

<b>Initiative [C2]</b>	<b>Performance Measures of Success</b>	<b>Milestone Year</b>
Initiative 1: Expand the Physical Installation of the Current MLDS Intelligence Reporting System.	Success of project will be measured by installation of additional computer servers, installation of business-intelligence software, and the results of a load performance test where data requests are serviced under 10 seconds.	Q4 2011
Initiative 2: Implementation of an Enterprise Security System.	Success will be measured by the installation of an enterprise security system software package and registration of administrations, teachers and students.	Q4 2011
Initiative 3: Design, develop and implement a P-20 Data Warehouse.	Success will be measured by development and operation of a new P-20 data warehouse and its ability to trade and store information with the K-12 MLDS, other higher-education institutions in Maryland data, and the Maryland Workforce system data.	Q4 2014
Initiative 4: Design, Develop, and Implement EAP Dashboards.	Success will be measured by the development of 32 EAP dashboards.	Q2 2014
Initiative 5: Implement Multi-media platform.	Success will be measured by operation of 40 multimedia data-usage training modules. See section (D)(5) for more information on school-based coaches.	Q4 2013
Initiative 6: Implement Expanded Education Portal.	Success will be measured by the operation of a portal for stakeholders to assess (1) Race to the Top performance information (2) the Online Instructional Toolkit, and (3) the MLDS and MLDS-EAP systems.	Q2 2011
Initiative 7: Design, Develop, and Implement Data Exchange.	Success will be measured by the development of the data exchange and ability to exchange data between MSDE and the LEA student information systems.	Q4 2013
Initiative 8: Implement a Statewide LDS Center of Excellence and Data Governance Program.	Success will be measured by development of the LDS-CE organization, development of LDS quality-assurance recommendations, and development of LDS resource-sharing recommendations.	Q4 2010
Initiative 9: Expand the LDS Research Collaboration Council.	Success will be measured by the development of a K-12 research agenda, identification of needed research data sets, implementation of a data-request governance policy, and hosting of quarterly research meetings.	Q4 2010
Initiative 10: Student-Teacher Linking and Growth Modeling.	Success will be measured by the developing and testing of expanded growth model and testing on existing student data.	Q4 2012

<b>Performance Measures</b> Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section II. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in <b>(D)(2)(ii)</b> .		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>General goals to be provided at time of application:</b>	<b>Baseline data and annual targets</b>				
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).	0	0	32*	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	0	0	32*	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	0	0	32*	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:					
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing teachers and principals.</li> </ul>	0	0	32*	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compensating teachers and principals.</li> </ul>	0	0	0*	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting teachers and principals.</li> </ul>	0	0	0*	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retaining effective teachers and principals.</li> </ul>	0	0	0*	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.</li> </ul>	0	0	0*	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.</li> </ul>	0	0	0*	100	100

<p>* The original targets related to the implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation system were adjusted to reflect targets for sample schools within the seven LEAs involved in the pilot evaluation. Since pilot data will not be available until SY 2011-12, all related targets have been adjusted to 0 percent in SY 2010-11. In SY 2011-12, targets have been adjusted to accurately reflect the targets for the sample schools in the seven pilot LEAs, as opposed to all LEAs, as specified in the application. Because the pilot evaluation data will not be used to inform decisions regarding compensation, promotion, retention, grant of tenure, or dismissal, the performance measures should be 0 percent in SY 2011-12. However, pilot data will still be used to inform decisions regarding professional development.</p>		
<b>General data to be provided at time of application:</b>		
Total number of participating LEAs.	22 LEAs	
Total number of principals in participating LEAs.	1,192	
Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.	46,838	
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]		
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</b>	
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.	
(D)(2)(iii) <sup>1</sup>	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.	

<sup>1</sup> Note that for some data elements there are likely to be data collection activities the State would do in order to provide aggregated data to the Department. For example, in Criteria (D)(2)(iii), States may want to ask each Participating LEA to report, for each rating category in its evaluation system, the definition of that category and the number of teachers and principals in the category. The State could then organize these two categories as effective and ineffective, for Department reporting purposes.

(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.	

<b>Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)</b>  <i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010- 2011	End of SY 2011- 2012	End of SY 2012- 2013	End of SY 2013- 2014
<b>General goals to be provided at time of application:</b>	<b>Baseline data and annual targets</b>				
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	0	<1*	20	30

Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	0	<1*	40	45
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	0	<1*	12	8
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	0	<1*	7	4
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	0	<1*	25	35
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	0	<1*	40	45
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	0	<1*	12	8
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	0	<1*	7	4
<p>[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]</p> <p>* The original targets related to the implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation system were adjusted to reflect targets for sample schools within the seven LEAs involved in the pilot evaluation. Since pilot data will not be available until SY 2011-12, all related targets have been adjusted to 0 percent in SY 2010-11. In SY 2011-12, targets have been adjusted to accurately reflect the targets for the sample schools in the seven pilot LEAs, as opposed to all LEAs, as specified in the application.</p>					
<b>General data to be provided at time of application:</b>					
Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	450				
Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	405				
Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	15,739				
Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	15,835				
Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	438				

Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	384	
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]		
<b>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</b>		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii)  <i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
<b>General goals to be provided at time of application:</b>					
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	0	<1*	65	70
Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	0	<1*	65	70
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	0	<1*	65	70

Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	0	<1*	65	70
--	-----	---	-----	----	----

\* The original targets related to the implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation system were adjusted to reflect targets for sample schools within the seven LEAs involved in the pilot evaluation. Since pilot data will not be available until SY 2011-12, all related targets have been adjusted to 0 percent in SY 2010-11. In SY 2011-12, targets have been adjusted to accurately reflect the targets for the sample schools in the seven pilot LEAs, as opposed to all LEAs, as specified in the application.

<b>General data to be provided at time of application:</b>	
Total number of mathematics teachers.	19,528
Total number of science teachers.	18,728
Total number of special education teachers.	7,319
Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs.	721

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

<b>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</b>	
Number of mathematics teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
Number of science teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
Number of special education teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
Number of teachers in language instruction educational programs in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
<b>General goals to be provided at time of application:</b>	<b>Baseline data and annual targets</b>				
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0	0	0	0	100
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0	0	0	0	100
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]					
<b>General data to be provided at time of application:</b>					
Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State.	23 MAPS (traditional programs) and 19 MAAPPs (alternative programs)				
Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State.	13				
Total number of teachers in the State.	59, 321				
Total number of principals in the State.	1,459				
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]					



<b>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</b>	
Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principal credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State’s credentialing programs.	
Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State’s credentialing programs.	

Performance Measures (E2)*	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.	16 Tier I and Tier II schools will select one of the four intervention models for implementation in School Year 2010-11.	16 schools will implement one of the four intervention models using 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds.	16 schools will implement one of the four intervention models.	16 schools will implement one of the four intervention models.	16 schools will implement one of the four intervention models.
<p>* LEAs have submitted to the State preliminary SIG applications for FY 10-11 (for implementation in SY 11-12). These decisions regarding applications will be finalized by April 21, 2011. Once final determinations are made regarding these applications, Maryland will submit an amendment to its RTT plan clarifying the number of schools that will implement one of the four intervention models in SY 2011-12, and subsequent years.</p>					