Policy Area 5
Governance and Accountability

Policy Area:

A structure will be put in place to ensure a strong system of accountability at all levels for implementation of the Commission’s recommendations.

Element Detail 5a

**Element**: Independent Oversight Body with authority to develop and oversee the system of accountability for implementation of the Commission’s recommendations. Such a body and system of accountability are essential for public support for the Commission’s recommendations. The body will sunset at the end of the implementation period specified in the enabling legislation.

1. The Oversight Body will consist of five members, appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate, who are recognized experts in preK-12 policy and/or leaders with proven records of implementing systemic change in complex organizations. The five individuals will be chosen from a slate presented by a nominating committee of six individuals, two appointed by each of the Governor, the President and the Speaker. These individuals should also have knowledge of pre-K-12 policy and/or systemic change in complex organizations.

   **Alternative**: Oversight Body will consist of a different number of members.

   **Alternative**: Two members will be appointed by the Governor, and one member by each of the Senate President and the Speaker of the House. The Governor, the President and the Speaker will jointly agree on the appointment of a chair.

2. The Oversight Body will have the authority to approve, monitor and evaluate implementation of the Commission’s recommendations. This will entail the authority to require information, including data from affected agencies and the Maryland Longitudinal Data System.

As an overarching guiding principle, the Oversight Body is expected to develop and maintain a strong working relationship with affected State agencies and entities, including the State Board of Education, the
Maryland State Department of Education, the Department of Labor Licensing and Regulations and the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

3. The Oversight Body will have an executive director and a relatively small staff (approximately 15–20 people) that will independently review proposed plans by State agencies and LEAs, progress in implementation of the plans, and outcomes.

4. The Oversight Body will:
   a) In consultation with the LEAs and other entities charged with the requirements in the enabling legislation, develop a detailed master plan and timeline for implementation of the various elements of the Commission’s recommendations;
   b) Develop guidelines for agencies and other entities to submit implementation plans to the Oversight Body; review and approve plans and related instruments submitted by the key agencies and entities responsible for implementing the Commission recommendations.

For LEA strategic plans, MSDE and the State Board of Education will make a recommendation to the Oversight Body as to whether an LEA plan should be approved and whether conditions have been met for release of funds.

Alternative: The Oversight Body will approve the criteria by which MSDE and the State Board will approve LEA plans and authorize release of funds for implementation.

LEA and MSDE plans must include:

- Plans to expand pre-K for low-income 3–year olds and all 4–year olds and to monitor the school readiness of students entering kindergarten;
- Plans to expand the network of Judy Centers and Family Resource Centers to serve families with children age 0–5 in high poverty communities;
Evidence that sufficient resources are in place to enable at-risk students to be successful, address funding equity issues and close present achievement gaps for vulnerable students;
Criteria that must be met by collaboratives of districts and teacher preparation programs seeking to strengthen teacher preparation and induction as recommended by the Commission;
Criteria to be used to approve plans from districts for State funds to implement their career ladder systems;
MSDE’s plan for the use of inspection teams charged with supporting struggling schools, including the data and criteria to be used to determine which schools will be inspected, the inspection schedule, the scope of the inspection, the criteria for selecting inspectors and the powers and responsibilities of the inspectors;
State plan to ensure all students reaching the Career and College Readiness (CCR) standard have access to post-CCR programs that prepare them for admission to selective colleges or for technical credentials leading to good jobs; and/or to complete college credits while in high school;
State plan to review CCR standard against international benchmark periodically (starting in year 5) to ensure Maryland students are competitive with their peers in top-performing countries;
State plan for training Maryland teachers, school leaders, administrators, school boards, dean’s of teacher preparation programs and members of the Professional Standards Board on the Commission’s recommendations.
State plan for developing a model State curriculum and for training teachers to teach the curriculum.

For the newly formed CTE Committee, its plan must include:

Standards and strategies for the development of rigorous CTE pathways including apprenticeships or other meaningful workplace experiences leading to industry-recognized credentials;
Benchmarks and targets to measure the success of CTE programs against state CTE goals and international standards;
The Committee’s plan for the selection and use of inspection teams charged with supporting struggling CTE programs, including the data and criteria to be used to determine which
schools and post secondary institutions will be inspected, the inspection schedule, the scope of the inspection, the criteria for selecting inspectors and the powers and responsibilities of the inspectors;

c) Monitor implementation efforts against the master plan and schedule, coordinate between agencies, and work with the respective agencies and entities to resolve implementation issues as they arise;

d) Gather and analyze data that reflects how the implementation plans are being implemented and their effects on student performance over time, with special emphasis on progress in closing achievement gaps for at risk students, including the authority to investigate whether local education agencies or schools are making sufficient progress;

d) Contract, as necessary, with independent experts;

e) Report progress at least annually to the Governor, legislature, and the public; describe implementation problems as they arise, and make recommendations as to changes in legislation, including on the adequacy of resources and accountability necessary to ensure the strategic plan will meet the objectives of the enabling legislation on schedule;

f) Coordinate the State’s participation in the OECD’s PISA survey program.

