u>contain no prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top guidelines.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>generally discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets <u>contain no prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>do not discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are not allocated across objects; and project budgets <u>contain some prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>
Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:		

Section E: Turning Around the Lowest –Achieving Schools: (E)(2) Turning

around the lowest-achieving schools

Narrative: The narrative for Section E will address the activities included in the original Memorandum of Understanding (E)(2). It will also describe any optional activities that the LEA wishes to address with its funds from Race to the Top.

**Section E:
Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools Narrative Rubric
Page Limitation: Up To Three Pages**

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools Section is <u>substantially aligned</u> to the MOU requirements in the State's Race to the Top program. STEM is referenced, as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section on Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools <u>generally aligns</u> with MOU requirements and to the State's Race to the Top program.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Section on Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools <u>does not align</u> completely or not at all with the State's Race to the Top program.
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative for this Section on Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools <u>clearly reflects</u> a correlation to the State RTTT Plan, to this Section's Action Plan, and to LEAs optional activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>somewhat reflects a correlation</u> to the LEAs Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative <u>does not reflect a correlation</u> to the LEA's Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.
<input type="checkbox"/> The goals for Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools are clear, measurable, and <u>substantially aligned</u> to the State's plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA's goals for Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools are <u>unclear</u> , not all goals are <u>measurable</u> , and not all goals are <u>aligned</u> to the state plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA <u>did not identify</u> its goals for Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools under this Section.

Section E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools Action Plan

Following the narrative, the LEA will complete the action plan for that section. Each cell of the action plan must be addressed if an activity is listed.

- a. Activity -- Describe the activity planned for supporting the Race to the Top application so that it is clearly understandable how the funds will be spent.
- b. Correlation to State Plan – Code the activity to the appropriate section of the State Race to the Top application
- c. Project # -- If the project has a budget attached, the LEA must assign a project number that corresponds to the number on the budget.
- d. Timeline -- Describe the timeline for the completion of the activity.
- e. Key Personnel – List the LEA employees who will be responsible for the activity.
- f. Performance Measure – Describe how this activity will be evaluated for implementation and

effectiveness.

- g. Recurring Expense -- Indicate if this use of funds will create recurring expenses beyond the four-year scope of the funding. If the LEA indicates that there are recurring funding needs at the conclusion of the grant period, it must specify in its narrative exactly what those recurring expenses will be and propose an ongoing funding source.

ACTION PLAN BUDGET

- If the LEA intends to submit a budget for a particular activity, that activity must appear on the action plan for that section.

Section E:
Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools Action Plan Rubric
No Page Limitation

REVIEWER DIRECTIONS: Column I describes what readers should expect to see. Circle in Column II Yes or No. If the answer is no or information is missing, provide comments or questions in Column III.

a. <u>Activity</u>	YES	
	NO	
b. <u>Correlation to State Plan</u>	YES	
	NO	
c. <u>Project #</u>	YES	
	NO	
d. <u>Timeline</u>	YES	
	NO	
e. <u>Key Personnel</u>	YES	
	NO	
f. <u>Performance Measure</u>	YES	
	NO	
g. <u>Recurring Expense</u>	YES	

	NO	
Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<p>➤ <u>Budget</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets in this section are <u>clearly aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some, but not all project budgets</u> in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some project budgets</u> in this section are <u>not aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>clearly articulate</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative accurately and in detail; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets <u>contain no prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top guidelines.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>generally discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets <u>contain no prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>do not discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are not allocated across objects; and project budgets <u>contain some prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>

Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:

Section F: General

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools.

Narrative: Even though, there are no required elements in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Charter Schools, LEAs may include a Narrative to describe plans for charter and other innovative schools.

