

# **STATE SCOPE OF WORK**

## **MARYLAND**

**Submitted: November 22, 2010**

### From National Leader to World-Class

Maryland has laid out a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda in its Race to the Top application. It remains committed to that agenda, which it believes will take it from being a national leader to world-class. As stated in its application, Maryland did not reach its first-place national ranking by standing still, and the State will not become world-class by resting on prior achievements. The innovations outlined in its application will give Maryland's schools a competitive edge, but more important, also will touch all Maryland students, regardless of backgrounds. This is the only way Maryland will move forward – by ensuring that standards and expectations remain high while paying close attention to the needs of students who have lagged behind. Throughout its application – from the clearer and more rigorous Common Core Standards and new assessments, to a new data system, to a redesigned human capital framework, to a more cohesive approach to turning around schools – it is evident that Maryland is primed for change. Maryland will continue to focus on outstanding student achievement, making gains, and closing gaps.

### Goals

Maryland has a number of ambitious goals in its Race to the Top application. The projects listed on pages 5 -- 8 of this State Scope of Work will help Maryland reach those goals. Maryland remains focused on the outcomes of its work as described below.

All Students		Grade 4			Grade 8	
	2009 % Basic and Above	2014 Goal	2020 Goal	2009 % Basic and Above	2014 Goal	2020 Goal
NAEP Reading	70	75	85	77	80	85
NAEP Mathematics	85	90	95	75	80	90

		Elementary			Middle	
		2009 % Meeting State Standards	2014 Goal		2009 % Meeting State Standards	2014 Goal
MSA Reading		87	100		82	100
MSA Mathematics		85	100		71	100

High School Students	HSA			4-Year Graduation		
	2009 % Passing All Four Exams	2014 Goal	2020 Goal	2009 % Cohort Rate	2014 Goal	2020 Goal
All Students	75	80	90	80 .18	TBD (upon receipt of data from new rate)	90
	... and 75% of students will go on to college by 2014, with a 65% persistence rate for high poverty and high minority students, which is consistent with the current national average for all income groups.					

### Monitoring Progress

In keeping with the theme of innovative practices and in order to monitor the progress of its fifty-four different initiatives presented in its budgets, Maryland has chosen to use Microsoft Project as the software application to manage the budgets in the Race State Scope of Work -- Maryland

to the Top application. Rather than simply copying and pasting action plans that were in the original Race to the Top application to the current Word document, Maryland is incorporating those action plans into a project management industry standard format. Maryland is currently in the process of training approximately 40 staff members in Microsoft Project so that there can be a consistency of approach and transparency of results. One of the biggest advantages of using this software is the ability to ensure that the State Scope of Work is a living document, changing as needs and circumstances arise, but with a level of transparency and accuracy that is needed for such a large grant.

A preliminary draft of the current status of Microsoft Project is included in this State Scope of Work (see Appendix 1). This draft includes the following elements:

1. Each project has an assigned number and assigned tasks in the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) column. These are numbered consecutively.
2. The second column is the MSDE assigned budget/project #.
3. The third column is the title of the project.
3. The fourth column is the start date of this project.
4. The fifth column is the finish date for this project.
5. The sixth column is the Predecessor column. This designates other projects that must be completed before the current one can begin.
6. The seventh column lists the Executive Sponsor. This is one of the Assistant State Superintendents who has supervisory responsibility for this particular project.
7. The eighth column is the Program Manager (appointed by the Executive Sponsor). This is the person who has day-to-day responsibility for the project.
8. The next set of columns make up the GANTT Chart that will show graphically the progress of each project.

Currently, staff is working on tasks and subtasks that will be included with each project. These tasks and subtasks can be found in the Maryland Race to the Top application with the numerous action plans that were included. Maryland believes, however, that tracking these tasks and subtasks will be a great deal easier for all involved once they are on the master Microsoft Project template.