5. The oversight body will contract for an evaluation of the implementation of the Commission’s recommendations at the mid-point and end of the implementation period, including the use of additional funding to meet the goals, progress toward the goals and whether the goals have been achieved, and any recommendations to alter the goals or strategies to reach the goals.

6. The body will sunset at the end of the implementation period specified in the enabling legislation.

Element Detail 5b

Element: MSDE will track and report on the progress of students in each Maryland school, as a whole and by and within subgroups, with a special focus on students at risk based on income, race and disability, regarding their progress toward the CCR endorsement and the closing of achievement gaps.
1. MSDE will use State accountability data to identify schools in which most students or groups of vulnerable students, are not making adequate progress toward achieving CCR by the end of Grade 10 and organize inspection teams of leading principals, master teachers and other experts to visit those schools to analyze the causes of inadequate student progress toward the CCR standards and issue recommendations to the school board, the school community and the State for actions needed to correct those problems.

2. The local school board and school community will review the inspection team’s recommendations and identify those it will implement, which may include recommendations that require State action. Only after a designated period of time has passed and if sufficient progress has not been made, then the State may require a school to implement specific recommendations of the inspection team.

3. Among the recommendations that might be made by these inspection teams to the State would be pairing the struggling school with another school with similar demographics but considerably better performance in a way that would involve the principal of the high performing school taking responsibility for sharing his or her expertise and that of his or staff with the faculty of the struggling school.

4. The inspection teams would also be expected to recommend, if they think such a step necessary, that the State require the school to fully implement the model State curriculum in detail and have its teachers trained to implement that curriculum. Based on their findings and expertise, the inspection team may make other measures to improve a school’s performance.

**Element Detail 5c**

**Element:** The CTE Committee will track and report on the progress of students in each Maryland school with a CTE pathway, as a whole and by and within subgroups, with a special focus on students at risk based on income, race and/or disability, regarding their progress toward achieving industry credentials and related employment upon graduation or in successful transfer to a Community College CTE program.

1. The CTE Committee will establish performance metrics for schools with a CTE pathway.
2. The CTE Committee will use State accountability data to identify schools in which insufficient numbers of students or groups of vulnerable students, are not making adequate progress to completion of its CTE Pathway. The Committee will organize inspection teams of leading
principals, teachers and other CTE experts to visit those schools to analyze the problems preventing adequate student progress toward successful completion of the CTE pathway and issue recommendations to the school board, the school community and the State for actions needed to current those problems.

3. The local school board and school community will review the inspection team’s recommendations and identify those it will implement, which may include recommendations that require State action. Only after a designated period of time has passed and if sufficient progress has not been made, then the State may require a school to implement specific recommendations of the inspection team.

4. Among the recommendations that might be made by these inspection teams to the school board and the state would be pairing the struggling school with another school with similar demographics but considerably better performance with its CTE pathway in a way that would involve the principal of the high performing school taking responsibility for sharing his or her expertise and that of his or her staff with the faculty of the struggling school.

Element Detail 5d

**Element: Not less than 25 percent of all new funds available to the schools and districts will be subject initially to the approval of strategic plans to implement the Commission recommendations and, once the program is underway, to demonstrated progress in implementing those recommendations.**

1. Schools and districts submitting annual plans and progress reports will be given an opportunity to respond to warnings from MSDE and the CTE Committee if MSDE and the Committee are considering rejecting their plans before those plans are declared non-responsive and initial or new funds are denied.

2. If the MSDE and/or the CTE Committee recommend withholding initial new funds for inadequate plans or for lack of progress for approved plans, the Oversight Body may request that MSDE and/or the CTE Committee send an inspection team to a school for an on-site analysis and report before withholding a portion of new funds or, after withholding funds, to assess the likelihood that a new plan will work. In either case, the inspection team would be asked to assess whether a submitted plan is sufficiently responsive to the problems at the school to warrant the release of the sequestered funds.
3. In no case will allocated funds be reduced once plans have been approved. However, new funds withheld after initial plan approval, would be allocated only after MSDE and/or the CTE Committee recommend to the Oversight Body that adequate plans are now in place and the Oversight Body concurs.

Alternative: Funding would be restored once MSDE and/or the CTE Committee approve the underperforming schools corrective actions.

4. It is the intention of the Commission that not less than 75 percent of enrollment–based formula funds available to the district flow down to the school for use by the faculty of the school to educate the children in that school.

The Oversight Body will monitor school–level spending (which will necessitate LEA reporting of student–level spending by school and likely a new financial reporting system for MSDE and LEAs) by LEAs, and may develop an appeal process by which LEAs may request flexibility in meeting this requirement, at least in the transition period as full implementation of the Commission’s policy and funding recommendations are phased–in.