

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report is also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- o Title I, Part A - *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 - *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- o Title I, Part C - *Education of Migratory Children*
- o Title I, Part D - *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o Title I, Part F - *Comprehensive School Reform*
- o Title II, Part A - *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o Title II, Part D - *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- o Title III, Part A - *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o Title IV, Part B - *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- o Title V, Part A - *Innovative Programs*
- o Title VI, Section 6111 - *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o Title VI, Part B - *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **Performance goal 2** : All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2004-2005 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006	
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2004-2005 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2004-2005	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Maryland State Department of Education	
Address: 200 West Baltimore Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Dr. Ronald Peiffer, Deputy State Superintendent for Academic Policy Telephone: 410-767-0473 Fax: 410-333-2275 e-mail: rpeiffer@msde.state.md.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick, State Superintendent of Schools	
_____ Signature	_____ 8/23/2006 3:44 PM EST Date

A copy of the comment section for 1.6.3.3 will be sent to Enid Marshall at USDE and John Ovad, Maryland's OELA contact.

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).**STATE RESPONSE**

Prior to NCLB, Maryland had begun the work to establish challenging academic standards in science. The Core Learning Goals (CLGs) for science were developed in 1996 for biology and skills and processes. These CLGs defined what students should know and be able to do in biology. Using indicator statements and expectations, the specificity of what students should know and be able to do was further defined. Assessment limits were developed to clearly communicate how students should be able to demonstrate their knowledge and skill on the High School Assessment (HSA) administered at the end of the course. The Assessment Limits have been in schools and used on the HSA since 2002. This test has been made a graduation requirement for all Maryland high school students, effective with the freshman class of 2005. The determination has been made to use these carefully crafted, rigorous content standards and the associated assessment to meet the criteria established by NCLB for high school students.

The call for rigorous standards in NCLB and the report, *Achievement Matters Most: The Final Report of the Visionary Panel for Better Schools* (MSDE 2002), recommending the development of a statewide K-12 curriculum, led to the development of Maryland's Voluntary State Curriculum. "One important recommendation of the Visionary Panel report is a call for state and local school systems to align every aspect of education—teacher preparation and development, curriculum, testing, leadership, and funding – to support the classroom teacher." The report goes on to add, "The state should develop with local school systems a statewide K-12 curriculum that specifies by subject and grade what students should know and be able to do."

The Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC) in science defines what students should know and be able to do at each grade level Pre-K through 8. MSDE staff worked with representatives from local school systems to develop the VSC. The science curriculum document is formatted so that it begins with content standards or broad statements about what students should know and be able to do. Indicator statements provide the next level of specificity and begin to narrow the focus for teachers. At the next level, the objectives provide teachers with very clear information about specific skills. More than 90 representatives from the local school systems participated in various steps in the curriculum development process. The steps that were used in the creation of the Maryland VCS included the development of grade three prototype, initial drafts at each grade level, revisions, internal and local school system reviews that led to additional revisions and finally dissemination of the draft documents for pilot use. As the writing teams worked through this process, they were guided by a vision to create a document that clearly articulated what students should know and be able to do in clear, concise, specific, "teacher-friendly" language. The draft document was posted on the mdk12.org website for use by districts and classroom teachers on September 2, 2003. (The final VCS in science is now posted on the website.)

A national expert review of the science VSC was completed and presented to the Maryland State Board of Education on April 7, 2005. The experts examined the document comparing it to benchmark standards for rigor, progression, focus, clarity, organization, specificity, and measurability. After the appropriate changes and edits were made to the Science Voluntary State Curriculum, it was presented to and accepted by the Maryland State Board of Education on May 24, 2005. A committee of science teachers, supervisors, specialists, and principals representing local school systems began to work in June of 2005 on the development of assessment limits to assure the alignment of curriculum and assessment. The Proposed Assessment limits were identified and presented to the Maryland State Science supervisors on December 7, 2005. These proposed assessment limits will be used to develop the science assessment to be field tested statewide in grades 5 and 8 in the spring of 2007. This field test will serve to set standards for the operational assessment that will satisfy the NCLB requirement to be administered in the spring of 2008.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

STATE RESPONSE

In spring 2003, Maryland implemented the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) in response to the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The initial assessments tested students in reading and mathematics in grades 3, 5, and 8 and included the Alternate MSA for students with severe cognitive disabilities. In 2004, tests were added for students in grades 4, 6, and 7. An Alternate MSA was developed for students in those grades as well. Beginning in spring 2007 students in grades 5 and 8 also will be assessed in science. The science assessment will be delivered on-line as well as in the traditional paper and pencil format.