Please be advised that there will be another column added to this chart once the Department is fully staffed. Maryland has hired one project director, and we are in the process of hiring a second project director. The former is responsible for all of the “academic” projects, while the latter will be responsible for all of the “technology” projects, with the exception of those related to the assessments or the longitudinal database. These individuals will be working closely with the Executive Sponsors and the Program Managers to ensure timely completion of projects. The Project Directors will be meeting with Program managers on a bi-weekly basis. The project directors will also report directly to the Chief Program Manager (Assistant State Superintendent for the Division of Academic Reform and Innovation) for overall Race to the Top implementation. This Chief Program Manager will convene on a monthly basis a cross-divisional team that will provide guidance and resolve issues that arise with any of the projects. The organizational structure (see Appendix 2) and the teams (see Appendix 3) that will guide this effort are enclosed.

For the sake of convenience, Maryland has included a listing of project responsibilities below that will serve on an interim basis (until the entire Microsoft Project chart is completed) to show the fifty-four projects and additional key information. The number on the left side of the below listing is the MSDE budget # assigned to the project. The number following the title of the project is the page where the project can be found in Maryland’s RTTT application. ES stands for Executive Sponsor, and PM stands for Program Manager.

### **Academic Projects – Reporting to Jim Foran**

Lyle Patzkowsky, Project Director

78 – Office of Reform and Innovation (p. 344) (ES – Foran; PM – Patzkowsky)

State Scope of Work -- Maryland

- 1 - Program Evaluation (p. 350) (ES -- Foran; PM -- Foran/Patzkowsky)
- 76 – Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development CTE-SREB (p. 374) (ES – Oliver; PM – Mikos)
- 5 - World Language Pipelines (p. 379) (ES – Cary; PM -- Spinnato)
- 10 – MSDE-IHE Teacher Preparation Workgroup (p. 475) (ES -- Satterfield/Cary; PM -- Allen/Jenkins)
- 13 – Building Leadership Capacity in Low Achieving Urban and Rural Districts (p. 505) (ES -- Satterfield/Foran; PM -- Allen/Swirnow)
- 73 – Teach for Maryland (p. 509) (ES – Satterfield; PM: Madden)
- 50 – Compensation to Teachers and Principals in Lowest 5% Schools (p. 517) (ES-- Gable; PM – Shepherd)
- 51 – Compensation for Teachers in Shortage Areas (p. 522) (ES -- Gable; PM – PM -- Shepherd)
- 26 – Elementary STEM Certification (p. 525) (ES – Satterfield; PM: Neal)
- 75 – Maryland Approved Programs (MAP) Cost for LEAs, Providers, and IHEs (Uteach Maryland) (p. 534) (ES – Satterfield; PM – Dunkle)
- 54 – International Partnerships to Recruit Teachers in Critical Areas (p. 539) (ES – Cary/Satterfield; PM – Spinnato)
- 53 – Incentives for Teachers Who Obtain ESOL Certification (p. 543) (ES -- Cary; PM – Spinnato)
- 25 – Teacher Induction Academies (p. 547) (ES – Cary/Satterfield; PM – Pfeifer)
- 15 – Professional Development for Executive Officers (p. 559) (ES – Foran; PM – Swirnow)
- 24 – Educator Instructional Improvement Academies (p. 556) (ES – Cary; PM – Pfeifer)
- 17 – Expand Maryland Principals’ Academy to Target Low-Achieving Schools (p. 561) (ES – Foran; PM – Swirnow)
- 41 – The Breakthrough Center (p. 569) (ES – Foran; PM – Glascock)
- 67 – RITA Team Audits in 20 Tier I and Tier II Schools (p. 576) (ES – Chafin; PM – Lamb)
- 57 – Extend Student Learning and Improve School Culture, Climate, and Student Support (582) (ES – Chafin; PM – Buckler)

- 45 – Coordinated Student Services (p. 586) (ES – Chafin; PM – Buckler)
- 69 – School Health Services (p. 591) ((ES – Chafin; PM – Buckler/Mazyk)
- 63 – Physical Activity (p. 595) (ES – Chafin; PM -- Mason)
- 58 – Extended Learning (p. 599) (ES – Chafin; PM – Diggs)
- 71 – STEM Project Lead the Way (p. 603) (ES – Oliver; PM – Gilli)
- 77 – Primary Talent Development (p. 608) (ES – Cary; PM – Spinnato)
- 44 – Charter School (p. 613) (ES – Chafin; PM – Ortiz)