Section F: Charter School Narrative Rubric

Page Limitation: Up To Three Pages

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative on Charter	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative on Charter	<input type="checkbox"/> The Narrative on Charter

schools <u>thoroughly complements and aligns</u> to the State's Race to the Top program. STEM is referenced, as appropriate.	Schools <u>generally aligns</u> with the State's Race to the Top program.	Schools <u>does not align</u> completely or not at all with the State's Race to the Top program.
<p>➤ <u>Budget</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets in this section are <u>clearly aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some, but not all project budgets</u> in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some</u> project budgets in this section <u>are not aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>clearly articulate</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative accurately and in detail; expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets <u>contain no prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top guidelines.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>generally discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative expenditures are allocated across objects; project budgets <u>contain no prohibited</u> expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All project budgets <u>do not discuss</u> the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are not allocated across objects; and project budgets <u>contain some</u> prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines</p>
Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:		

**Race to the Top
LEA Scopes of Work
Budget Review**

Step-by Step Process

Introduction

There 22 participating LEAs in the State's Race to the Top grant. There are seven review teams (three people on a team) reviewing 22 Scopes of Work. In addition, there are seven people reviewing the budget components, separately from the Review Panels.

Timeline

November 3:	The Scopes of Work are due to MSDE
November 3-9:	Individual reviews occur, panel caucus meetings on or before the 9 th
November 9:	Panel results due, electronically, to Jim Foran
November 11:	Jim provides feedback to LEAs
November 17:	Revised Scopes of Work due to MSDE
November 22:	Scopes of Work due to USDE

Scopes of Work

Each Scope of Work contains five sections, A-E, with an optional Section F and a C-125 workbook. Section A is the Executive Summary in narrative form only. For Sections B-E, and possibly F, you should have a narrative, action plan and any project budgets.

Budget Review

Reviewers will begin receiving electronic copies of the LEA Scopes of Work and the budget attachments on November 3. Please clean out your email inbox and create a personal folder so the Scopes of Work and their attachments will not close your box.

IMPORTANT – you must first review all materials to be sure you have all the information to conduct your review. Go to the Action Plans and find the last numbered project. That is the number of Project Budgets you should have for this LEA. If you don't have everything you need, call Donna Gunning immediately (x70757).

Review Process

The following is intended to be a guide for reviewing the Scopes of Work. We have not done this before and we won't know exactly what they will look like until we see them. Please be prepared to adjust your process as necessary.

1. Be sure you have all the information you need for the review (see **IMPORTANT** above).
2. Read the Executive Summary first.
3. Review the C-125 against the LEA's Race to the Top Allocation.
4. For each project budget, review as follows:
 - a. Read the Budget Narrative. This should give you an overview of the project, its purpose and its connection to the Scope of Work.
 - b. Review the Details by Object. Each item contains cells for the object cost by year and a total. Beneath the costs is space for an explanation. The explanation should fully detail the purchase – what it is, how many, item cost, total for each year.
 - c. Using the Reviewer's Tool, complete the tests in the Details tab for each project. Add columns if necessary; should be one for each project.
 - d. As you review the project budget, where you have issues, list them in the Reviewer's Tool, Results tab. Be sure to include the project # and the section.
5. Compare the Details by Object totals to the Summary tab totals to be sure the totals match for each object and for each year.
6. Compare the Project Budget Summary tabs with the C-125s for each year to be sure the totals match.
7. Compare the C-125 tabs for each year to the Summary C-125 to be sure those match.
8. When you have completed your review, send your completed Reviewer's workbook to Donna Gunning electronically.

Notes:

- Be sure the narrative discussion of the year match the budget for that year.
- The workbooks were designed to calculate. Check the cells for formulas, but do not assume calculations are working.
- Refer to the Financial Reporting Manual for Local School Systems for complete information on how to categorize expenditures by object.
- LEAs are required to participate in certain aspects of the State's plan – see MOU information.
- The following are prohibited expenditures: payment of maintenance costs; stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions, or other events for which admission is charged to the general public; purchase or upgrade of vehicles; improvement of stand-alone facilities whose purpose is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities; and, school modernization, renovation, or repair that is inconsistent with State law.

