# Legislative Committee Meeting

**Monday, December 17, 2018**  
10:00 a.m. – Noon  
MABE Conference Room

Julie Hummer, Chair

## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Welcome and Introductions</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reports from Board Members</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kirwan Commission Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of Final Workgroup Reports and Policy Area Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of Costing Out Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Issue Updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Governor’s School Construction Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IAC Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ESSA Report Card Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gifted &amp; Talented Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Grading Policy Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>John Woolums/All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislative Committee Calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Next meeting on Monday, January 7, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Legislative Day - Thursday, Feb. 21, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See reverse for links to meeting materials and additional resources.
Materials & Resources for the Dec. 17, 2018 Meeting

Item 3. Kirwan Commission Updates
- Final drafts of Working Group & Commission recommendations and Costing Out Reports (Updated as of Dec. 6, 2018):
  - 1. Early Education, (Costing Out, Alternative Costing Out)
  - 2. Teachers & Leaders, (Costing Out Report)
  - 3. College and Career Readiness and CTE, (Costing Out Report)
  - 4. More Resources for At-Risk Students, (Costing Out), (Special Education Costs), (Mental Health Services Costs)
  - 5. Governance & Accountability
  - Costing Out Decision Point Presentation
  - Preliminary Total Cost Estimates

Item 4. Issue Updates
- Governor’s School Construction Initiative
- ESSA Report Card Release
- Gifted & Talented Program Regulations
- Calendar Legislation
- IAC Regulations
- Other Issues

Item 5. Legislative Committee Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 17, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 7, 2019</td>
<td>FYI – The Legislative Session begins on January 9, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FYI – The NSBA Advocacy Institute in Washington, DC is Jan. 27-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 4, 2019</td>
<td>FYI – MABE’s Legislative Day in Annapolis is February 21, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 25, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 2019</td>
<td>FYI – The 2019 legislative session ends at midnight on April 8, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 6. Distribute Final 2019 Legislative Priorities and Positions
- Final Publication

MABE’s Legislative Committee meetings are held in the MABE office on Monday mornings, 10:00 to 12:00, unless otherwise indicated.
Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education
William E. "Brit" Kirwan, Chair

2018 Interim Schedule (September-December 2018)

All meetings will be held in Room 120 of the House Office Building, Annapolis unless otherwise specified. Meeting agendas will be posted in advance on the Commission’s website at http://bit.ly/MDCommission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day/Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, September 21</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>- Working Groups 1 and 2 Revised Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>- Discuss Comments on Working Groups 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Working Groups 3 and 4 to meet following the full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission to discuss revisions to recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 10</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>- Working Groups 3 and 4 Revised Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>- Element 4b Mental/Behavioral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accountability Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of Proxy for At-risk Students Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- School Finance Primer (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Working Group 2 will meet in mid–late October TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 31</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>Work Session (Agenda TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 14</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>Work Session (Agenda TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 29</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>Work Session (Agenda TBA) followed by a Public Hearing in Annapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>(time TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, December 6</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>Work Session (Agenda TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, December 18</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>Review Draft Final Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, December 19</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–</td>
<td>Final Decision Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working Group 1: Early Childhood Education
Working Group 2: High Quality and Diverse Teachers and Leaders
Working Group 3: College and Career Readiness Pathways
Working Group 4: More Resources for At-risk Students
Working Group 1
Early Childhood Education

Policy Area:

Expands high-quality pre-K to four-year-olds based on a sliding scale and three-year-olds from low-income families; assesses all children to identify those who need supports to be ready to succeed in school; and expands Judy Centers, Family Support Centers, and the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program for children ages 0–5 and their families.

Element 1a: Expand full-day Pre-K at no cost for four-year-olds and three-year-olds from families with incomes up to 300% of the federal poverty level (FPL) (approximately $75,000 for a family of four), and for four-year-olds from families with incomes between 300% and 600% FPL (approximately $75,000 to $150,000 for a family of four) using a sliding scale.

Element 1b: Capacity building for new and current programs (tuition assistance for prospective staff; training; support of peer networks; integration with career ladder).

Element 1c: Implementation of a school readiness assessment for all students entering kindergarten.

Element 1d: Expand Judy Centers, Family Support Centers, and the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to provide and coordinate access to education and support services for at-risk children ages 0-5 and their families.

Implementation:
Expansion of pre-K will be focused on making pre-K available for all four-year-olds from low-income families in half-day slots, while half-day slots are being converted into full-day slots. By year four, all four-year-olds from low-income families will be offered high-quality, full-day pre-K. This will occur at the same time as full-day pre-K is expanded gradually for three-year-olds from low-income families.

Full-day pre-K for three-year-olds from low-income families will be phased-in over the 10 year period by a minimum of 10% per year. Therefore, by year 10, all three-year-olds from low-income families will be offered full-day pre-K.