External peer reviewers and the U.S. Department of Education staff evaluated Maryland's submission and found it to be in substantial compliance with ESEA's standards and assessment requirements.

Each summer Maryland educators are involved in the rangefinding activities for the purpose of scoring the MSA assessments. Grade level teachers are recruited to attend the weeklong project of determining scores for live student constructed response questions. The scores and papers selected are used in the training of testing vendor's staff in the actual scoring of the tests. In addition, Maryland educators are involved in the review of all MSA items on an annual basis. Each summer the testing contractor holds a content review and bias/sensitivity review meeting in which the educators from across the state review passages and test items for grade level appropriateness, content accuracy, and fairness to all students.

To date, science educators in Maryland assisted MSDE staff in the development of the Voluntary State Curriculum for science. Once a vendor is selected to develop the assessment, science educators will be involved in the same activities (range finding and content review) as the reading and mathematics teachers.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

STATE RESPONSE

Maryland has set performance standards for grades 3 through high school. The performance standards have been approved by USDE.

Maryland has had a history of challenging content standards and assessments. In the early 1990's, the State adopted the Maryland Learning Outcomes (MLO's). The MLO's were content standards for the grade bands K-3, 4-5, and 6-8 in reading, language usage, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science. These standards were assessed through the state's integrated performance assessments, the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), which was the cornerstone of the state's accountability system. In addition, high school content standards (known as Core Learning Goals or CLS's) were adopted by Maryland in 1995 as the basis for high school instruction and assessment. The English Core Learning Goals were updated in August 2004 to reflect the revised English High School Assessment administered in 2005.

In 2002, Maryland began a process of revising its grade band content standards into grade by grade content standards. With educators from across the state, the Prek-8 grade level standards were developed. The content standards were reviewed by Achieve Inc. for clarity and posted on the department's website for one year to receive public feedback. The final version incorporated the feedback received from both Achieve and the public. These content standards are known as the Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC).

Maryland also has revised its science content standards for PreK-8. In the 2006-07 school year, Maryland plans to field test the Science Maryland School Assessments (MSA) in grades 5 and 8 and add a science component to its ALT-MSA assessments in those grades. These assessments will be fully integrated to meet the NCLB requirement in the 2007-08 school year. In addition, the grade 10-12 science assessment requirement will be fulfilled by the state's end-of-course assessment in high school biology. The biology assessment is based on the state's current Core Learning Goals. NCLB achievement standards will be set on this assessment in 2006-07 in order to fulfill the federal requirements by the 2007-08 school year. The biology end-of-course test will fulfill NCLB requirements as well as the state's high school graduation requirements.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2004-2005 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	466956	100.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	1734	100.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	22999	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	179889	100.0
Hispanic	30362	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	231922	100.0
Students with Disabilities	57610	100.0
Limited English Proficient	10556	100.0
Economically Disadvantaged	156432	100.0
Migrant	101	100.0
Male	239118	100.0
Female	227793	100.0

In 2004-05 Maryland used a synthetic participation rate (i.e. students who were unable to make-up the test were assigned a basic score). That calculation has been discontinued.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	463075	100.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	1714	100.0
Asian/ Pacific Islander	22396	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	179003	100.0
Hispanic	30252	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	229696	100.0
Students with Disabilities	58297	100.0
Limited English Proficient	10080	100.0
Economically Disadvantaged	156793	100.0
Migrant	102	100.0
Male	237531	100.0
Female	225532	100.0

In 2004-05 Maryland used a synthetic participation rate (i.e. students who were unable to make-up the test were assigned a basic score). That calculation has been discontinued.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	52454	100.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5156	100.0

In 2004-05 Maryland used a synthetic participation rate (i.e. students who were unable to make-up the test were assigned a basic score). That calculation has been discontinued.