Race to the Top
Budget Reviewer's Tool

LEA Scope of Work Budget Review

LEA:	
Reviewer:	
<p>Directions: First, be sure there is a project budget template for each project. The projects are to be numbered sequentially and listed in the action plans. Next, read Section A of the Scope of Work. This is the Executive Summary. This will provide an overview of the LEA's approach to education reform through the Race to the Top grant. For each Project Budget, read the budget narrative. This will provide an overview for the project and include general information on what is to be accomplished during a given time period. The Details by Object page will itemize the costs for the project. Each Object section has a place for the total cost with an explanation section underneath. In the explanation, the reviewer should expect to see the basis for the amount. The totals for each object carry forward to the Project Budget Summary page. The objects costs are shown over the four years of the grant.</p> <p>As you review the Scope of Work Project budgets, use this review tool to track your notes and comments. Where you have a question, include that in the Results tab. For each question, include the project #, the section, and the issue. All questions will be vetted prior to submission to the LEA for response.</p>	
# of Projects:	
Total:	
Allocation:	
General Review (if yes, indicate so on the line. If no, please add quesiton in the Results page)	
1. Does the Total allocation presented in the Summary C-125 match the LEA's total Race to the Top Allocation?	
2. Do the four individual year C-125 form totals match the summary C-125 total?	
3. Do each of the project budgets aggregate to the C-125 by project year?	
4. Is each project number noted in the respective Scope of Work Action Plan?	

Race to the Top
Budget Reviewer's Tool

Project Budget Detail Review			
LEA:	-	Reviewer:	-

Directions: complete this matrix, indicating a response for each item for each project. Add columns where necessary. Where you have an issue, indicate it here and add the issue to the Results tab.

Project Budget Tests	Project #	Project #	Project #	Project #	Project #
	[title]	[title]	[title]	[title]	[title]
1. The budget is identified as recurring/nonrecurring in the respective action plan.					
2. The project budget timeline corresponds to the timeline in the respective action plan.					
3. The project budget details by object are fully explained, identifying what is being purchased, the basis for the amount, and is itemized. For example, # of items times the item cost equals the total cost.					
4. Indirect Costs, if included, contain the most recently approved Indirect Cost rate for the LEA or an allowable variation.					
5. The salary and wages category contains wages only and the fringe benefits are included in the other category.					
6. The total project costs are accurate for each year.					

Race to the Top
Budget Reviewer's Tool

Project Budget Detail Review					
LEA:	-		Reviewer:	-	

7. The project budget summary page totals accurately reflect the details by object for each year.					
8. None of the costs included in the project budget are prohibited expenditures.					

Race to the Top
Budget Reviewer's Tool**Review Results**

LEA: _____ -
Reviewer: _____ -

Scope of Work

Overall Comments:

Issues:

Project Budgets

Project #	Section	Issue/Question for LEA
-----------	---------	------------------------

Race to the Top
Budget Reviewer's Tool

Review Results

LEA: _____ -
Reviewer: _____ -

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NOTICE OF GRANT AWARD

Vendor No. 1526000868 MC: 000 Grant No. 115740 Date February 7, 2011
 New X Amendment No. _____ Grant Period From August 25, 2010 To September 30, 2014

Grant Name: Race to the Top Participating LEA Grants
 Recipient Agency Name Allegany Co. Board of Education
 Recipient Agency Address 108 Washington Street
Cumberland, MD 21502

Amount of Current Grant 1,714,775
 Previously Awarded This Grant -
 Total 1,714,775

Program Manager's Name/ Title/ Phone# Superintendent, (301) 759-2036
 MSDE Program Manager's Name/ Division/ Phone # James Foran, Asst. State Supt., 410-767-0589

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

This grant award consists of and is subject to the Mandatory Grant Provisions and acceptance of the Assurances on the attached sheets.

Grant is subject to compliance with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, State Investment Grants, Recovery funds (Public Law 111-5) requirements.

Grant award represents LEA allocation. Grant lines represent approved Year One Scopes of Work and associated project budgets. UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE, LEAS HAVE AUTHORITY TO DRAW UP TO 50% OF THE YEAR ONE TOTAL.

For this funding, payments will be reimbursed to school systems through the normal federal grant process. However, LEAs must also update the AFR system monthly to correspond with the payment request.

Grant is subject to compliance with all ARRA reporting requirements, USDE and associated guidance.

Payments will be made only for grantees in compliance with the reporting requirements.

LEA Race to the Top Projects:

1. Standards and Assessments
2. Early College Classes
3. Externships
4. Data Systems To Support Instruction
5. Educator Effectiveness Academy Budget

0
0

*AD213
Crew
2-10-11*

MSDE ACCOUNT CODE INFORMATION

LINE NO.	PCA	AOBJ	AMOUNT	FUND	PMT SCHED CODE (0) (1) (2)	FUND SOURCE	CFDA NO.	REVENUE SOURCE TITLE	GRANT END DATE	MATCH FUNDS (Y/N)	AFR REQUIRED (Y/N)
001	13RT1	1205	77,108	4171	1	F	84.395	ARRA RTTT - Proj. 1	09/30/11	N	Y
002	13RT1	1205	45,972	4171	1	F	84.395	ARRA RTTT - Proj. 2	09/30/11	N	Y
003	13RT1	1205	-	4171	1	F	84.395	ARRA RTTT - Proj. 3	09/30/11	N	Y
004	13RT1	1205	20,432	4171	1	F	84.395	ARRA RTTT - Proj. 4	09/30/11	N	Y
005	13RT1	1205	-	4171	1	F	84.395	ARRA RTTT - Proj. 5	09/30/11	N	Y
99	13RT1	1205	1,571,263	4171	1	F	84.395	ARRA RTTT Yrs. 2-4	09/30/11	N	Y

Assistant Superintendent/ Office Head

James Foran

DATE

2/9/11

Appendix 7

ASSURANCES

By receiving funds under this grant award, I hereby agree, as grantee, to comply with the following terms and conditions:

1. Programs and projects funded in total or in part through this grant shall operate in compliance with State and federal statutes and regulations, including but not limited to the 1964 Civil Rights Act and amendments, the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 34, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
2. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) may, as it deems necessary, supervise, evaluate and provide guidance and direction to grantee in the conduct of activities performed under this grant. However, MSDE's failure to supervise, evaluate, or provide guidance and direction shall not relieve grantee of any liability for failure to comply with the terms of the grant award.
3. Grantee shall establish and maintain fiscal control and fund accounting procedures, as set forth in 34 CFR Parts 76 & 80 and in applicable statute and regulation.
4. Grantee shall adhere to MSDE reporting requirements, including the submission of all required reports. Failure to submit complete, accurate, and timely progress and final reports may result in the withholding of subsequent grant payments until such time as the reports are filed.
5. Entities receiving federal funds of \$500,000 or more must have an annual financial and compliance audit in accordance with OMB Circular A-133.
6. Grantee shall retain all records of its financial transactions and accounts relating to this grant for a period of three years, or longer if required by federal regulation, after termination of the grant agreement. Such records shall be made available for inspection and audit by authorized representatives of MSDE.
7. Grantee must receive prior written approval from the MSDE Program Monitor before implementing any programmatic changes with respect to the purposes for which the grant was awarded.
8. Grantee must receive prior written approval from the MSDE Program Monitor for any Budgetary realignment of \$1,000 or 15% of total object, program or category of expenditure, *whichever is greater*. Grantee must support the request with the reason for the requested change. Budget realignments must be submitted at least 45 days prior to the end of the grant period.
9. Requests for grant extensions, when allowed, must be submitted at least 45 days prior to the end of the grant period.
10. Grantee shall repay any funds that have been finally determined through the federal or State audit resolution process to have been misspent, misapplied, or otherwise not properly accounted for, and further agrees to pay any collection fees that may subsequently be imposed by the federal and/or State government.
11. If the grantee fails to fulfill its obligations under the grant agreement properly and on time, or otherwise violates any provision of the grant, including failure to maintain proper documentation and records as required by pertinent federal and State statute and regulations, MSDE may suspend or terminate the grant by written notice to the grantee. The notice shall specify those acts or omissions relied upon as cause for suspension or termination. Grantee shall repay MSDE any funds that have been determined through audit to have been misspent, unspent, misapplied, or otherwise not properly accounted for. The repayment may be made by an offset to funds that are otherwise due the grantee.