The State will require that a minimum percentage of full-day pre-K slots in each local education agency be provided in participating community-based settings. This minimum requirement will be phased-in over the 10 year period in 10% per year increments in years one through four, and remain constant at 50% beginning in year five.
### Working Group 1: Early to PreKindergarten Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3: $8,343</th>
<th>Level 4: $11,476</th>
<th>Level 5: $12,222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1: $8,343</td>
<td>Year 2: $9,332</td>
<td>Year 4: $11,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5: $12,222</td>
<td>Year 6: $13,253</td>
<td>Year 7: $13,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 (FY21)</th>
<th>Year 2 (FY22)</th>
<th>Year 3 (FY23)</th>
<th>Year 4 (FY24)</th>
<th>Year 5 (FY25)</th>
<th>Year 6 (FY26)</th>
<th>Year 7 (FY27)</th>
<th>Year 8 (FY28)</th>
<th>Year 9 (FY29)</th>
<th>Year 10 (FY30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Slots (in Public School and Community-Based Settings)</td>
<td>38,254</td>
<td>36,393</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>32,686</td>
<td>32,345</td>
<td>33,963</td>
<td>38,789</td>
<td>41,992</td>
<td>48,485</td>
<td>53,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA Half-Day Slots</td>
<td>14,899</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>11,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converged Half Day to Full Day Slots</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>7,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited (Not EXCEEDS)</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cost Estimates to Serve 4-year-olds at or below 300% Federal Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 (FY21)</th>
<th>Year 2 (FY22)</th>
<th>Year 3 (FY23)</th>
<th>Year 4 (FY24)</th>
<th>Year 5 (FY25)</th>
<th>Year 6 (FY26)</th>
<th>Year 7 (FY27)</th>
<th>Year 8 (FY28)</th>
<th>Year 9 (FY29)</th>
<th>Year 10 (FY30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Served with New Public Funding (Participation Rate)</td>
<td>27,298</td>
<td>15,358</td>
<td>19,083</td>
<td>22,896</td>
<td>26,629</td>
<td>26,178</td>
<td>28,226</td>
<td>28,351</td>
<td>30,596</td>
<td>30,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population at 300% FPL</td>
<td>38,130</td>
<td>37,075</td>
<td>37,014</td>
<td>37,044</td>
<td>37,184</td>
<td>37,397</td>
<td>37,635</td>
<td>37,811</td>
<td>37,961</td>
<td>38,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 4-yr Old Student Population</td>
<td>75,314</td>
<td>75,424</td>
<td>73,319</td>
<td>73,422</td>
<td>73,724</td>
<td>74,182</td>
<td>76,674</td>
<td>75,039</td>
<td>75,366</td>
<td>75,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cost Estimates to Serve 4-year-olds between 300% and 600% Federal Poverty Level (Shading Scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 (FY21)</th>
<th>Year 2 (FY22)</th>
<th>Year 3 (FY23)</th>
<th>Year 4 (FY24)</th>
<th>Year 5 (FY25)</th>
<th>Year 6 (FY26)</th>
<th>Year 7 (FY27)</th>
<th>Year 8 (FY28)</th>
<th>Year 9 (FY29)</th>
<th>Year 10 (FY30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Served with New Public Funding (Participation Rate)</td>
<td>16,397</td>
<td>16,419</td>
<td>17,675</td>
<td>17,782</td>
<td>16,088</td>
<td>11,334</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>24,002</td>
<td>34,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost to State and Locals</td>
<td>$23,315,126</td>
<td>$22,343,166</td>
<td>$39,426,699</td>
<td>$121,651,938</td>
<td>$130,394,002</td>
<td>$111,018,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cost Estimates to Serve 3-year-olds at or below 300% Federal Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 (FY21)</th>
<th>Year 2 (FY22)</th>
<th>Year 3 (FY23)</th>
<th>Year 4 (FY24)</th>
<th>Year 5 (FY25)</th>
<th>Year 6 (FY26)</th>
<th>Year 7 (FY27)</th>
<th>Year 8 (FY28)</th>
<th>Year 9 (FY29)</th>
<th>Year 10 (FY30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Served with New Public Funding (Participation Rate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum % to be Offered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-day Slots Offer to Meet Minimum %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,726</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>11,172</td>
<td>14,898</td>
<td>18,625</td>
<td>22,352</td>
<td>26,079</td>
<td>30,805</td>
<td>34,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population at 300% FPL currently 3,574</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>5,873</td>
<td>8,816</td>
<td>11,960</td>
<td>15,099</td>
<td>18,248</td>
<td>21,407</td>
<td>24,566</td>
<td>27,725</td>
<td>30,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost to State and Locals</td>
<td>$24,867,184</td>
<td>$35,435,712</td>
<td>$59,059,547</td>
<td>$71,970,445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Cost Estimates

| 3-year-olds and 4-year-olds at or below 300% FPL | $120,968,078 | $233,117,608 | $326,641,397 | $363,948,753 | $319,047,516 | $344,978,172 | $346,503,922 | $372,499,353 | $445,206,751 | $564,302,474 |
| 4-year-olds between 300% and 600% FPL | $33,316,126 | $72,241,166 | $95,428,639 | $121,651,938 | $130,394,002 | $111,018,586 |
| Total Cost to State and Locals | $373,285,132 | $417,201,393 | $429,934,610 | $457,148,791 | $575,096,792 | $695,554,240 |
Working Group 2
High Quality Teachers and Leaders

Policy Area:

Higher paid, better educated, more rigorously trained teachers will work as professionals in schools that offer real careers in teaching and are organized to ensure that teachers have the time they need to work together in teams to continuously improve their practice and improve the performance of students. All schools will have highly trained principals who are prepared to create fully professional work environments for teachers.

Element 2a: Teacher preparation will be much more rigorous, and induction will be integrated with teacher preparation more systematically.

Element 2b: Raise standards for licensing new teachers in MD to levels comparable to the standards for teachers in the top performing nations.

Element 2c: Expand incentives for highly skilled and diverse candidates to teach in high-need schools.

Element 2d: Encourage higher education institutions to take advantage of national foundation efforts to develop highly qualified teachers and leaders from diverse backgrounds.

Element 2e: Launch statewide public relations and communications initiative to rebrand teaching as an attractive career and attract students from diverse backgrounds.

Element 2f: Raise teacher pay to make it equitable with other highly trained professionals with the same amount of education.

Element 2g: Develop career ladders for teachers and school leaders comparable in design to the career ladders found in Singapore and Shanghai, with respect to standards for advancement and relationship to the system for compensating teachers and school leaders.

Element 2h: Train the State Superintendent and the 24 local superintendents, their senior, instruction–related staff, State and local board of education members, and school principals to give them the vision, motivation, skills, and knowledge they will need to implement the recommendations made in the Commission’s report.

