

Howard County Public School System

Bridge to Excellence Comprehensive Master Plan

2009 Annual Update

Part III: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Supplement

Howard County Board of Education

Frank Aquino, Esq., Chairman
Ellen Flynn Giles, Vice Chairman
Lawrence H. Cohen
Sandra H. French
Patricia S. Gordon
Allen Dyer, Esq.
Janet Siddiqui, M.D.
Josh T. Manley, Student Member

Superintendent

Sydney L. Cousin

Deputy Superintendent

Sandra J. Erickson

Chief of Staff

Mamie J. Perkins

Chief Financial Officer

Raymond H. Brown

Chief Operating Officer

Theresa R. Alban

Chief Academic Officer

Linda Wise

The Howard County Public School System does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, age, national origin, religion or disability in matters affecting employment or in providing access to programs. For more information, contact the Human Relations Office of the Howard County Public School System at 10910 Route 108, Ellicott City, MD 21042 or call 410.313.6654.

HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Excellence in Teaching & Learning

Bridge to Excellence Comprehensive Master Plan

2009 Annual Update

Part III: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Supplement

<i>The Content</i>	<i>Pages</i>
Howard County Board of Education	
Table of Contents.....	1
Section 1	
Executive Summary	2-3
1.1.A: ARRA Funds Financial Reporting Table.....	4
Section 2	
State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase I	
Planned Use of State Fiscal Stabilization (SFS) Funds	5
Section 3	
State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II	
Proposed Program Requirements.....	6
Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution	7-15

Section 1

Executive Summary to the 2009 Annual Update Part III: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Supplement

Planned Use of ARRA Funds

1. *How has having State Fiscal Stabilization (SFS) funds available influenced the school system's decisions regarding the master plan priorities for the year? How are specific ARRA grants being used to support the master plan priorities?*

The use of SFS funds has enabled the Howard County Public School System (HCPSS) to continue to support the two goals of the system—to ensure academic success for all students and to provide a safe and nurturing environment, by providing resources for differentiated support of schools. One of the key high leverage strategies that the HCPSS emphasizes in the master plan is providing differentiated support to schools so that the specific needs of the school and its students are met. Many schools have not met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or met AYP by confidence interval for the special education student group. The IDEA ARRA funds allowed the HCPSS to strategically support efforts for this student group by supporting a new program for autistic students, purchasing assistive technology devices, supporting professional development efforts, providing extended day and extended school year services, contracting for intensive special education and related services, and enabling the development and/or enhancement of instructional materials.

2. *Please explain how the ARRA funding streams are being coordinated to support the law's reform priorities.*

The HCPSS used SFS funds to support the reform priorities of increasing teacher effectiveness, making progress toward rigorous standards and high quality assessments, and providing targeted, intensive support and effective interventions for the lowest performing schools. In supporting teacher effectiveness, funding was used to provide professional development for Instructional Intervention Teams. These teams include regular and special education teachers, as well as support personnel (psychologists, speech therapists, etc.) who meet regularly to discuss students who are not performing at standard proficiency levels. Teams are trained in problem solving techniques, the use and analysis of data, and quality instructional interventions. Professional development was also provided to co-teaching teams—regular and special educators and paraeducators who teach together in inclusive classrooms. These professional development opportunities enable special educators and paraeducators to learn more about the curriculum and for regular educators to learn more about differentiated instruction strategies.

There were several areas in which the funds supported progress toward rigorous standards and high quality assessments. Teachers were trained in the use of a transition model that has been identified as a best practice in preparing students pursuing a life skills program to prepare for the world of work. Additionally, funds were used to provide diagnostic reading assessments across elementary and middle school levels that are aligned and provide more in-depth information for teachers to use in planning

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

instruction. Finally, funds were used to align the curriculum for the students in the life skills program with the Voluntary State Curriculum that guides the development of the state assessment program.

Schools that did not make AYP or made AYP by the confidence interval benefited from the support of SFS funds. Professional development opportunities for teachers and support in creating formative assessments were provided to schools using an integrated approach intervention program. Additionally, funds were used to provide mathematics interventions that have proven highly successful to students in after-school programs in more schools. In a proactive strategy, funds were used to offset the cost of a new program for preschool programs for autistic students. Research has shown that students who receive this early intervention are more likely to succeed in inclusive classes in elementary school.