I further certify that all of the facts, figures and representations made with respect to the grant application and grant award, including exhibits and attachments, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Superintendent of Schools/Head of Grantee Agency	Date

Maryland's Race to the Top Local Education Agency Scope of Work Amendments

Introduction

MSDE recognizes that LEAs may wish to revise Scopes of Work, including their goals, activities, timelines, or budgets, in order to accomplish their goals. Such revisions can be made under the following circumstances:

1. They do not result in the LEA's failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the award and the program's statutory and regulatory provisions;
2. They do not change the overall scope and objectives of the approved proposal; and
3. MSDE and the LEA mutually agree in writing to such revisions, with MSDE having final approval rights.

All commitments contained in the LEA's Memorandum of Understanding and the proposed use in the State's grant application remain fully binding on the State and the LEAs unless otherwise approved by the United State Department of Education (USDE). In the event that MSDE determines that an LEA is not meeting its goals, activities, timelines, budget, or annual targets, or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, MSDE will take appropriate enforcement actions.

Additionally, amendments to an LEA Scope of Work must adhere to the following Race to the Top principles:

- LEAs will be held accountable for increasing student achievement, increasing graduation rates, narrowing achievement gaps, and preparing students for success in college and the workforce. An LEA must ensure that Race to the Top resources are directed towards activities and strategies that support these student outcomes.
- The annual performance measures LEAs included in their applications are leading indicators of their success towards achieving student outcomes, and LEAs will be held accountable for meeting these targets or making significant progress towards them.
- Changes in an LEA's plan that would significantly decrease or eliminate reform in any of the four assurance areas constitute a fundamental change to the LEA's Scope of Work.
- An LEA must justify any revisions to its Scope of Work that substantially diverge from its original Scope of Work and must provide compelling evidence of how such a change will help it meet its performance measures and achieve increases in student outcomes.

When is an amendment required?

Amendments are required in the following circumstances (please allow two weeks from receipt at MSDE before making contact):

1. Substantial changes as defined in the Race to the Top principles above in program (including vision, goals, activities, timelines, annual targets, or performance measures)
2. Changes in budget -- \$1,000 or 15% of total object, program, or category of expenditure, whichever is greater
3. Requests for changes above \$100,000 also require USDE pre-approval

What documents are required to process an amendment?

1. Scope of Work Section Narrative(s) – “strike through” and “redline” as defined below
2. Scope of Work Section Action Plan(s) – “strikethrough” and “redline” as defined below
3. C-1-25 (A and B) – “yellow” cells as described below. Please note that the C-1-25 B must describe in the results section any impact the proposed amendment will have on performance measures or achievement goals.
4. Scope of Work Project Budget workbook(s) – “yellow” cells as defined below

How do LEAs prepare and submit amendments?