### **Technology Projects – Reporting to Jim Foran**

#### New Position: Technology Project Director

- 3 - Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development (p. 363) (ES – Cary; PM – Pfeifer/Jenkins)
- 4 - Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development for ITEEA (p. 369) (ES – Oliver; PM – Gilli)
- 31 – Develop and Implement State Curriculum Management System (p. 419) (ES – Cary; PM – Pfeifer/Jenkins)
- 7 - Expand Instructional Toolkit (p. 424) (ES – Cary; PM – Moore)
- 20 – STEM Instructional and Career Support (p. 429) (ES – Cary; PM – Jenkins/Stem Coordinator)
- 6 - Develop On-Line Instructional Intervention Modules (p. 460) (ES – Cary; PM – Jenkins)
- 55 – Develop Framework for Teacher Toolkit Portal (p. 464) (ES – Cary; PM – Pfeifer/Lageman)
- 56 - Develop and Implement a Course Registration System (p. 469) (ES – Cary; PM – Jenkins)
- 43 – Implement a System to Support E-Learning for Intervention, Enhancement, and  
Enrichment (p. 478) (ES – Cary; PM – Jenkins/Moore)
- 49 - Expand Educator Information System to Accommodate Additional Data (p. 499) (ES – Satterfield/Cary; PM – Ericson/Pfeifer)
- 21 – Develop On-Line PD on Educator Instructional Improvement Content (p. 565) (ES – Cary; PM – Moore)

State Scope of Work -- Maryland

### **Technology Projects (Assessment and Longitudinal Database Related) – Reporting to Leslie Wilson**

- 2 - Formative Assessments (p. 353) (ES – Wilson; PM – Bagsby)
- 11 - Develop the Overall Technology Infrastructure to Support RTTT Initiatives (p. 385) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 27 - Accessing and Using State Data Dashboards (p. 391) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 28 - Multi-Media Training (397) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 29 - LEA System Application Upgrades and Infrastructure Upgrades (p. 402) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 46 – Equating of MSA for Use on Growth Model (p. 485) (ES – Wilson; PM -- Bagsby)
- 60 - Expansion to LDS – Data Exchange (p. 407) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 61 - Enhancement to LDS – Develop P-20 and Workforce Data Warehouse and Center  
(p. 413) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 32 – Implement a Test Item Bank System (p. 434) (ES – Wilson; PM – Bagsby)
- 33 – Implement a Computer Adaptive Test Delivery System (p. 439) (ES – Wilson; PM – Bagsby)
- 34 - Complete an Item Load and Set Up for the Test Item Bank and CAT System (p. 445) (ES – Wilson; PM – Bagsby)
- 35 - Adaptive Testing Units for High Schools (p. 450) (ES -- Wilson; PM – Bagsby)
- 42 – Implement a Statewide System to Support Student Instructional Intervention (p. 455) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 47 – Develop and Implement a Statistical Model to Measure Student Growth (p. 489) ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 48 – Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System (p. 494) (Es – Wilson; PM – Wilson)
- 79 – Invitational Priority - Implement Statewide Centralized Student Transcript System  
(p. 622) (ES – Wilson; PM – Wilson)



### Participating LEAs (Proposed Amendment)

As stated in the Maryland Race to the Top application, twenty-two of Maryland's 24 LEAs will participate in the Race to the Top effort. With these 22 LEAs, the reform proposals in this application will reach the overwhelming majority of Maryland's students: 79 percent of all students, including 77 percent of minority students 94 percent of high-poverty schools, and 85 percent of students in poverty. Although Montgomery County and Frederick County have not signed the Race to the Top Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), many of the reforms outlined in this proposal exist to some degree in both counties, and Maryland will continue to examine lessons learned from these districts. In addition, Maryland wishes to propose one amendment to its original application. Maryland is committed to making the reform efforts in the application statewide, and as such, Maryland wishes to include Montgomery County and Frederick County as possible recipients of sub-grants that will come from the State's portion of the Race to the Top grant. These possible sub-grants include the following projects:

<u>Section</u>	<u>Budget #</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Section B.	5	World Language Pipelines	120,000
Section C:	29	LEA System Application Upgrades and Infrastructure Upgrades	4,750,000
Section D:	50	Compensation to Teachers and Principals in Lowest 5% Schools	3,216,000
	51	Compensation Incentives for Teachers in Shortage Areas	1,320,000
	54	International Partnerships to Recruit Teachers in Critical Needs Areas	120,000
	53	Incentives for Teachers Who Obtain ESOL Certification	1,200,000
Section E:	57	Extend Student Learning and Improve School Culture, Climate, And School Support	410,000
	45	Coordinated Student Services	454,440
	69	School Health Services	35,600
	63	Physical Activity	65,000

	71	STEM Project Lead the Way	330,000
Section F:	53	Charter Schools	1,300,000
Grand Total			\$13,321,040

### **LEA Scopes of Work**

Maryland engaged in an extensive process for managing the LEA Scopes of Work. This process began with a statewide meeting on September 14, 2010 where the Scope of Work template (see Appendix 4) was shared. As can be seen by the template, Maryland inserted steps in the LEA Scope of Work process to ensure that all LEA Scopes of Work would be aligned with the Maryland Race to the Top application. It also ensured that agreements made in the original Memorandum of Understanding were reinforced and that timelines and budgets were aligned. Finally, it ensured that goals, activities, and timelines were clear and that performance measures were indeed measurable. In order to try to ensure a better quality LEA Scope of Work, Maryland also engaged LEAs in the following ways:

- 9/14 – 9/30/10 MSDE continued to ask questions of USDE and receive updated guidance from USDE regarding Scopes of Work and other matters.
- 10/30/10 MSDE participated in the first of ongoing monthly calls with USDE.
- 10/5/10 Sample narrative for LEA distributed (Section D)
- 10/5/10 Sample Action Plan distributed (Section D)
- 10/5/10 Sample Goals distributed (Section D)
- 10/6/10 Sample Budgets distributed (Section D)
- 10/12/10 Planned, individual, optional technical assistance phone calls with 12 LEAs

State Scope of Work -- Maryland

- (Allegany, Baltimore City, Caroline, Cecil, Charles, Dorchester, Harford, Queen Anne's, Somerset, St. Mary's, Talbot, Washington)
- 10/13/10 MSDE held an internal retreat on Race to the Top implementation.
- 10/14/10 Planned, individual, optional technical assistance phone call with Kent County
- 10/15/10 Planned, individual, optional technical assistance phone calls with Anne Arundel and Howard counties
- 10/19/10 Frequently asked questions (resulting from phone calls) distributed
- 10/19/10 Scoring rubric distributed
- On average, there have been approximately 5-7 phone inquiries a day from LEAs to MSDE.

The LEA Scopes of Work were all received by the deadline of November 3, 2010. Upon receipt, they were distributed to one of eight internal teams that reviewed them for quality, consistency with the State application, and alignment with State reform efforts based on an established rubric (see Appendix 5) that was shared in advance with LEAs. These teams had previously gone through a training session on using the rubric and on what to look for in the LEA Scopes of Work. A separate LEA budget review was conducted by the Maryland State Department of Education budget office. Clarifying questions were sent back to the LEAs by the November 10, 2010 deadline. Revised LEA Scopes of Work were returned to the Maryland State Department of Education by the November 17, 2010 deadline. The review teams completed a final review on November 18 and 19 to ensure that all clarifying questions were answered and that the LEA Scopes of Work were ready for submission to the United States Department of Education. It is important to point out that one of the agreements made by LEAs was to participate in both State and national evaluations of Race to the Top. Maryland is currently working on its evaluation design so that we can measure quality and impact of the key reform measures in its plan.

State Scope of Work -- Maryland

### **Budget (Proposed Amendment)**

In the initial Race to the Top application budget, Maryland estimated that the 50% share of grants to Participating LEAs would be distributed 20% in Project Year 1, 30% in Project Year 2, 30% in Project Year 3, and the remaining 20% in Project Year 4.

Understandably, this estimate preceded knowing the actual need reflected in the Local Scopes of Work. Maryland will request a budget amendment to adjust the distribution across the four years of the grant to correspond to the statewide sum of the approved Local Scopes of Work for Project Years 1 through 4, respectively. This will impact the amount by year but will not affect the total nor the allocation by LEA.

### **Approvals**

In previous correspondence, the United States Department of Education has given Maryland permission to approve one or more years of each LEA Scope of Work. A partial reason for this permission has to do with the extensive Master Plan process that each LEA must complete in Maryland. State Code requires the State Superintendent to report to the General Assembly each year. The pertinent sections of the State Code are found below.

#### **§5-401**

(h) *Annual review; reports.-*

(1) The State Superintendent annually shall review how each county board's current year approved budget and actual prior year budget align with the master plan and any updates to the master plan. This review may be based on the information required to be submitted by the county board under subsection (b)(5) of this section and any other information required by the State Superintendent.

(2) The State Superintendent annually shall report the results of the budget review by December 31 to the Governor, the county governing body, and, subject to § 2-1246 of the State Government Article, the General Assembly.

(k) *State Superintendent to identify and report best practices.-*

State Scope of Work -- Maryland

- (1) The State Superintendent shall review academic intervention programs and behavior modification programs to identify best practices.
- (2) The State Superintendent shall periodically report on the best practices to the State Board, the county boards, the Governor, and, subject to § 2-1246 of the State Government Article, the General Assembly.

These Master Plan updates are extremely comprehensive and time-consuming, and they were due this year on October 15, 2010. It is often the case that the same personnel who complete these Master Plan updates are the very ones who are also assigned the LEA Scope of Work to be completed. Accordingly, Maryland informed its LEAs that it expected four-year Scopes of Work, but that it would be concentrating on year one. Maryland wishes to incorporate years two, three, and four of the LEA Scopes of Work into one document – the LEA Master Plan. We have begun internal conversations on how this might be done, recognizing that we need to be able to show clearly what parts of the Master Plan would be paid for with Race to the Top funds. Maryland believes that this will be a fairly straightforward process. Maryland also believes that LEAs will appreciate greatly not having to do two separate plans which essentially serve the same purpose, especially since they need to be woven together seamlessly in order to have the greatest impact. Maryland will be working with its LEAs over the next several months to determine how best to make this happen and will be seeking further guidance and approval from the United States Department of Education.

LEA	Narrative/Action Plan Approval	Budget Approval	Allocation
Allegany	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	1,714,775
Anne Arundel	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	6,850,953
Baltimore City	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	52,789,872
Baltimore County	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	17,403,073

State Scope of Work -- Maryland

Calvert	Yes	Approved as presented	847,260
Caroline	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	780,138
Carroll	Yes	Approved as presented	520,521
Cecil	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	1,959,554
Charles	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	1,830,692
Dorchester	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	925,006
Garrett	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	833,298
Harford	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	2,904,665
Howard	Yes	Approved as presented	823,257
Kent	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	334,426
Prince George's	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	23,571,891
Queen Anne's	Yes	Approved as presented	478,898
St. Mary's	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	1,602,820
Somerset	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	1,029,235
Talbot	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	490,314
Washington	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	3,105,678
Wicomico	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	3,082,320
Worcester	Yes	Approved, Notice of Grant Award released pending clarifications	1,120,989

**Challenges**

Maryland, like all states, faces many challenges in implementing its Race to the Top application. Hiring the appropriate personnel is the biggest initial challenge, but Maryland is well on its way to overcoming that obstacle. Securing the LEA Scopes of Work at a time when the same LEAs had to complete their comprehensive Master Plans was also a significant challenge, but Maryland has overcome that hurdle, as well. Getting the technology project director on board will be a huge step forward for Maryland during the next two weeks. Maryland is also hiring a full-time communications expert. Additionally, getting the tasks and subtasks identified and put in Microsoft Project will be important to our ability to track these fifty-four projects appropriately. Dealing with the well-documented political challenges surrounding teacher and principal evaluation is an ongoing challenge, but as discussed in Maryland's application, the regulation is still moving through the regulatory process, and at some point, Maryland will have a final regulation in place that will drive the teacher and principal evaluation process. Regardless of these challenges, Maryland's resolve and commitment to reform has not wavered. The overall goal remains – moving Maryland from national leader to world-class.