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	53141	100.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5156	100.0

In 2004-05 Maryland used a synthetic participation rate (i.e. students who were unable to make-up the test were assigned a basic score). That calculation has been discontinued.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2004-2005 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2004-2005 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	62015	76.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	237	74.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	3197	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	23306	63.6
Hispanic	4804	69.4
White, non-Hispanic	30465	86.7
Students with Disabilities	7608	51.2
Limited English Proficient	2300	55.9
Economically Disadvantaged	23173	62.3
Migrant	27	66.7
Male	31726	75.7
Female	30284	78.0

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	61986	75.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	237	71.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	3176	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23307	64.4
Hispanic	4796	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	30467	85.4
Students with Disabilities	7599	52.8
Limited English Proficient	2264	47.4
Economically Disadvantaged	23162	61.2
Migrant	27	44.4
Male	31710	72.3
Female	30273	79.5

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	63789	76.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	255	73.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	3221	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	24324	62.0
Hispanic	4617	69.1
White, non-Hispanic	31368	87.1
Students with Disabilities	8241	48.9
Limited English Proficient	1916	52.3
Economically Disadvantaged	23703	61.1
Migrant	16	75.0
Male	32766	75.0
Female	31019	78.0

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	63741	80.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	255	80.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	3201	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	24319	69.8
Hispanic	4598	72.9
White, non-Hispanic	31366	89.7
Students with Disabilities	8238	57.2
Limited English Proficient	1875	54.2
Economically Disadvantaged	23691	68.0
Migrant	16	75.0
Male	32737	77.4
Female	31002	84.6

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	65729	69.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	265	66.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	3207	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	25790	53.1
Hispanic	4552	58.9
White, non-Hispanic	31906	81.8
Students with Disabilities	8656	38.9
Limited English Proficient	1729	38.9
Economically Disadvantaged	24437	51.3
Migrant	20	35.0
Male	34038	68.3
Female	31683	70.2

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	65685	74.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	264	71.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3189	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	25793	60.8
Hispanic	4536	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	31902	85.5
Students with Disabilities	8645	46.7
Limited English Proficient	1694	38.8
Economically Disadvantaged	24428	58.1
Migrant	20	45.0
Male	34018	71.2
Female	31666	77.7

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	66751	60.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	264	54.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	3124	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	26695	42.7
Hispanic	4345	50.0
White, non-Hispanic	32234	73.8
Students with Disabilities	8596	25.8
Limited English Proficient	1229	33.4
Economically Disadvantaged	24517	39.7
Migrant	16	31.3
Male	34453	57.8
Female	32280	62.6

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	66679	70.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	265	70.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	3100	86.1
Black, non-Hispanic	26684	56.2
Hispanic	4304	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	32217	82.0
Students with Disabilities	8601	36.1
Limited English Proficient	1184	29.1
Economically Disadvantaged	24514	52.2
Migrant	16	37.5
Male	34428	66.8
Female	32249	74.0

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	69304	55.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	225	55.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	3221	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	27608	33.3
Hispanic	4258	45.4
White, non-Hispanic	33985	72.2
Students with Disabilities	8930	22.7
Limited English Proficient	1050	26.7
Economically Disadvantaged	24239	32.5
Migrant	11	9.0
Male	35893	53.6
Female	33406	57.5

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	69295	67.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	226	66.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	3193	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	27633	50.1
Hispanic	4247	55.1
White, non-Hispanic	33994	81.0
Students with Disabilities	8939	32.3
Limited English Proficient	1008	24.2
Economically Disadvantaged	24234	47.2
Migrant	12	16.7
Male	35886	63.6
Female	33407	71.1

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	70027	51.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	244	47.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	3226	80.2
Black, non-Hispanic	27315	30.8
Hispanic	4239	40.5
White, non-Hispanic	34998	67.2
Students with Disabilities	8949	21.7
Limited English Proficient	1076	32.4
Economically Disadvantaged	22818	29.5
Migrant	7	14.3
Male	35925	49.5
Female	34097	54.5