1. **Initial** requests for amendments will be submitted electronically to Patrick Kellinger (pkellinger@msde.state.md.us) via email with all documents attached. This initial submission is intended to expedite the process and eliminate the need to get the superintendent’s signature until the proposed amendment is considered approvable.
2. MSDE will communicate electronically the receipt of the **initial** amendment request.
3. If necessary, discussions will occur electronically – also intended to expedite and provide a record of the process.
4. Once the **initial** proposed amendment is considered **approvable** by MSDE, MSDE will communicate such status to the LEA electronically.
5. The LEA must then submit hard copies of all amendment documents for **final approval**.
6. The LEA superintendent’s signature (in blue ink) is required on all **final requests for approval**.
7. Upon receipt of the final documents, MSDE will send the LEA an **electronic final approval**, which shall be followed by **final approval in writing**.
8. LEAs may not move forward with the proposed amendment until they have received the **final electronic approval** from MSDE.
9. If the amendment request *also* requires USDE approval, the above approval process will be followed first. Once MSDE gives its **final approval pending USDE approval**, MSDE will communicate with USDE and the LEA in the manner prescribed by USDE. The LEA may not consider the amendment to have received **final approval** until MSDE communicates that USDE has also given its approval. The LEA should allow extra time (at least two additional weeks) for processing the amendment through USDE.
10. Amendment requests must be made 45 days prior to the end of the fiscal year (September 30 is the end of the fiscal year).

Additionally:

Changes in Program Only

1. Complete the C-1-25 B form
2. Where applicable in a Section Narrative and/or Section Action Plan, strike through any deletions in the actual approved Scope of Work. (Example: ~~Extend the school day by 90 min.~~)—Revisions should be inserted in actual approved Scope of Work in red font in *italics* and **bold**. (Example: ***Extend the school day by 60 min.***)

Changes in Project Budget Only

1. Complete the C-125 A form
2. Where applicable in the Project Budget workbook, Tab 2 (Project Budget Narrative) and Tab 3 (Project Budget Details by Category), strike through any deletions in the actual approved Scope of Work. (Example: ~~Extend the school day by 90 min.~~) Revisions should be inserted in actual approved Scope of Work in red font in *italics* and **bold**. (Example: ***Extend the school day by 60 min.***)
3. Verify that adjustments made in the Project Budget workbook, Tabs 2 and 3 automatically recalculated Tab 1 (Project Summary Budget). Changed cells should be highlighted in yellow.
4. Revise the approved RTTT C-1-25 workbook, changed cells should be highlighted in yellow.

Changes in Program and Project Budget

1. Complete the C-1-25 A and B forms
2. Where applicable in a Section Narrative and/or Section Action Plan, strike through any deletions in the actual approved Scope of Work. (Example: ~~Extend the school day by 90 min.~~)—Revisions should be inserted in actual approved Scope of Work in red font in *italics* and **bold**. (Example: ***Extend the school day by 60 min.***)
3. Where applicable in the Project Budget workbook, Tab 2 (Project Budget Narrative) and Tab 3 (Project Budget Details by Category), strike through any deletions in the actual approved Scope of Work. (Example: ~~Extend the school day by 90 min.~~) Revisions should be inserted in actual approved Scope of Work in red font in *italics* and **bold**. (Example: ***Extend the school day by 60 min.***)
4. Verify that adjustments made in the Project Budget workbook, Tabs 2 and 3 automatically recalculated Tab 1 (Project Summary Budget). Changed cells should be highlighted in yellow.
5. Revise the approved RTTT C-125 workbook, changed cells should be highlighted in yellow.

Appendix

Grant Amendment Documents
C-1-25; C-1-25 A; C-1-25 B

Helpful website link

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/faq.html>

Appendix 9

Agenda **Race to the Top Technical Assistance Meeting** **LEA Amendment Process** **March 17, 2011**

Welcome and Introductions	Jim Foran
USDE Oversight	Jim Foran
Explanation of Notice of Grant Award	Steve Brooks
Review of Amendment Process	Jim Foran
Numbering Amendments Example: 0801 LEA Code: 08; Amendment #: 01	Jim Foran
Budget Reviewer Rubrics	Pat Kellinger
Program Reviewer Rubrics	Lyle Patzkowsky
Q & A	All
Evaluation	

Evaluation

Please rate from 1 (lowest to 5 (highest)

1. Overall, to what extent did the technical assistance meeting meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5

2. To what extent do you feel you understand the Notice of Grant Award process?

1 2 3 4 5

3. To what extent do you feel you understand the LEA Amendment Process?

1 2 3 4 5

We want to make sure that there are no unanswered questions. Please list any outstanding questions you still have, and we will send a FAQ document to all participants.