3. *How has the potential “funding cliff” impacted current discussions and subsequent decisions regarding the most effective use of ARRA funds?*

Since ARRA funds were received after the HCPSS budget had been developed, the decisions made last year offset budgeted costs or included one-time costs, thus allowing for the development of a new program. As the budget is being developed this year, the funds will be used to continue many of the efforts with attention being paid to looking at ways to streamline or redirect funds in the future. There is awareness of the need to prepare for the elimination of these funds without identified sources of funding to replace them, so that the system is able to “climb down the cliff gently.”

4. *Please complete the ARRA Funds Financial Reporting Table.*

The ARRA Funds Financial Reporting Table is completed and presented on the next page.

Section 1

**Executive Summary to the 2009 Annual Update
Part III: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Supplement**

1.1.A: ARRA Funds Financial Reporting Table			
Local School System:Howard County Public Schools			
(\$ in Thousands)			
CFDA	Grant Name	Current FY 09 Budget	Current FY 10 Budget
			Total Arra Funds
10.579	National School Lunch - Equipment Assistance	-	-
84.387	Homeless Children and Youth	-	-
84.389	Title I - Grants to LEAs, Neglected and Delinquent	-	-
84.391	IDEA Part B - Grants to States-Pass-Through	-	9,489,712
	IDEA Part B - Grants to States-Discretionary	-	-
84.392	IDEA Part B - Preschool Grants	-	375,592
84.393	IDEA Part C - Infants and Families (Extended IFSP Option)	-	716,481
84.393	IDEA Part C - Infants and Families	-	339,899
84.394	State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Education Program	-	5,058,723
	Other*	-	-
Total			15,980,407
*The amounts below are included in the revenue above but will not be used until fiscal 2011			
84.392	IDEA Part B - Preschool Grants	-	187,796
84.393	IDEA Part C - Infants and Families	-	169,949
84.391	IDEA Part B - Grants to States-Pass-Through: amount not included in Part II adjustment	-	15,050
Instructions: For each of the four assurances, please identify how ARRA funds were used by itemizing expenditures for each assurance. Indicate the grant CFDA number as the source of the funds for the expenditure.			
Assurance 1: Increase teacher effectiveness and address inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers (recruiting, developing, and retaining effective teachers and principals).			
Expenditures:	Source	Amount	FTE
Wages-Professional Development	84.391	381,206	
Fixed Charges	84.391	29,162	
Supplies & Material	84.391	1,923,556	
Conference and Meetings	84.392	2,500	
Wages-Professional Development	84.392	2,700	
Fixed Charges	84.392	207	
Contracted Services	84.392	1,500	
Supplies & Material	84.392	64,612	
Tuition Reimbursement	84.394	2,000,000	
National Board Certification-Salary	84.394	150,000	
Wages-Professional Development	84.394	2,011,360	
Fixed Charges	84.394	165,343	
Total		6,732,146	
Assurance 2: Establish and use a pre-K through college and career data system to track progress and foster continuous improvement (building data systems that measure student success and inform teachers and principals how they can improve their practices).			
Expenditures:	Source	Amount	FTE
Assurance 3: Make progress towards rigorous college and career-ready standards and high quality assessments that are valid and reliable for all students, including limited English proficient students and students with disabilities (adopting internationally benchmarked standards and assessments that prepare students for success in college and the workplace).			
Expenditures:	Source	Amount	FTE
Assurance 4: Provide targeted, intensive support and effective interventions to turn around schools identified for corrective action and restructuring (turning around lowest performing schools).			
Expenditures:	Source	Amount	FTE
Workshop/Summer Wages	84.391	3,397,837	
Contracted Labor	84.391	1,377,110	
Equipment	84.391	155,621	
Non-public Transfers	84.391	1,760,814	
Indirect Cost	84.391	189,499	
Fixed Charges	84.391	259,857	
Workshop/Temp Help/Summer Wages	84.392	104,594	
Indirect Cost	84.392	3,682	
Fixed Charges	84.392	8,001	
Salaries & Wages	84.393	460,918	3.0
Contracted Labor	84.393	276,480	
Supplies	84.393	31,991	
Mileage, Conference and Meetings	84.393	34,000	
Indirect Cost	84.393	17,381	
Fixed Charges	84.393	65,661	
Wages-Summer School	84.394	680,000	
Fixed Charges	84.394	52,020	
Total		8,875,466	
Other: Please itemize other uses of ARRA funds in this category.			
Expenditures:	Source	Amount	FTE
*Indicate any other ARRA funds received by the school system, including the CFDA number.			