Element 2i: Change the way schools are organized and managed to increase the amount of time available for teachers to tutor students who need intensive help and work together in teams to use data and observation to identify students who are falling behind and collaborate on getting them back on track, develop highly engaging and effective lesson plans, mentor new and struggling teachers and systematically improve the school’s instructional program using applied research.
Working Group 2
***
High Quality Teachers and Leaders
Revised Cost Estimates
December 6, 2018
### Current Law Base Compensation Costs

- **Salaries**:
  - $4,463,371,780 in 2018
  - Declining to $4,459,995,805 in 2020
  - Total: $46,680,026,070

- **Fringe Benefits Including Retirement**:
  - $19,647,351,030 in 2018
  - Declining to $19,643,896,453 in 2021
  - Total: $209,796,672,481

- **Total Base Teacher Compensation Cost**:
  - $24,110,722,810 in 2018
  - Declining to $24,107,267,233 in 2021
  - Total: $249,477,298,551

### Proposed Compensation Costs

- **Salaries**:
  - $4,662,372,785 in 2018
  - Declining to $4,659,995,805 in 2020
  - Total: $48,513,901,170

- **Fringe Benefits Including Retirement**:
  - $20,714,351,030 in 2018
  - Declining to $20,710,896,453 in 2021
  - Total: $218,989,746,531

- **Total Proposed Teacher Compensation Cost**:
  - $25,376,722,810 in 2018
  - Declining to $25,373,267,233 in 2021
  - Total: $258,574,748,551

### Change in Salary Costs

- **Change in Base Teacher Salary**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

- **Change in Fringe Benefits Excluding Retirement**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

- **Change in Total Teacher Compensation Cost**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

### Additional Prekindergarten Teachers

- **Increase in Salary Cost for Enrollment Growth**:
  - $7,328,863 in 2018
  - Total: $73,487,212

- **Increase in Salary Cost for Collaboration Time**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

- **Total Increase in Salary Costs**:
  - $7,328,863 in 2018
  - Total: $73,487,212

- **Fringe Benefits Including Retirement**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

- **Increase in Total Prekindergarten Compensation Cost**:
  - $7,328,863 in 2018
  - Total: $73,487,212

### Master Principals (Cost of Salary Increase Only)

- **Total FTE**:
  - 51.4 in 2018
  - Total: 517.2

- **Increased Salary Cost**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

- **Fringe Benefits Including Retirement**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

- **Total Increased Compensation Cost**:
  - $0 in 2018
  - Total: $0

- **Cost of NBPTS Fee Reimbursement**:
  - $490,912 in 2018
  - Total: $4,719,042

### Preliminary Total Proposed Cost Increase

- **Total**:
  - $143,799,835 in 2018
  - Total: $1,546,884,889

---

*December 6, 2018*

Scenario: Run 1: 10% base salary increase 2020-2022, $60,000 minimum teacher salary, $12,000 NBPTS rate, all voluntary opt-in until 2023 when new teachers are required to opt-in.*
Working Group 3
College and Career Readiness Pathways

Policy Area:

Develop a world class instructional system that will enable Maryland high school graduates to match students in the highest achieving countries in the world in academic attainments, equip them with the complex skills they will need to be successful in a technologically sophisticated economy, contribute to their communities, and play their roles as informed and thoughtful citizens in the world's oldest democracy.

It is also important to bear in mind that many who do not achieve the CCR by age 18 will still be able to receive high school diplomas. Under the present system, many who receive such a diploma do so by passing a very undemanding "alternative" that undermines the diploma's real-world value. In the new system, students will get a diploma by taking a set of high school courses required for graduation by the State Board and assessments of their performance on those courses that will be incorporated into the course requirements. There will be no alternative to these assessments or these requirements.

**Element 3a:** Develop a fully aligned instructional system, including curriculum frameworks, course syllabi and assessments, together with clear examples of standard-setting work and formative assessments to ensure that students stay on track.

**Element 3b:** Establish and implement a College and Career Readiness (CCR) standard set to global standards. At the outset, the CCR standard will be a score of 4 or higher on PARCC Algebra I and English 10 exams.

**Element 3c:** Transitional Supplemental Instruction (TSI), including tutoring, for all K–3rd grade students identified as struggling learners.

**Element 3d:** Develop alternative educational approaches for students in middle school and early high school who are not likely to meet the CCR standard by the end of 10th grade that gives them extra time and more supports to help them meet that standard as soon as possible.

**Element 3e:** Students who reach CCR by the end of 10th grade will choose from among four pathways for the remaining two years of high school:
1. A college preparatory pathway that includes completion of one of the following: the Advanced Placement (AP) Capstone program, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, or the Cambridge Diploma program;
2. Dual enrollment in a public postsecondary institution that allows the student to earn up to an Associates' degree at no cost to the student;
3. A rigorous career and technology education (CTE) program that leads to an industry-recognized credential that provides entry to a challenging career;
4. A fourth pathway developed by the student (in consultation with a guidance counselor) that blends elements of some or all of the other three pathways.
Element 3f: The State Board of Education will revise high school graduation requirements so that students who achieve CCR will be able to enter any of the post-CCR pathways and still earn high school diplomas.

Element 3g: Develop 11th and 12th grade programs for students who do not meet the CCR standard by the end of 10th grade.

Element 3h: A new Committee of the Governor's Workforce Development Board (GWDB) will be created, to be known as Career and Technical Education Committee (CTE Committee). It will be charged with building a world-class career and technical education system for Maryland, taking into consideration the priorities established by the Economic Development Commission.

Element 3i: The CTE Committee will create an advisory group to provide advice on skills standards that can be used to drive the new Maryland CTE system. To be called the Skills Standards Advisory Committee, it will be comprised primarily of employers from a diverse mix of industries, leaders of industry associations, and labor groups. It will be charged with setting standards for a greatly strengthened statewide system of work-based learning and apprenticeships that will form the backbone of the new system.

Element 3j: Every middle and high school student should have ready access to individuals who can counsel and advise them on CTE pathway options and help them navigate among the available and emerging opportunities.

Element 3k: CTE instruction will take place in two kinds of high schools: Comprehensive CTE High Schools and regular comprehensive high schools. Existing Career and Technology Centers will transition into Comprehensive CTE High Schools as resources become available.

Element 3l: The entire CTE system will be informed by a close relationship between CTE providers and the State's economic development, workforce development, and labor agencies.

Element 3m: Funds from local, State, and federal sources will be used to support development and delivery of course and program progressions approved by the CTE Committee that lead to industry credentials.
Working Group 3

***

College and Career Readiness Pathways
Revised Cost Estimates
December 6, 2018
### Cost Estimates for Workgroup 3 CCR Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment (projected)</td>
<td>873,835</td>
<td>879,747</td>
<td>885,532</td>
<td>889,811</td>
<td>892,352</td>
<td>894,476</td>
<td>894,794</td>
<td>897,088</td>
<td>899,484</td>
<td>901,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th &amp; 12th Grade Est. Enr.* (14% of total)</td>
<td>122,357</td>
<td>123,165</td>
<td>123,975</td>
<td>124,434</td>
<td>124,929</td>
<td>125,227</td>
<td>125,253</td>
<td>125,592</td>
<td>125,925</td>
<td>126,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ per CCR student</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ per non-CCR student</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CCR (11th and 12th)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% non-CCR (11th and 12th)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3e (CCR)</td>
<td>$36,701,084</td>
<td>$41,875,960</td>
<td>$47,110,323</td>
<td>$52,262,104</td>
<td>$57,467,455</td>
<td>$62,613,346</td>
<td>$67,641,853</td>
<td>$72,843,505</td>
<td>$78,073,432</td>
<td>$82,069,374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Annual Salary</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
<td>$70,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits (15%)</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
<td>$11,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculation of estimated 11 and 12 Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade Actual</td>
<td>60,857</td>
<td>59,835</td>
<td>59,717</td>
<td>59,193</td>
<td>60,991</td>
<td>60,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade Actual</td>
<td>59,578</td>
<td>59,114</td>
<td>58,624</td>
<td>58,493</td>
<td>58,303</td>
<td>60,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total K-12 Enrollment</td>
<td>821,106</td>
<td>823,452</td>
<td>827,869</td>
<td>834,524</td>
<td>842,229</td>
<td>845,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Enrollment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working Group 4
More Resources for At-risk Students

Policy Area:

System that ensures at-risk students are successful that supports these students and their families as soon as they arrive at school with both academic supports and extensive case management to address social, physical, mental, and family needs to enable success at school.

Element Detail 4a:
• Add a concentrated poverty weight to the funding formula to support intensive services for students and their families to enable them to succeed in school, that are coordinated and able to meet the additional needs of students in schools located in distressed communities.
• Add fixed, categorical funding amounts for each school with concentrated poverty to be used to: 1) establish or enhance community schools and 2) establish or enhance school health and behavioral services.

Element Detail 4b (referred to full commission): Train school staff in all schools to recognize mental health issues as well as other issues related to trauma and coordinate access to needed mental health and other services for students, as part of effort to increase school safety (see SB 1265 – signed into law as Chapter 30).

Element Detail 4c: Revise funding formula weight for special education students. To provide special education resources, local school systems spend more than the current funding formula provides. Total State and local expenditures on special education equaled $1.567 billion in fiscal 2015. Of this, the State provided $272 million, or 17.3% of the total. Thus the local funding accounted for the remaining $1.296 billion.

A weight of 2.18 is recommended as the “stop-gap” weight until the completion of the special education study required by HB1415 and until any recommendations of the study are implemented in law. This weight is calculated based on the fiscal 2015 foundation per pupil base of $6,860. For context, the weight in current law is 0.74. The weight will be recalculated once the Commission determines a new foundation base such that an equivalent amount of State funds are generated as the weight of 2.18 would generate. The result of this stop gap weight is that State funding, in fiscal 2015 dollars, increases by 195% from $272 million to $800 million. This increases the State proportion of expenditures from 17% to 51%.

Element Detail 4d: Revise funding formula weight for English Learner students. The Commission’s preliminary report recommends increasing support for at-risk students, including special education, low-income, and EL.

Because most of EL students also qualify for compensatory education funding, the compensatory education weight will provide for academic and social/emotional supports. Therefore, the EL weight as recommended by APA is only reflective of resources needed to specifically support language acquisition.
Policy Area 5
Governance and Accountability

Policy Area:

Research shows that, beyond a threshold level, how funds for education are spent is at least as important as how much is spent in determining student achievement and funding equity. The Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education's recommendations call for a substantial increase in funding for Maryland schools in order to implement strategies for greatly improving student achievement and equity. These recommended strategies have proven to be highly successful in the top performing countries and, for the most part, in Massachusetts, the only state in the US that performs at a high standard internationally.

Almost two decades ago, a predecessor commission, the Thornton Commission, recommended increased funding for PreK-12 education in Maryland. While there was some increase in student achievement on state standardized tests as the funding was phased in, unfortunately this funding did not produce significant increases in student outcomes, especially on NAEP where Maryland students continue to rank in the middle of the pack in comparison to students in the other 49 states. Moreover, the Thornton funding did little to eliminate achievement gaps based on income, race and disability. This must not be replicated with the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education's recommendations. It is imperative that a strong system of accountability be put in place to give the public confidence that its increased investment in PreK-12 education will lead to a system that performs as well as the best education systems in the world.

The recommendations of this Commission amount to a proposal to substantially redesign Maryland's education system for high performance. Many agencies and institutions at all levels of Maryland government have key roles to play in bringing this new system into being. Fundamental changes in institutional culture and in established ways of doing things will be required. Some will resist these changes and would prefer to use new funds to do more of what they have been doing. This must not be allowed to happen. All of the institutions and agencies involved will have to work in concert within the context of one coherent plan and be held accountable for playing their respective roles in implementing the Commission's redesign of the PreK-12 education system in Maryland. The governance and accountability proposals that follow are based on the idea that this will happen only if there is an Oversight Board with the authority to make certain that the new funds are used to implement the Commission's recommendations with fidelity.
Element Detail 5a

**Element:** There will be an Independent Oversight Board with authority to develop a comprehensive plan for implementing the Commission’s recommendations and then hold all the State and local institutions and agencies involved in that plan accountable for carrying out their assigned roles. The Independent Oversight Board will sunset at the end of the implementation period specified in the enabling legislation.

1. **Membership and appointments:** The Oversight Board will consist of seven members, appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate. The members will include experts in preK-12 policy with knowledge of the strategies used by the top performing states and countries to get to world class performance, and leaders with proven records of implementing systemic change in complex organizations. The seven 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. Members of the nominating committee should also have knowledge of pre-K-12 policy, the strategies used by the top performing states and nations and systemic change in complex organizations. Should any member of the Oversight Board be unwilling or unable to serve until the Body sunsets, the same procedure would be used to select replacements as was used to create the initial membership.

2. **Staffing:** The Oversight Board will have an executive director and a staff of about 15 people.

3. **Authority and Functions:** The Oversight Board is not intended to usurp the operational authority of the MSDE, GWDB, MHEC, Commerce, DLLR, higher education institutions, or any other State agency or entity that will be involved in implementing the legislation. Likewise, it is not intended to replace day-to-day decision-making by local boards of education and superintendents. It is instead intended to develop, with input from those State and local agencies and entities, a comprehensive plan for implementing the legislation and then to hold these State and local agencies and entities accountable for their assigned roles in implementation by reviewing and approving the policies, plans and operations of each agency and entity for compliance with the overall plan; monitoring implementation; and gathering and analyzing data on results. It will also assess the adequacy of resources available to achieve the plan’s goals on student achievement. The Oversight Body will report on those results and recommend corrective actions to the Governor, the Assembly and the public. If, in the judgement of the Oversight Board, action by the Governor and legislature is needed to improve implementation of the enabling legislation while implementation is underway, it will say so.
Specifically, the Oversight Board will:

a) With input from the State and local agencies and state entities charged with implementing the legislation, including those named above, develop a Comprehensive Implementation Plan— including a timeline with key milestones for the year-by-year implementation of the enabling legislation.

b) Develop guidelines and criteria for State agencies, local school systems, and other entities to submit detailed implementation plans consistent with the Comprehensive Implementation Plan to the Oversight Board.

c) Review and approve State agency, local school system, and other entity implementation plans and related instruments for consistency with legislative intent and the Comprehensive Implementation Plan. Among such plans and instruments will be, for example:

1. Plans from MHEC and MSDE for redesigning the process for accrediting teacher education programs in the State using criteria consistent with the Commission’s proposals for strengthening teacher education in Maryland

2. Documents accrediting and approving particular teacher education programs in Maryland higher education institutions following review of their programs by MHEC and MSDE

3. Plans from MHEC and MSDE for making awards to collaboratives of teacher education institutions and school districts for the purpose of working jointly on improving the quality of beginning teachers in Maryland

4. MSDE’s plans for expansion of PreK for four- and three-year-olds and the expansion and coordination of Judy Centers and Family Resource Centers;

5. The criteria that MSDE will use to determine whether the department will approve the career ladder plans offered by the school districts;

6. MSDE’s plan for the selection, assembly and deployment of Expert Review Teams to review in detail the operation of schools and districts in which the average student or groups of historically underserved students are not making progress at a rate likely to enable them to achieve a CCRR endorsement by the end of grade 10. The MSDE plan will, among other things, include issues to be addressed by the team, data to be collected, timing of school and district visits and the nature of the reports to be provided as well as the responsibilities of the Expert Review Team in relation to the use of their reports as part of the process of initial and subsequent funding of the
school and district under the terms of the enabling legislation (see item 7 immediately below). While the reports of the Expert Review Teams will be used for accountability purposes, these outside reviews are intended to provide a strong, credible source of expertise that will prove supportive and helpful to the schools and districts they advise.

7) MSDE plan for integrating the work of the Expert Review Teams with the review and approval of district annual performance and plans and the release of funds in connection with that process (see 8 below and Element 5e);

8) Criteria on which MSDE will review and recommend approval (or disapproval) of local school system implementation plans and release of a portion of new funds to school districts contingent on implementation of plans and, after the legislation has been implemented for 5 years, student performance (see Element 5e);

9) MSDE plan for training Maryland teachers, school leaders, administrators, school boards, deans of teacher preparation programs and members of the Professional Standards Board on the Commission’s recommendations;

10) GWDB/CTE Committee standards and strategies for the development of rigorous CTE pathways including apprenticeships or other meaningful workplace experiences leading to industry–recognized credentials;

11) GWDB/CTE Committee benchmarks and targets to measure the success of CTE programs against state CTE goals and international standards; and

12) GWDB/CTE Committee plan for integrating and redeveloping high school and postsecondary career and technical education programs into rigorous and articulated pathways

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

e) 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 based on income, race, ethnicity, and disability, including the authority to investigate whether local education agencies or schools are making sufficient progress; the Oversight Board will have authority to gather and use data from all related government agencies, including the Maryland Longitudinal Data System;

f) Contract, as necessary, with independent experts;
g) 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; these progress reports will include, in addition to a commentary on the degree to which the State and local agencies and institutions are carrying out their assigned roles, an analysis of the degree to which the funds provided by the State and by the localities are consistent with the Commission’s estimates of what would be needed to fully implement the Commission’s proposals; and

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

4. **Evaluation**: The Oversight Board 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.

5. **Sunset provision**: The body will sunset at the end of the implementation period specified in the enabling legislation.

6. **Recommendations of Oversight Board on redesign of government agencies to support to support high performance system for Maryland education and career development**: Prior to sunsetting, the Oversight Board will submit to the Governor and the Assembly a report on its work that includes recommendations for changes in the design of the functions, structure and authority of the state agencies responsible for education and the job training and career development of young people in the state. The Commission believes that, once the new system is in place, an Oversight Board will no longer be necessary if the relevant Maryland agencies and the relationships among them are redesigned on the basis of the implementation experience to function effectively and efficiently in support of the new high performance system of education, job training and career development.
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, based on income, race, ethnicity, and disability, regarding their progress toward the CCR endorsement and the closing of achievement gaps. MSDE will use this data to identify schools in which students, especially groups of historically underserved students, are not making adequate progress toward a CCR endorsement by the end of grade 10. MSDE will create a system of Expert Review Teams (see 5a above) to conduct on-site investigations of the causes of poor student performance and make recommendations for correcting the problems identified to the school faculty, the school board, the community and MSDE on measures the need to be taken by each of these bodies to improve the performance of these low-performing schools.

Members of the Expert Review Teams will, when the Career Ladder is well established, be selected from among expert teachers and principals from those in senior positions on the career ladder and others whose expertise is directly relevant. Prior to that, MSDE will select Expert Review Team members from the ranks of highly regarded teachers, school leaders and senior Department staff members. All people appointed as members of Expert Review Teams will receive extensive training in the performance program described in the Commission report and on the rationale for that design, including extensive knowledge of the way similar systems work in the top performing systems elsewhere in the world. The purpose of these reviews will be to conduct interviews, observe classes and use other data to analyze the extent to which the recommendations of the Commission are being implemented and determine reasons why the student progress is insufficient and to make recommendations to the faculty, school leaders, the school community, the school district administration and MSDE as to measures that need to be taken to address the issues identified by the Expert Review Team.

Expert Review Team visits will begin in Year 3 of implementation. In years 3 through 5 of implementation, review team visits will be focused on the schools in the lowest decile of performance on the state accountability tests and on the districts with the highest concentration of such schools. They will be asked to advise these schools and districts on the design of the overall reform program and what will be expected of them in the sixth year of implementation, the first year in which the state can withhold funds from a school or district, based on inadequate implementation of the reform program and/or lack of progress in achieving academic goals by a school as a whole or by historically underserved groups of students (see 5e). During these three years, the review team will be expected to make recommendations to the schools and districts for strengthening the program and management of both the schools and districts, to put both in the strongest possible position for the Year 6 reviews. During this period, both the school and
the district will have the option of modifying or rejecting the advice received from the expert review committee, without prejudice.

However, beginning in Year 6 of implementation, MSDE will organize the visits of the review teams following the submission of their report on the prior year and their plans for the next year. The reports and plans submitted by these schools and districts, as well as their progress in addressing the issues revealed in prior reviews and in implementing the Commission’s reforms will all be taken into account by the review team as they visit the schools selected for them by the state. After they have visited the schools and districts, the review teams will prepare reports either recommending that the contingent funds (see 5e) be released or that they be withheld pending satisfactory responses to their recommendations. The schools and districts will then be expected to submit detailed written responses to the recommendations made by the review teams. Those responses will describe the actions the schools and districts are prepared to make in response to the recommendations as well as the changes they are prepared to make in their plans. The schools and districts will be given a reasonable amount of time to respond to these recommendation made by the expert review teams before any funds for the upcoming year are withheld. The funds will be released as soon as MSDE and the Oversight Board have determined, on the advice of the review committee, that a satisfactory plan has been submitted by the school or district.

In each subsequent year, the Expert Review Teams will again be triggered by data showing poor student performance for the school as a whole or among students in protected groups within the school, and, in particular, data showing that too many of the student body as a whole or within one or more protected groups at a school are unlikely to get a CCR endorsement by the end of grade 10. In each case, the Expert Review Teams will be instructed to compare actual implementation of the Commission’s recommendations to the Master Schedule of implementation and report discrepancies. It will also be expected to identify any other probable causes of poor performance and make recommendations for addressing them to the school, the district and MSDE.

In cases in which multiple Expert Review Teams are needed for a particular district because of the number of low-performing schools in that district, the MSDE will assemble meetings of those teams to help them come to consensus on the problems they see at the district level and on recommendations made to the district for addressing those problems. MSDE will be expected to enter into ongoing discussions with the district about the ways in which the district will address the district-level problems identified by the review teams.
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The following are intended to illustrate the kinds of issues that might be identified at the school level and recommendations that might be made to address them:

1. The review team might find that expectation for students are very low, the curriculum is weak, there is very little alignment in curriculum from grade to grade or from teacher to teacher within a grade; the review team would have the option of recommending that the school be required to use the model state curriculum developed by the MSDE.

2. The review team might find that the leadership of the school is inept; the review team might recommend that the principal be given a mentor, another principal of a school at the same level serving very similar students whose students are performing at level far above those in the subject school.

3. The review team might find that many students in the school are living in deep poverty and suffering from the kind of constant violence and associated trauma often found in such schools; the review team might recommend that the school’s provisions for wrap-around services be greatly strengthened, and, in particular, that the school work out a partnership with the top staff at a nearby trauma hospital.

The review team might find that, well after the Career Ladder System has been introduced state-wide, the district has still not developed and fully implemented the program; the Expert Review Team might recommend that the superintend shop steward put together a team to visit three districts that have done an exemplary job of setting up a system and produce a plan for their own system by a date certain, under penalty of losing their career ladder funds if they fail to meet the deadline.
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 based on income, race/ethnicity and 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 protected classes of students, are not making adequate progress toward completion of its CTE Pathway. The Committee will organize Expert Review Teams of representatives of employers and CTE educators to visit those schools and employer sites 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 CTE Committee will schedule the visits of the Expert Review Teams to inform the annual decisions made by the CTE Committee and MSDE on the release of school funds conditioned on school performance. Schools, districts and employers will be given adequate time to respond to the recommendations of the Expert Review Teams before any funds to which the schools would otherwise be entitled are sequestered.
4. The local school board, the school and the relevant employers and employer associations will review the expert review team’s recommendations, which may include recommendations that require State action and submit a plan to the CTE Committee for addressing the expert review team’s recommendations.
5. Among the recommendations that might be made by these Expert Review 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 5d.

Element: MSDE and MHEC will track and report on the progress of the teacher preparation programs in upgrading the quality and standards of their programs in response to the Commission’s recommendations. MSDE and MHEC will prepare for the Oversight Board an annual joint report on the progress made in implementing the Commission’s recommendations on teacher education in Maryland. That report will include data on trends in 1) teacher quality as measured by the grades, class standing and accountability test performance of students applying to and admitted to Maryland teacher education institutions; 2) the number of applications to and acceptance by those institutions, as a whole and by gender and racial and ethnic background, 3) the proportion of graduates of teacher education programs (including those graduates expecting to teach at the elementary school level) who have majored as undergraduates in the subjects they plan to teach, 4) the proportion of new teachers hired in the state who were trained out of state to those trained in state, 5) the satisfaction of school district officials with the new teachers they hire just graduated from Maryland institutions as determined by their responses to questions on a form they helped to develop.

MSDE and MHEC will prepare for the Oversight Board as part of the same annual report a description all measures taken during the prior year by the schools and the universities to implement the Commission’s recommendations concerning teacher quality in Maryland. Among these recommendations are those concerning:

1. Measures taken to increase the proportion of highly qualified applicants to teacher education institutions who come from minority backgrounds
2. Measures taken to increase the proportion of high students graduates with very strong academic backgrounds selecting teaching as a career
3. Measures taken to make teacher education in the underlying disciplines more rigorous
4. Measures taken to better align the program of the the teacher education institutions with state curriculum frameworks
5. Measures taken to improve the background of beginning teachers in research and research techniques
6. Implementation more rigorous licensing standards and measures for new teachers in both mastery of the subject or subjects being taught and the methods for teaching them
7. Implementation of incentives to attract high quality high school graduates into careers in teaching
8. Trends in the rates at which teachers are acquiring the credentials needed to go up the new career ladders, including National Board Certification and higher steps on the ladder
9. Trends in the distribution of teachers along the steps of the new career ladder
10. Trends in longevity in teaching in Maryland schools, and, in particular, in service in schools serving high proportions of students in historically underserved students.
Element Detail 5e

Element: Not less than 25 percent of new funds available to the schools and school systems for initial funding of implementation plans will be released subject to approval by MSDE, the CTE Committee and the Oversight Board of the implementation plans submitted by the school systems to implement the Commission recommendations.

Beginning in year 6, not less than 25 percent of new funds will be released only on a finding by MSDE, the CTE Committee and the Oversight Board that 1) the schools and district are appropriately implementing the Commission's recommendations, 2) the plans for the upcoming years are fully responsive to those recommendations and 3) the student body as a whole and student subgroups are making adequate progress toward CCR endorsement.

If increased funds are not used in ways likely to improve outcomes for students, students will lose their opportunity to learn and the public will become cynical about arguments that the schools need more money. This recommendation is intended to provide school districts and school faculties with strong incentives to implement the policies and practices the Commission believes will greatly improve student performance and close performance gaps between historically underserved populations of students and others. This recommendation is paired with the preceding recommendation concerning Expert Review Teams. MSDE and the CTE Committee are expected to field Expert Review Teams in schools and districts in which data gives them good reason to believe that students are not making reasonable progress toward earning diplomas, CCR endorsements and solid-employer-recognized credentials. It will be up to the Expert Review Teams to gather data and testimony from many sources and to produce sound recommendations for actions to be taken by the school, district, employers (where appropriate in the case of CTE) and the relevant state agencies. The Commission expects that MSDE and the CTE Committee, when making decisions about not releasing a portion of new funds in response to inadequate performance and plans, will lean heavily on the advice it receives from the Expert Review Teams. The Commission does not believe that funds should be withheld from any school simply because of poor student performance. Poor student performance should instead be used to trigger a visit from an expert review team. A portion of new funds should be withheld only when the district or school is not doing what it should be doing to improve student performance, and for only so long as it takes to produce a plan which, in the judgment of the expert review team, is consistent with the Commission plan and likely to lead to the improvement that is needed. Funds will be withheld from a district by MSDE and the CTE Committee only when a recommendation to withhold has been made to the Oversight Board and the Oversight Board has approved that recommendation.
A recommendation to the Oversight Board from the MSDE or the CTE Committee to withhold funds will be made only after an Expert Review Team has made recommendations for changes, the school or district has had sufficient time to respond, and MSDE and/or the CTE Committee, in consultation with the Expert Review Committee has determined that the response from the school and district is inadequate.

In no case will allocated funds be reduced once plans have been approved, but MSDE may, with the approval of the Oversight Board, release some funds while continuing to withhold others if the some parts of a plan are satisfactory and others are not.
Element Detail 5f

**Element:** Not less than 75 percent of enrollment-based formula funds allocated to school systems or schools on the basis of the needs of students enrolled in the school will flow down to the school for use by the school to educate the children in that school.

It is the intention of the Commission that the majority of all State and local formula funds allocated to school systems on the basis of student enrollment and student needs should follow students to their school for use in educating those students and providing the extra resources they may need. The Oversight Board 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.
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Building the Formulas

- Per Pupil Weights — reflects on-going resources needed by a specific population
- Guaranteed Tax Base
- Add-on Grants or categorical funding — reflects one-time or short term initiatives

Foundation Program — reflects on-going resources all students need

- Wealth
- Equity
- Enrollment
Wealth Decision Points

• Property and income proportions
  – Multiplicative?
  – Rebased additive?
• Shift NTI to only November 1 and eliminate the grant in current law?
• Embed TIF district adjustment into wealth calculation and eliminate the add-on grant?
• Use the “greater of” enrollment count to calculate wealth per pupil or the unadjusted enrollment count?
• Include preK students in wealth?
Enrollment Decision Points

- Use the "greater of" average of prior 3 years or most recent enrollment count in the foundation program?
- Include preK students?
- For compensatory education proxy, use unduplicated count based on direct certification including Medicaid?
Equity Decision Points

- Funding floors – eliminate? reduce?
- At-risk formulas – require locals to pay local share?
- GCEI – eliminate? switch to CWI? State continues to fund both State and local shares? adjust for counties with lower than average cost?
- MOE – include prek enrollment in calculation? phase in new costs? include local share of at-risk formulas?
- GTB – enhance?
- Supplemental grant – eliminate?
- Money follow the student to the school level? What proportion? (also part of Governance and Accountability) Set aside for administrative cost?
Foundation Decision Points

- What policy elements from work groups should be included in the foundation?
- What inflation adjustment for the per pupil foundation amount?
At-risk Formula Decision Points

• Once foundation amount is determined, what weight should be applied for each student subpopulation?

• What policy elements from work groups should be included in the weights?
Add-on/Categorical Decision Points

• Add-on – cost shared between local jurisdiction and State
• Categorical – State bears the full cost
• What policy elements from work groups should be included as either add-on or categorical?
Building the Foundation
(examples)

• WG1
  – Include Prek teachers in the career ladder (1b)
• WG2
  – Raise teacher pay and career ladders (2f and g)
  – Additional teachers to restructure school day (2i)
• WG3
  – Getting students to CCR (3b)
  – Alternative educational approaches (3d, 2i)
• Other on-going costs not covered by WGs
  – School maintenance
  – Other?
Building the Weights (examples)

- WG 1
  - Full-day prekindergarten cost of quality (1a)

- WG 4
  - Compensatory education
  - Concentration of poverty (school-based per pupil) (4a)
  - English learners (4d)
  - Special education (4c)
Building Add-on (cost share)
(examples)

• WG3
  - Transitional supplemental instruction (3c)
  - 11th and 12th grade transition (3g)
  - Post CCR pathways including CTE (3e, 3m)
  - CTE career counselors (3j)

• WG4
  - Concentration of poverty per pupil funding (4a)
Building Categorical (State funded)
(examples)

- **WG1**
  - Technical assistance incentives, tuition assistance (1b)
  - Grants to expand Judy Centers and Family Support Centers (1d)
- **WG2**
  - LEA and teacher preparation program collaborative seed grants (2a)
  - Teaching scholarships and loan repayment assistance (2c)
  - Public relations/marketing campaign (2e)
- **WG3**
  - Expert review teams (3a/5)
  - CTE Innovation Grants (3h-m)
- **WG4**
  - Community schools coordinator/health care practitioner (4a)
Building Infrastructure

- MSDE one-time and ongoing costs
- CTE Committee
- Independent Oversight Board
- Information Technology capacity for performance and financial data collection
- Other State and local capacity building?
Governor Larry Hogan Announces Over $3.5 Billion "Building Opportunity Fund" School Construction Initiative

Largest School Construction Investment in Maryland History Will Create More Than 27,000 New Jobs

ANAPOLIS, MD — Governor Larry Hogan today announced a major initiative to make a historic investment in school construction projects across the state. Called the Building Opportunity Fund, the governor unveiled plans to submit legislation during the 2019 session of the Maryland General Assembly to provide $1.9 billion in new school construction funding over five years. This proposed new funding is in addition to the $1.6 billion in public school construction funding currently included in the state's five year Capital Improvement Program, bringing the total proposed state investment to more than $3.5 billion over five years.

"Education has always been our administration's top priority and today's announcement represents the largest investment in school construction - ever - in Maryland history," said Governor Hogan. "I believe very strongly that every single child in Maryland deserves access to a world-class education regardless of what neighborhood they happen to grow up in, and an important part of that is making sure that all of our students are educated in facilities that are modern, safe, and efficient which provide them with an environment that encourages growth and learning."

The governor made the announcement at Highland Park Elementary School in Landover, Md., where he was joined by Prince George's County Executive Angela Alsobrooks, Maryland Department of Budget Secretary David Brinkley, State Superintendent of Schools Dr. Karen Salmon, Maryland Stadium Authority Executive Director Michael Frenz, Highland Park Elementary School Principal Wanda Robinson, and representatives from the Laborers' International Union of North America (LiUNA).

The new funding will come from revenue bonds funded by casino gaming revenues. Legislation passed with the governor's support during the 2018 session created a ballot initiative to ensure casino revenues are used to provide additional funding for Maryland schools. The ballot referendum was approved by nearly 90 percent of Maryland voters in the November election, and will result in an additional $4.4 billion in school funding. The referendum specifies "public school construction and public school capital improvement" as one of the targeted uses for this additional funding.

Governor Hogan will submit the Building Opportunity Act early in the 2019 legislative session, which will provide funding to cover more than 90 percent of the projects requested by local school systems from 2020 to 2024 if enacted. The legislation will give the Maryland Stadium Authority oversight of these additional school construction funds, and include accountability measures.

The new construction projects are estimated to create more than 27,000 new jobs over the five year construction period.

The Building Opportunity Act will be closely modeled after the highly successful 21st Century School Buildings Program currently underway in Baltimore City, which is providing students with the healthy, efficient, and modern school buildings they deserve. The Hogan administration opened five newly renovated campuses in Baltimore City in August 2018, bringing the program total to nine improved schools with 19 more currently in the construction or planning stages.

The Hogan administration has invested $1.4 billion toward school construction since taking office, including $430.2 million in the Fiscal Year 2019 budget, which is the largest investment in a decade.

###