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	70014	66.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	243	65.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3203	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	27345	48.7
Hispanic	4225	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	34995	80.7
Students with Disabilities	8960	31.3
Limited English Proficient	1041	20.7
Economically Disadvantaged	22815	45.6
Migrant	7	14.3
Male	35916	61.5
Female	34096	71.7

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	69341	51.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	244	40.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3803	78.5
Black, non-Hispanic	24851	24.2
Hispanic	3547	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	36896	67.5
Students with Disabilities	6630	22.8
Limited English Proficient	1256	41.9
Economically Disadvantaged	13545	28.9
Migrant	4	0
Male	34317	51.6
Female	35024	50.7

Inquiry Response: The variation exists because CCSSO's report asked for MSA data. Alt-MSA data was not included in those numbers. Alt-MSA data was included in the CSPR numbers. That difference accounts for the variance.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	65675	58.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	224	53.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	3335	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23905	39.1
Hispanic	3529	46.4
White, non-Hispanic	34681	71.6
Students with Disabilities	7315	23.2
Limited English Proficient	1014	17.8
Economically Disadvantaged	13919	37.4
Migrant	4	25.0
Male	32836	51.3
Female	32839	65.7

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1420	1039	73.2

Inquiry Response: Verified as correct.

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	24	4	16.6

Inquiry Response: Verified as correct.

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	385	274	71.0

Inquiry Response: Verified as correct.

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	0	0	0

Note: All 24 school districts in Maryland receive some Title I funds. No Maryland school district is comprised of only Title I schools. Inquiry Response: Verified as correct.

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

Inquiry Response: These numbers are accurate. The difference could be attributed to many factors. Some schools that were T-I and in improvement in 2004-05, were no longer T-I in 2005-06. Adjustments were made to MD accountability system in the area of special ed, etc.

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Local school systems have developed five-year comprehensive Master Plans in accordance with the State's Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act of 2002 (Senate Bill 856). These Master Plans have been approved by the State Board as having the potential to improve student achievement. Updates to Master Plans are developed and reviewed annually. In their Updates, local school systems identify the number of schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and the number of schools that are entering, continuing, or exiting school improvement. Local school systems also describe the steps being taken at the system, school, or classroom level, as applicable, to overcome the areas of concern. MSDE reviews and the State Board approves Annual Updates. Approved Updates contain the mid-course corrections that are necessary to improve student achievement.

During the Restructuring 1 Planning year, MSDE reviews and the State Board approves the alternative governance selection and restructuring improvement plans for those schools that may move into Restructuring 2 Implementation. MSDE provides Technical Assistance to the LSS in the development of Alternative Governance selections and the infusion of those selections into the school improvement planning process.

MSDE has established partnerships with LSS to support all low performing schools. Through these partnerships, MSDE provides professional development on reading and mathematics content and instruction that reflects the Maryland Professional Development Standards. A specific memorandum of understanding to delineate and articulate the responsibilities of MSDE, each LSS, and each school in improvement is developed to move from professional development to improved achievement.

Additionally, if the school misses AYP for the third time and progresses to Year 2 of improvement, MSDE will offer an optional, in-depth analysis of student, staff, administrator, climate, attendance, and parent involvement needs in that school. MSDE will automatically provide a school profile that will organize all current state available data relevant to school improvement in one report. The school will also be offered the option of participating in a schoolwide self-assessment on teacher capacity on the degree of implementation and analysis of the root causes surrounding teachers' capacity to teach the Voluntary State Curriculum and assess student learning. Leadership interviews will be conducted and analyzed. MSDE staff will draft a summary report back to the school and school system.

Through the Bridge to Excellence, funds have been distributed to high risk, restructured schools.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1.4.4.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)**See attached file**

Inquiry Response: No. The response should not be the same on tables 1.4.1 and 1.4.2. We do have districts in the state that are either in School Improvement or in Corrective Action. None of those districts are Title I districts. The state has 0 Title I districts because no district has 100% of the schools receiving Title I funds. There was no data table included for 1.4.4.1 because MD does not have Title I districts.