Section 2

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program Requirements – Phase I

Planned Use of State Fiscal Stabilization Funds

1. *Describe what the influx of unrestricted ARRA funds has allowed the district to accomplish this year, regardless whether or not the SFS funds were directly used to fund an initiative.*

The HCPSS used unrestricted ARRA funds to support professional development efforts to enhance teacher effectiveness. The funds paid for tuition reimbursement for teachers pursuing graduate coursework. It also provided support to teachers seeking National Board Certification. These items are included in the budget, so the funds enabled the HCPSS to offset some of these increasing costs. Additionally, funds were also used to offset the cost of summer school services for students in need of academic intervention.

2. *If the State Fiscal Stabilization (SFS) funds are being used for specific construction projects, please provide a list of the specific construction projects (ARRA Division, A, Section 14008) and the corresponding resource allocations.*

HCPSS did not receive funds for specific construction projects.

3. *If the SFS program funds are being used for one-time costs to avoid the “funding cliff” when the money runs out in two or three years, please describe these initiatives, and include the corresponding resource allocations.*

HCPSS did not use unrestricted funds for one-time costs.

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Proposed Program Requirements

Please complete the Excel Workbook for the State Fiscal Stabilization (SFS) Fund Program requirement. The workbook is organized by education reform area and intended to be used by local school system in addressing the SFS program's proposed data and information collection and reporting requirements.

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution is completed and presented on the following pages.

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Summary: To enable State officials, parents, the Department of Education, local educators and other key stakeholders to measure States' progress towards improving teacher effectiveness and achieving equity in the distribution of teachers and principals, States will need to collect, publish, and analyze basic information about how districts evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness and distribute their highly qualified and effective teachers among schools. The objective is to highlight inequities that result in low-income and minority students being taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field or ineffective teachers at higher rates than other students. Similarly, because principals play a critical role in teaching and learning, it is important to highlight inequities that result in low-income and minority students being taught in schools overseen by ineffective principals at higher rates than other students.

Response: In support of Goal 1 and Goal 2, the Office of Human Resources recognizes that recruiting and hiring diverse and highly qualified staff that is reflective of our schools and community is an important component of student success.

Each year the Office of Human Resources publishes a Hiring and Separation Report highlighting data on experience, age, gender, and race/ethnicity of our newly hired staff. Additionally, data is published on current demographics of certificated staff by school. School-based administrators and central office administrators use this data as part of the decision-making process in staffing schools.

The hiring of minority teachers continues to be extremely competitive. The Office of Human Resources continues to offer contracts as early as possible to qualified minority candidates, because most will receive multiple offers from competing districts. Ongoing efforts to increase the diversity of our teaching staff include the following initiatives: continuing the recruiting trips to colleges and universities with substantial minority populations; inclusive print advertising in campus career guides, newspapers, and job search journals; participation in an on-line recruiting service; and involvement in the school system's Future Educators Association (FEA) Program. During the 2009/2010 recruiting season, Howard County Public School System recruiters visit Historically Black colleges and Universities in Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, as well as universities with significant Asian and Hispanic populations in Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Puerto Rico. A school system team of 174 trained recruiters reflects the diversity of our teaching staff.

Each spring, representatives from the Office of Human Resources meet with school-based administrators to discuss and assist with teaching assignments for the coming school year. These meetings help school administrators to achieve diversity in the instructional staff and to assign highly qualified teachers to the appropriate classroom settings and support efforts to retain teachers by aligning teacher assignments with qualifications.

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

The Howard County Public School System has made consistent progress toward the goal of 100% of classes taught by highly qualified teachers. For 2008-2009 school year, the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers is 92.5%. The data for the 2009-2010 will be submitted during spring of 2010. The Office of Human Resources is hiring only highly qualified teachers for the ten Howard County Public School System Title I elementary schools. To accomplish this, Human Resources staff reviews certification and Federal highly qualified status prior to making job offers to potential candidates. Additionally, school administrators work closely with Human Resources to verify the highly qualified status of teachers being considered for voluntary transfer.

In the 2009 Bridge to Excellence Plan, Section I.D. 6, has data and detailed specific strategies used in achieving equitable staffing assignments across all school in Howard County.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local education agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	Teacher evaluation systems typically reflect a holistic view of teacher performance, and as such are an important information source for assessing the distribution of effective teachers.

Directions: Please include the following information on the local school system's designated website reporting the evaluation systems of teachers.

Teacher Evaluation Systems:
The description of the teacher evaluation system must explain how evaluation results are used in decisions regarding each of the following: teacher professional development, compensation, promotion, retention and removal.

