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.

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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
❑ The LEAs' vision for reform is <u>substantially aligned</u> to the State's Race to the Top program. (Component 1)	❑ The Executive Summary is <u>partially aligned</u> to the State Race to the Top program.	❑ The Executive Summary is <u>minimally aligned</u>, if aligned at all, to the State Race to the Top program.
❑ The LEA <u>thoroughly identified</u> its needs, goals, and stakeholder involvement. The goals are <u>clear and measurable,</u> (Components 2 and 3)	❑ The description of the LEA's needs, goals, and stakeholder involvement is <u>somewhat unclear. Not all goals are clear and measurable.</u> (Components 2 and 3).	❑ The Executive Summary <u>minimally describes, or is missing information</u> on one or more of Components 2 and 3.
❑ Proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap are <u>robust and full of potential.</u> (Component 4)	❑ Proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap are <u>vaguely discussed and somewhat disconnected.</u> (Comp. 4)	❑ Proposed strategies for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap are <u>weak and lack potential for success.</u> (Comp. 4)
❑ 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)	❑ The Executive Summary <u>vaguely discusses</u> how Components 5-6 are addressed in the Scope of Work.	❑ The Executive Summary <u>lacks specificity</u> as to how this Scope of Work will address Component 5-6.

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F

LEA: _____

❑ The C-125 Workbook <u>accurately allocates</u> the LEA's share of RTTT funds across the four year grant period.	❑ The C-125 Workbook <u>somewhat accurately</u> allocates the LEA's share of RTTT funds across the four year grant period.	❑ The C-125 Workbook <u>does not accurately</u> allocate the LEA's share of RTTT funds across the four year grant period.

Reviewer's Comments and Clarification Questions:

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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

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.

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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 B: 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. **Activity**	YES NO	
b. **Correlation to State Plan**	YES NO	
c. **Project #**	YES NO	
d. **Timeline**	YES NO	
e. **Key Personnel**	YES NO	
f. **Performance Measure**	YES NO	
g. **Recurring Expense**	YES NO	

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F

LEA: _____

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
➢ **Budget** ❑ All project budgets in this section are clearly aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ Some, but not all project budgets in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ Some project budgets in this section are not aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.
❑ All project budgets clearly articulate 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.	❑ All project budgets generally discuss 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	❑ All project budgets do not discuss the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are not allocated across objects; and project budgets contain some prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines
Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:		

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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
❑ 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.	❑ The Narrative for this Section <u>generally aligns</u> with MOU Requirements and to the State's Race to the Top program.	❑ 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.
❑ 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.	❑ 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.	❑ 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.
❑ The goals for Data Systems to Support Instruction <u>are clear, measurable, and substantially aligned</u> to the State's plan.	❑ 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.	❑ 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.
   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.

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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 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. **Activity**	YES NO	
b. **Correlation to State Plan**	YES NO	
c. **Project #**	YES NO	
d. **Timeline**	YES NO	
e. **Key Personnel**	YES NO	
f. **Performance Measure**	YES NO	
g. **Recurring Expense**	YES NO	

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F

LEA: _____

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
➢ **Budget** ❑ All project budgets in this section are clearly aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ Some, but not all project budgets in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ Some project budgets in this section are not aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.
❑ All project budgets clearly articulate 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.	❑ All project budgets generally discuss 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	❑ All project budgets do not discuss the purpose of the project in the project budget narrative; expenditures are not allocated across objects; and project budgets contain some prohibited expenses as stipulated in the Race to the Top Guidelines

Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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
❑ 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.	❑ 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.	❑ 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.
❑ 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.	❑ The Narrative <u>somewhat reflects</u> <u>a correlation</u> to the LEAs Great Teachers and Leaders Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.	❑ 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.
❑ The goals for (D 2, D3, and D5) under this Section on Great Teachers and Leaders are <u>clear, measurable, and substantially</u> aligned to the State's plan.	❑ The LEA's goals for Great Teachers and Leaders (D2, 3, and5) are <u>unclear</u>, not all goals <u>are measurable</u>, and not all goals <u>are aligned</u> to the state plan.	❑ The LEA <u>did not identify</u> its goals for Great Teachers and Leaders (D2, 3, and 5) under this Section.

Section D – Great Teachers and Leaders 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.

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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 D
Great Teachers and Great Leaders 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. **Activity**	YES NO	
b. **Correlation to State Plan**	YES NO	
c. **Project #**	YES NO	
d. **Timeline**	YES NO	
e. **Key Personnel**	YES NO	

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

f. __Performance Measure__	YES NO		
g. __Recurring Expense__	YES NO		

Fully Developed Response	**Partial Response**	**Limited Response**	
➢ **Budget** ❑ All project budgets in this section are <u>clearly aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ <u>Some, but not all project budgets</u> in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ <u>Some</u> project budgets in this section <u>are not aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.	
❑ 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.	❑ 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	❑ 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	
Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions: 			

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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
❑ 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.	❑ 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.	❑ 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.
❑ 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.	❑ The Narrative <u>somewhat reflects</u> <u>a correlation</u> to the LEAs Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.	❑ The Narrative <u>does not reflect</u> <u>a correlation</u> to the LEA's Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools Action Plan and to the LEAs optional activities for this Section.
❑ The goals for Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools are clear, measurable, and <u>substantially aligned</u> to the State's plan.	❑ The LEA's goals for Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools are <u>unclear</u>, not all goals <u>are</u> <u>measurable</u>, and not all goals <u>are aligned</u> to the state plan.	❑ 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

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F

LEA: _____

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. **Activity**	YES NO	
b. **Correlation to State Plan**	YES NO	
c. **Project #**	YES NO	
d. **Timeline**	YES NO	
e. **Key Personnel**	YES	

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

		NO	
f. **Performance Measure**	YES		
		NO	
g. **Recurring Expense**	YES		
		NO	

Fully Developed Response	Partial Response	Limited Response
➢ **Budget** ❑ All project budgets in this section are <u>clearly aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ <u>Some, but not all project budgets</u> in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ <u>Some</u> project budgets in this section <u>are not aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.
❑ 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.	❑ 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	❑ 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

Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions:

Maryland State Department of Education
Race to the Top
October 2010 Scope of Work Rubric for Sections A - F
LEA: _____

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
❑ 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.	❑ The Narrative on Charter Schools <u>generally aligns</u> with the State's Race to the Top program.	❑ The Narrative on Charter Schools <u>does not align</u> completely or not at all with the State's Race to the Top program.
➢ **Budget** ❑ All project budgets in this section are <u>clearly aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ <u>Some, but not all project budgets</u> in this section are aligned with the section narrative and the section action plan.	❑ <u>Some</u> project budgets in this section <u>are not aligned</u> with the section narrative and the section action plan.
❑ 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.	❑ 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	❑ 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

Reviewer Comments and Clarifying Questions: