



Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD

TO: Members of the State Board of Education
FROM: Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D. *Lillian M. Lowery*
DATE: August 27, 2013
SUBJECT: School Progress Release – Elementary and Middle Schools

A briefing concerning the 2013 School Progress results for elementary and middle schools will be provided to you at the State Board meeting on August 27, 2013. The briefing will include State level results for Elementary and Middle schools.

This memorandum provides you with highlights of the 2013 results for your information only. The presentation at the board meeting will give you more details and will provide an opportunity to ask questions about the results.

Summary of School Progress Results for Elementary and Middle Schools

The MSA data release marks the second year under Maryland's granted flexibility regarding the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Under Maryland's new "School Progress" plan, each school is measured against more realistic and achievable targets, and must work to strengthen achievement across all subgroups.

Schools and systems will work to cut in half over the next six years the percentage of students not scoring at proficient levels on the exams. As in the past, the accountability system measures all students as well as racial subgroups and groups of students receiving additional services, such as special education, English language learners and FARMs. Schools and systems must work to hit improvement targets, known as annual measurable objectives (AMOs). AMOs will be calculated for the student population in each school as well as in special service and racial subgroups.

Maryland's plan now focuses special attention on those schools with the most difficulty.

Under the School Progress calculation, over 60 percent (61.8 percent) of Maryland schools met the AMO targets for all students compared to 84.8 percent in 2012. The targets will continue to rise over the next six years.

Data Tables

Percentage of Schools Meeting “All Students”

2012			2013		
School Count	Schools Met	% Met	School Count	Schools Met	% Met
1127	956	84.8%	1133	700	61.8%

Percentage of Subgroups for Elementary and Middle Schools Meeting AMOs

2012				2013			
School Count	Total Sub-groups	Subgroups Met	% Sub-groups Met	School Count	Total Sub-groups	Subgroups Met	% Sub-groups Met
1127	16,962	16,141	95.2%	1133	17,130	14,283	83.4%

ACTION:

For information only.

LML/CMW

State Board of Education

School Progress Elementary and Middle School 2013 Results

Henry R. Johnson, Jr. Ed.D
Assistant Superintendent
Division of Curriculum, Assessment and
Accountability
August 27, 2013

School Progress (SP) versus School Progress Index (SPI) Elementary and Middle Schools

SP

Student performance measured annually in Reading and Mathematics in grades 3-8. High schools English and Algebra.

Schools accountable for attainment of "proficiency" by ALL students and each subgroups

Schools accountable for participation rate for ALL students and each subgroup and Attendance Rate for ALL students

No overall school rating or interventions

SPI

Student performance measured annually in Reading, Mathematics and Science in grades 3-8. High schools English, Algebra and Biology.

Schools accountable for achievement, growth and closing achievement gaps for ALL students and subgroups

Multiple indicators of performance including progress, closing gaps and growth targets

Overall School Index and Strand assigned with associated interventions

School Progress “Cells” Chart

Group	Reading		Mathematics		Attendance
	% Proficient	Participation	% Proficient	Participation	
All Students					
Hispanic					
Amer. Ind.					
Asian					
African Amer.					
Hawaiian					
White					
2 or More					
FARMS					
ELL					
Special Ed.					

ESEA FLEXIBILITY: School Progress

- All schools should improve the learning of all students.
- Schools have different needs and operate in specific contexts - the strategies they adopt for improvement should reflect their needs.
- School performance targets should reflect the school's history of student performance.

- Schools should be judged by
 - the progress they make towards improving the learning of all students, in the aggregate and by subgroup.
 - the extent to which they close subgroup gaps in achievement.

School Progress

- Moving to Realistic and Achievable targets through ESEA Flexibility
- New Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) approved by USDE as part of Maryland's ESEA Flexibility Request
- Uses MSA results and attendance data

- **Three indicators:**
 - Proficiency Progress
 - Reading and Mathematics Proficiency
 - All Student group and at each subgroup
 - Participation Rate
 - All Student group and at each subgroup
 - Attendance Rate
 - All Student group only

Proficiency Progress

- **Establishing AMOs - Calculations**
 - 50% reduction of basic proficiency by 2017 (Subtract the non-proficient number from 100, divide in half, then divide this number by 6)
 - Target increases in equal increments for the 6 years from 2012 to 2017
 - For “all students” group and each subgroup
 - 2011 assessment results used as the baseline year for setting AMOs
 - Each school for **all and each subgroup** has its own unique targets based on its baseline year results

Examples of Achievement Targets

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Gain/ Year
0.00%	8.33%	16.67%	25.00%	33.33%	41.67%	50.00%	8.33%
10.00%	17.50%	25.00%	32.50%	40.00%	47.50%	55.00%	7.50%
20.00%	26.67%	33.33%	40.00%	46.67%	53.33%	60.00%	6.67%
30.00%	35.83%	41.67%	47.50%	53.33%	59.17%	65.00%	5.83%
40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%	5.00%
50.00%	54.17%	58.33%	62.50%	66.67%	70.83%	75.00%	4.17%
60.00%	63.33%	66.67%	70.00%	73.33%	76.67%	80.00%	3.33%
70.00%	72.50%	75.00%	77.50%	80.00%	82.50%	85.00%	2.50%
80.00%	81.67%	83.33%	85.00%	86.67%	88.33%	90.00%	1.67%
90.00%	90.83%	91.67%	92.50%	93.33%	94.17%	95.00%	0.83%
95.00%	95.42%	95.83%	96.25%	96.67%	97.08%	97.50%	0.42%

2012 versus 2013 School Progress Results

Elementary and Middle Schools

Percentage of Subgroups Meeting AMOs

2012				2013			
School Count	Total Sub-groups	Sub-groups Met	% Sub-groups Met	School Count	Total Sub-groups	Sub-groups Met	% Sub-groups Met
1127	16,962	16,141	95.2%	1133	17,130	14,283	83.4%

Percentage of Schools Meeting “All Students”

2012			2013		
School Count	Schools Met	% Met	School Count	Schools Met	% Met
1127	956	84.8%	1133	700	61.8%

Summary

- “The progress of each school toward meeting their own unique targets provide valuable information over time on the effectiveness of instructional strategies, the inherent needs of the students and the extent to which the school is fulfilling those needs.”