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 115

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 81 How many of these schools were charter schools? 1

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 1612

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 59875

Optional Information :

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 1775

7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2004-2005 school year. 1723

The number listed under 1.4.5.1.1 was based on the 2004-05 Title I schools in improvement list of 115 schools. The number and schools under 1.4.3.1 were the 2005-06 schools listed for improvement consisting of 95 schools.

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 84

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 5970

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 30357

Optional Information :

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. _____

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	161774	122027	75.4
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	15293	9250	60.5
Low-Poverty Schools	13973	12614	90.3
All Elementary Schools	58265	45660	78.4
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	15703	8507	54.2
Low-Poverty Schools	30005	25009	83.3
All Secondary Schools	103509	76357	73.8

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [*Title IX*, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes; or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003.

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2005, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are being taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (note: percentages should add to 100 percent of the classes taught by not highly qualified teachers).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	12.2
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.1
d) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	24.6
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	42.1
g) Other (please explain)	2.0

The data for items "b" & "e" is not available for SY 2004-05; however, we are planning to obtain it for the SY 2005-06 submission. The response in the other category, "g", includes no data, missing data, and expired data.

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty *elementary and secondary* schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>63.9%</u>	Less than <u>16.0%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for free/reduced price meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>43.9%</u>	Less than <u>10.7%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for free/reduced price meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2004-2005 School Year	65.0

1.6 English Language Proficiency**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed Yes No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned Yes No

Operationalized Yes No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

MSDE has developed and operationalized the ELP standards. The Maryland ELP standards project has been a collaborative effort of many educators who work with ELL students throughout the state. The mission of this project was to create a conceptual framework for standards-based classroom instruction and assessments of ELL students at all levels of language proficiency in grades K-12. The first four standards are derived from the four domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing, the fifth standard addresses school and academic culture and the sixth standard addresses the basic pre-literacy skills students (who have no literacy in their first language or have experienced interrupted schooling) need to acquire. These Standards are currently posted on the MSDE Web site, www.mdk12.org, and are being used by LEA's to develop curriculum. At the end of this school year MSDE will bring together all the stakeholders to solicit input on the ELP standards and any necessary edits will be made at that time. The standards will receive an expert review in the fall and be brought to the State Board for acceptance by the end of 2006. Maryland is purchasing an ELP assessment that aligns with these standards. This assessment will be administered at the end of the 2005-2006 school year to determine the Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) for each school district.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The Maryland ELP standards are aligned with the Maryland Voluntary State Curricula in the four core content areas of mathematics, reading, science, and social studies. The ELP Standards demonstrate the connection between learning the correct forms of English and the functional application of that knowledge to the content areas of Reading/Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies. They focus on the development of academic language proficiency by identifying the forms and functions of English that ELL students need in order to access, comprehend, and participate successfully in the classroom setting. A draft of this document will be posted on the MSDE Web site by fall of 2006. It will be piloted in the 2006-2007 school year.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. **The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**
 - **An independent alignment study** _____
 - **Other evidence of alignment** Yes
2. **Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:**
 - **The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;**
 - **The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;**
 - **ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;**
 - **Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)**

STATE RESPONSE

1. Maryland developed English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards during the summer 2005. These standards reflect the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing across five proficiency levels. Following the development of these standards, Maryland entered into a comprehensive search for an aligned ELP Assessment. Three vendors submitted proposals to the RFP. Each proposal included an alignment matrix representing the vendors' alignment study. An MSDE alignment committee comprised of a cross section of teachers and supervisors who served as standards and curriculum writers conducted a separate in-depth alignment study. Maryland selected CTB/McGraw Hill LAS Links as the summative test to assess English Language Proficiency of all English Language Learners (ELLs). This assessment will be administered annually to all ELL students K-12 starting spring 2006.

2. CTB LAS Links is a summative assessment of the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension. The comprehension score is a composite score derived from the listening and reading domains.

Training for teachers in the districts will be conducted in February and March 2006. The assessment will be implemented in April/May 2006.