The Guide to Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development, which is currently under revision, provides direction to administrators in the supervision and evaluation of all teachers. The Guide is based on the Frameworks of Excellence in Teaching and Learning which delineates the standards by which teachers are to be supervised and evaluated. The current standards include Interpersonal Skills, Planning and Preparation, the Classroom Environment, Delivery of Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. Principals set expectations and monitor progress using these standards as a foundation. Central Office content supervisors and administrators observe teachers to facilitate their continuous improvement and achievement of the standards.

This observation includes a focus on student learning and results that are achieved within a classroom lesson. The revised edition of this document will expand the standards to include a commitment to cultural proficiency and accountability for student growth and achievement. These expectations are used to assist in the evaluation and retention of teachers in the HCPSS. Our response to teacher evaluation is governed by law, research, best practices, and negotiated agreements.

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

The HCPSS provides a comprehensive professional development plan for teachers that includes:

- Tuition reimbursement
- University cohort programs for graduate study
- Strategic Teacher Induction Plan
- Site-based training that supports school improvement plans
- Data-based decision-making training for central office and school based instructional leaders
- Differentiated training for teachers and leaders on systemic data tools that include Inroads, Sandbox, and the HCPSS Data Protocol
- Content mentors for secondary non-tenured teachers
- Mentor teachers for third year non-tenured teachers as specified in COMAR
- Reading and Math Support Teachers who provide comprehensive, school-based professional development and provide support to teachers at designated elementary and middle schools

- Elementary and Secondary Curricular Coordinators, Instructional Facilitators, and Resource Teachers who provide new and non-tenured teacher seminars, informal observation process support, content, strategy, and technology integration workshops

- Teacher Development Liaisons coordinate professional development for and mentor and coach instruction

- Mentors for Pre-Service Candidates through the Professional Development Schools Program: Classroom master teachers mentor interns/student teachers through observation and providing daily formative and summative feedback in the areas of content, instructional processes and assessment

- Professional Learning Communities for schools, administrators, and central office leaders

- National Board Certification option for master teachers

- Cultural Proficiency training to identify and remove self-imposed barriers to student achievement. The Frameworks provides a rubric of responsible practices expected of HCPSS teachers (Commits to Cultural Proficiency Indicator 5F).

- Compensation in HCPSS is based on the negotiated Master Agreement between the HCPSS and HCEA. Advancement along the salary scale is aligned with state regulations regarding teacher certification.

- In the area of promotion, teachers who continually meet satisfactory performance evaluations may apply for promotional opportunities Examples include, but are not limited to: resource teachers, reading support teachers, math support teachers, and academic achievement liaisons.

- Our support for teacher retention is delineated in our comprehensive professional development plan. In addition, every effort is made to ensure new teachers have an instructional assignment and teaching load they can handle.

The HCPSS works to support teachers who are not meeting satisfactory standards. There are procedures in place to help those staff in need of remediation. These procedures include our comprehensive professional development plan. Those teachers who receive an unsatisfactory evaluation are placed on an action plan. Intensive supports and resources are provided at both the school and central office levels. Teacher action plans are monitored by school administrators and administrative directors. The shared goal is to have the teacher perform at the Satisfactor level. However, when a teacher on an action plan is unsuccessful, termination becomes a possibility.

The Board of Education expects that all employees conduct themselves in accordance with applicable laws and standards of behavior that reflect and support the educational and human relationship philosophies of the HCPSS.

Teachers who violate this expectation may be subjected to termination.

Directions: Please provide the link to this information on the LSS's designated website:
<http://www.hcpss.org/employees/>

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution		
Indicator (a)(2)	Whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes as an evaluation criterion	Evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes yield reliable assessments of teacher performance. Knowing if an evaluation system includes these outcomes informs the value of teacher performance ratings.
<p>Directions: Please mark either a "yes" or "no" response.</p> <p>_____ Yes, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes as an evaluation criterion.</p> <p><u> X </u> No, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers do not include student achievement outcomes as an evaluation criterion.</p>		
Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(3)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.	Evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes yield reliable assessments of teacher performance. Knowing if an evaluation system includes these outcomes informs the value of teacher performance ratings.
<p>Directions: Please mark "Yes" or "No".</p> <p><u>Evaluation Systems Include Achievement Outcomes or Student Growth</u></p> <p>_____ Yes, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.</p> <p>If Yes, please respond (check one):</p> <p>_____ Student achievement outcomes are included as an evaluation criterion.</p> <p>_____ Student growth is included as an evaluation criterion.</p> <p><u> X </u> No, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers do not include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.</p> <p>The Guide to Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development, which is currently under revision, provides direction to administrators in the supervision and evaluation of all teachers. The Guide is based on the Frameworks of Excellence in Teaching and Learning which delineates the standards by which teachers are to be supervised and evaluated. The current standards include Interpersonal Skills, Planning and Preparation, the Classroom Environment, Delivery of Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. Principals set expectations and monitor progress using these standards as a foundation. Central Office content supervisors and administrators observe teachers to facilitate their continuous improvement and achievement of the standards.</p> <p>This observation includes a focus on student learning and results that are achieved within a classroom lesson. The revised edition of this document will expand the standards to include a commitment to cultural proficiency and accountability for student growth and achievement. These expectations are used to assist in the evaluation and retention of teachers in the HCPSS. Additionally, we are in our third year of implementation of Purposeful Observation as an evaluation tool. This process gives principals and teachers common language to leverage student results through teacher performance.</p> <p>Our response to teacher evaluation is governed by law, research, best practices, and negotiated agreements. The HCPSS supports and encourages the use of student data tools in leveraging student learning. Systemwide professional development continues to focus on the use of data to inform instruction and school improvement planning. School based administrators are required to use the systemic data protocol to drive their school improvement plans and help teachers deliver high quality instruction.</p>		

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution																				
Citation	Description	Rationale																		
Indicator (a)(4)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.	Ratings from teacher evaluation systems further highlight the strengths and weaknesses of those systems and provide valuable information on the distribution of effective teachers across districts.																		
<p>Directions: Please complete the table below by listing each of the rating or performance levels in the LEA's performance evaluation systems, and the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.</p>																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>* Performance Rating or Level</th> <th>Number of Teachers</th> <th>Percentage of Teachers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SATISFACTORY</td> <td>4,624</td> <td>99.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UNSATISFACTORY</td> <td>23</td> <td>0.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Total: 4,647</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			* Performance Rating or Level	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers	SATISFACTORY	4,624	99.50%	UNSATISFACTORY	23	0.50%	Total: 4,647								
* Performance Rating or Level	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers																		
SATISFACTORY	4,624	99.50%																		
UNSATISFACTORY	23	0.50%																		
Total: 4,647																				
<p>* Data is only for those teachers evaluated in school year 2008-2009</p>																				
<p>Directions: Please provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website: http://www.hcpss.org/employees/</p> <p>If the LEA does not currently publicly report this data, please list the major action steps that you will take to make this information publicly available by 6/30/11.</p>																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Action Steps</th> <th>Who's Responsible</th> <th>Completion Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Establish internal work group to explore options, delineate stakeholders and draft plan</td> <td>Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff</td> <td>January 2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed plan vetted through School Support Team (Division of Instruction Directors), Division Of Support Services Management Team and Chiefs</td> <td>Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent</td> <td>June 2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Implementation of Data Collection Involving School Based Administrators and the Office of Human Resources</td> <td>Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff</td> <td>June-September 2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data collection process continues with ongoing assessment driving refinement</td> <td>Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff</td> <td>October 2010- May 2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Refined process institutionalized</td> <td>Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent</td> <td>June 2011</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Action Steps	Who's Responsible	Completion Date	Establish internal work group to explore options, delineate stakeholders and draft plan	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	January 2010	Proposed plan vetted through School Support Team (Division of Instruction Directors), Division Of Support Services Management Team and Chiefs	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent	June 2010	Implementation of Data Collection Involving School Based Administrators and the Office of Human Resources	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	June-September 2010	Data collection process continues with ongoing assessment driving refinement	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	October 2010- May 2011	Refined process institutionalized	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent	June 2011
Action Steps	Who's Responsible	Completion Date																		
Establish internal work group to explore options, delineate stakeholders and draft plan	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	January 2010																		
Proposed plan vetted through School Support Team (Division of Instruction Directors), Division Of Support Services Management Team and Chiefs	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent	June 2010																		
Implementation of Data Collection Involving School Based Administrators and the Office of Human Resources	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	June-September 2010																		
Data collection process continues with ongoing assessment driving refinement	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	October 2010- May 2011																		
Refined process institutionalized	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent	June 2011																		

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(5)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.	To the extent information on the distribution of teacher performance ratings is readily accessible by school, State officials, parents and other key stakeholders can identify and address inequities in the distribution of effective teachers on an ongoing basis.

Directions: Please mark "Yes" or "No".
 _____ Yes, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are **publicly reported for each school in the LEA.**
 Please provide the link to this information on the LSS's designated website:

 _____ **X** No, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are not **publicly reported for each school in the LEA.**
If the LEA does not currently publicly report these data, please list the major action steps that you will take to publicly report this information by 6/30/11.

Action Steps	Who's Responsible	Completion Date
Establish internal work group to explore options, delineate stakeholders and draft plan	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	January 2010
Proposed plan vetted through School Support Team (Division of Instruction Directors), Division Of Support Services Management Team and Chiefs	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent	June 2010
Implementation of Data Collection Involving School Based Administrators and the Office of Human Resources	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	June-September 2010
Data collection process continues with ongoing assessment driving refinement	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	October 2010- May 2011
Refined process institutionalized	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff Superintendent	June 2011

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution		
Citation	Description	Rationale
Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	
<p>Directions: Please include the following information on the local school system's designated website reporting the evaluation systems of principals.</p> <p>Principal Evaluation Systems: The description of the principal evaluation system must explain how evaluation results are used in decisions regarding each of the following: principal professional development, compensation, promotion, retention and removal. HCPSS has expanded principal evaluations to include performance-based indicators.</p> <p>Compensation of principals is negotiated through Howard County Administrators Association.</p> <p>Promotional opportunities are based on vacancies and success in job related performance.</p> <p>Principals receive systemic professional development through monthly Leadership I (Division of Instruction Principals and Central Office based leaders) meetings and yearly Summer Institute for School Improvement. Many principals serve on systemic long range planning committees, advisories, internal work groups and interview panels. Additionally, an executive leadership fellows program is under exploration for the 2010-2011 school year.</p> <p>Principal retention is supported through the professional development opportunities delineated above as well as strategic placement provided through school administration. Principals who are not meeting success in an identified standard work with their administrative director to set performance based indicators. Progress is reviewed both mid-year and the end of the year. Principals that receive an unsatisfactory on their overall evaluation are placed on an action plan. Intensive supports and resources are provided. Principal action plans are monitored by administrative directors throughout the year. The shared goal is to have the principal perform at the Satisfactory level. However, when a principal on an action plan is unsuccessful, he/she may be reassigned to a non-leadership position or terminated.</p> <p>The Board of Education expects that all employees conduct themselves in accordance with applicable laws and standards of behavior that reflect and support the educational and human relationship philosophies of the HCPSS. Principals who violate this expectation may be subjected to termination.</p> <p>Directions: Please provide the link to this information on the LSS's designated website: http://www.hcpss.org/employees/</p>		

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.	Evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes yield reliable assessments of teacher performance. Knowing if an evaluation system includes these outcomes informs the value of teacher performance ratings.

Directions: Please mark "Yes" or "No".

Evaluation Systems Include Achievement Outcomes or Student Growth

_____ Yes, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

_____ **Student achievement outcomes** are included as an evaluation criterion.

_____ **Student growth** is included as and evaluation criterion.

_____ **X** No, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals do not include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.	Ratings from principal evaluation systems further highlight the strengths and weaknesses of those systems and provide valuable information on the distribution of effective principals across districts.

Directions: Please complete the table below by listing each of the rating or performance levels in the LEA's performance evaluation systems, and the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

* Performance Rating or Level	Number of Principals	Percentage of Principals
SATISFACTORY	36	97.30%
UNSATISFACTORY	1	2.70%
Total:	37	

* Data is only for those principals (37 of 73) evaluated in school year 2008-2009

Section 3

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program – Phase II

Table 3.a Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Please provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website:
<http://www.hcpss.org/employees/>

If the LEA does not currently publicly report this data, please list the major action steps that you will take to make this information publicly available by 6/30/11.

Action Steps	Who's Responsible	Completion Date
Establish an internal work group to identify a process and protocol to align performance-based objectives with principal evaluation.	Chief Academic Officer	January 2010
Review principal evaluations to determine the impact of performance based objectives. Use data to inform and revise goal setting process for SY 2010 - 2011	Chief Academic Officer	June 2010
Develop a communication plan to keep stakeholders informed.	Chief Academic Officer Chief of Staff	August 2010
Pilot the recommendations of the internal work group.	Chief Academic Officer	September 2010
Assess the progress of the pilot and communication plan	Superintendent and Chiefs	January 2011
Revise and refine process based on assessment	Chief Academic Officer	February-May 2011
Institutionalize the process	Chief Academic Officer	June 2011