I still have the following questions (we will respond to all questions):

Sign-in Sheet
Race to the Top Technical Assistance Meeting
LEA Amendment Process

[illegible]

Appendix 10

LEA Monthly Report

*LEAs Must submit an electronic monthly report to Patrick Kellinger at
pkellinger@msde.state.md.us*

LEA: _____ **Month/Year** _____

Person submitting report: _____

Part A:

Please provide the following information:

1. A description of the LEA's key accomplishments this month.
2. A description of the LEA's challenges this month
3. How you will address the identified challenges?
4. What help can MSDE provide?

Part B:

Please complete the below grid for each of your projects so that MSDE can be aware of any issues that arise. Place either a YES or a NO in the correct box. Create additional lines if you need them. **If there is a "No" in any of the boxes, please describe what the LEA is doing to correct the issue(s) below the matrix.**

Project	The timelines and activities for this project are on track.	The budget for this project is on track.
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Local School System Onsite Monitoring Questionnaire

Race to the Top

(This should capture any changes since submission of the last Master Plan Annual Update)

School System: _____

Monitoring Date: _____

School System Representatives:

MSDE Representatives:

I. Overall Race to the Top Progress

Issue: What are the major successes and challenges faced by the LEA in implementing its LEA Scope of Work?

Guiding Questions

1. What are your major RTTT implementation successes since the last onsite visit?
2. What are your biggest RTTT implementation challenges since the last onsite visit?
3. Describe what you have done or plan to do to address the challenges you identified in your monthly reports.
4. How can the state help the LEA to maximize your successes and/or overcome your challenges in implementing the grant?

Evidence/Documentation: Monthly RTTT Reports to MSDE; processes implemented; products designed and/or delivered

II. Student Achievement

Issue: What kind of progress is the LEA making in student achievement?

Guiding Questions

1. Describe the progress you are making in the following areas:
 - MSA
 - HSA
 - Graduation Rate
 - Dropout Rate
2. Describe why you think such progress is being made (or not being made).
3. What assistance can MSDE be in helping you make progress?

Evidence/Documentation: Maryland Report Card

III. Assurance Areas/Project Management

Issue: How is the LEA assisting the State in making progress in the four assurance areas: (a) standards and assessments; (b) data systems; and (c) teachers and leaders; and (d) supporting low-achieving schools?

Guiding Questions

1. Generally, how is the LEA assisting the State in making progress in each of the four reform areas?

Standards and Assessments:

Data Systems:

Teachers and Leaders:

Low-achieving Schools

2. Review each project and do the following:
 - To what degree is the LEA on track with each project?
 - What risks, if any, exist that could cause the project to fail?
 - Are any changes needed in the projects?
 - Are there any alignment issues with the State Scope of Work?
3. What assistance can the State provide to help you with your projects?

Evidence/Documentation: Monthly RTTT Reports to MSDE; RTTT Scope of Work Integrated into Master Plan

IV. Fiscal Oversight of RTTT Funds

ISSUE: Does the LEA have appropriate policies, procedures, and records for ensuring fiscal oversight of RTTT funds.

Guiding Questions

1. What internal controls does your LEA have in place to ensure that RTTT funds are expended for allowable and approved activities?
2. How does your LEA ensure that it complies with the requirements of the Cash Management Improvement Act (CMIA)?
3. How does your LEA maintain records that separately track and account for RTTT funds to ensure that they are being spent as approved?
4. What procedures does the local school system use for Section 1512 reporting?

Evidence/Documentation

- a. *Grant award notification from the State for RTTT funds*
- b. *Policies and procedures regarding obligations and expenditures*
- c. *Financial management policies and procedures*
- d. *Policies and procedures on compliance with CMIA requirements*
- e. *Reporting guidelines and protocols*
- f. *Documentation for data provided in Section 1512 quarterly reports*