Information on the technical quality of the assessment was provided in the vendor proposal. This information included validity and reliability studies and field testing information. The assessment will be a valid measure of Maryland ELP standards, that is, it will measure the objectives outlined in the standards. The test will be reliable and provide standardized scores.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
		Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (4)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)					
IPT Idea Proficiency Test	31111	24811	79.7	2790	11.0	6258	25.0	9164	37.0	6599	27.0

Inquiry Response: The percentages in columns 4,5,6&7 have been re-calculated based on the "Total number and percentage of All students identified as LEP" (column 3). Previously it was calculated based on the "Total number of All students assessed for ELP" (column 2).

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Spanish	19360	61.3
2. Korean	1159	3.6
3. French	1102	3.5
4. Vietnamese	898	2.8
5. English-based Creole	894	2.8
6. Mandarin Chinese	730	2.3
7. Tagalog	525	1.6
8. Amharic	510	1.6
9. Urdu	473	1.5
10. Cantonese Chinese	455	1.4

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)			
IPT	31111	100.0	2790	9.0	6258	20.1	9164	29.5	6599	21.2	4057	13.0

The reason for the differences between columns 2 and the sum of columns 3-6 is that there were 1608 students that do not have at least one or more test scores (oral, reading, or writing). There are 4692 pre K, K, & ELL students with special needs who do not fall into the criteria for Proficiency 1, 2, 3, or 4.

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>18025</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>12272</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>5</u>

Of the total (18,025) number of immigrant children and youth reported, 12,272 received English language instruction. The difference of 5,753 students represents those students who are immigrants but whose native language is English or who tested to be fully English proficient by the Idea Proficiency Test and therefore not eligible for English Language instructional services.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

- 1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;**
- 2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;**
- 3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

There were no changes for the 2004-2005 school year to the definition of "proficient."

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

There were no changes for the 2004-2005 school year to the definition of "making progress."

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

There were no changes for the 2004-2005 school year to the definition of "cohort."

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

Yes No

If **yes**, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English		Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency	
	Projected AMAO Target	Actual	Projected AMAO Target	Actual
2004-2005 School Year				

Note: All Maryland LEA students are served by Title III. "Made Progress" answered in this comment area. "Attained Proficiency" answered in comment section 1.6.9 ----- LEP MADE PROGRESS, 2004-2005: COHORT I Target 66% Actual 102.05%; COHORT II Target 78% Actual 95.24%; COHORT III Target 78% Actual 84.3%; COHORT IV Target 78% Actual 80.72%; COHORT V Target 78% Actual 75.7%; COHORT VI Target 78% Actual 73.78%

If **no**, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English		Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency	
	Projected AMAO Target	Actual	Projected AMAO Target	Actual
2004-2005 School Year				

Note: All Maryland LEA students are served by Title III. "Attained Proficiency" answered in this comment area. "Made Progress" answered in comment section 1.6.8----- LEP ATTAINED PROFICIENCY, 2004-2005: COHORT I Target 5% Actual 59.54%; COHORT II Target 2% Actual 36.11%; COHORT III Target 5% Actual 19.22%; COHORT IV Target 7% Actual 10.14%; COHORT V Target 25% Actual 5.33%; COHORT VI Target 73% Actual 4.76%;

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	23
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	23
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	0

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2004-2005 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	868	75.0
4	1043	83.8
5	739	70.1
6	547	56.0
7	383	46.0
8	272	48.6
H.S.	205	39.3

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	928	80.3
4	1007	81.0
5	701	66.5
6	485	49.6
7	370	44.5
8	262	46.6
H.S.	298	48.9

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	6

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2003-2004 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	84.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	76.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	77.1
Hispanic	82.6
White, non-Hispanic	88.2
Students with Disabilities	77.6
Limited English Proficient	86.4
Economically Disadvantaged	80.1
Migrant	
Male	81.1
Female	87.5

Migrant: The number of migrant graduates is not collected and therefore we are unable to provide this information.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	3.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	4.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5.7
Hispanic	4.1
White, non-Hispanic	2.8
Students with Disabilities	4.1
Limited English Proficient	1.2
Economically Disadvantaged	4.5
Migrant	
Male	4.6
Female	3.1

Migrant = 0.00%

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.