

**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 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007

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 are 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:

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

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 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:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **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.
- **Performance goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **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 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<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: 07/31/2007

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2005-2006 Part II, 2005-2006

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 A. 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

_____ Wednesday, February 28, 2007, 1:28:24

PM
Signature

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 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.

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 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.

Former Secretary of Education Henry L. Johnson, in his letter received on June 12, 2006, stated, "I have concluded that the evidence demonstrates that Maryland's standards and assessment system satisfies the NCLB requirements. Specifically, Maryland's system includes academic content and student achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science; alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in those subjects; assessments in each of grades 3 through 10 in reading/language arts and mathematics; and alternate assessments for each subject. Accordingly, Maryland's system warrants FULL APPROVAL. This status means that Maryland's standards and assessment system meet all statutory and regulatory requirements."

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.

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.

Former Secretary of Education Henry L. Johnson, in his letter received on June 12, 2006, stated, "I have concluded that the evidence demonstrates that Maryland's standards and assessment system satisfies the NCLB requirements. Specifically, Maryland's system includes academic content and student achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science; alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in those subjects; assessments in each of grades 3 through 10 in reading/language arts and mathematics; and alternate assessments for each subject. Accordingly, Maryland's system warrants FULL APPROVAL. This status means that Maryland's standards and assessment system meet all statutory and regulatory requirements."

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

Former Secretary of Education Henry L. Johnson, in his letter received on June 12, 2006, stated, "I have concluded that the evidence demonstrates that Maryland's standards and assessment system satisfies the NCLB requirements. Specifically, Maryland's system includes academic content and student achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science; alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in those subjects; assessments in each of grades 3 through 10 in reading/language arts and mathematics; and alternate assessments for each subject. Accordingly, Maryland's system warrants FULL APPROVAL. This status means that Maryland's standards and assessment system meet all statutory and regulatory requirements."

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.

Maryland's Plan for Family, School, and Community Involvement

The plan addresses the importance of families, schools, and communities working together to reach academic success for all students. Parent and family involvement in education is a priority for the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) and the State Board of Education. The goal is to create family-friendly schools where everyone - from teachers to parents - has the tools to promote student success.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	465847	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1781	99.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	23873	99.70
Black, non-Hispanic	180080	99.20
Hispanic	33376	99.20
White, non-Hispanic	226697	99.80
Students with Disabilities	58896	99.10
Limited English Proficient	11047	99.30
Economically Disadvantaged	155384	99.20
Migrant	87	100.00
Male	239184	99.40
Female	226626	99.60

Comments:

- 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 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	452738	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1742	99.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	23239	99.50
Black, non-Hispanic	173787	99.20
Hispanic	32323	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	221638	99.80
Students with Disabilities	57322	99.10
Limited English Proficient	9744	98.00
Economically Disadvantaged	149991	99.10
Migrant	81	100.00
Male	232059	99.40
Female	220671	99.60

Comments:

- 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

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 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	54049	99.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4847	98.40

Comments: The categories are mutually exclusive and therefore should not be combined. If you have additional questions, please Gary Heath, Assistant Superintendent of Accountability and Assessment at 410-767-0073, or gheath@msde.state.md.us.

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 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	52476	99.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4846	98.40

Comments: The categories are mutually exclusive and therefore should not be combined. If you have additional questions, please Gary Heath, Assistant Superintendent of Accountability and Assessment at 410-767-0073, or gheath@msde.state.md.us.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	60657	79.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	76.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	3387	91.90
Black, non-Hispanic	22890	66.00
Hispanic	5042	72.40
White, non-Hispanic	29048	88.80
Students with Disabilities	7575	53.00
Limited English Proficient	2323	59.00
Economically Disadvantaged	22475	65.10
Migrant	20	80.00
Male	31246	78.60
Female	29406	79.40

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 60,500 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	60588	78.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	74.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3368	87.90
Black, non-Hispanic	22882	67.50
Hispanic	5024	69.20
White, non-Hispanic	29025	86.90
Students with Disabilities	7576	57.50
Limited English Proficient	2263	55.50
Economically Disadvantaged	22446	65.40
Migrant	20	45.00
Male	31216	75.10
Female	29369	81.30

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 60,500 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	61994	81.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	224	82.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3311	94.10
Black, non-Hispanic	23229	69.90
Hispanic	5010	76.20
White, non-Hispanic	30217	90.80
Students with Disabilities	8057	55.00
Limited English Proficient	1765	60.50
Economically Disadvantaged	22324	69.10
Migrant	14	92.90
Male	31655	80.70
Female	30336	83.20

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 62,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	61952	81.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	77.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3299	91.60
Black, non-Hispanic	23232	71.10
Hispanic	4994	75.20
White, non-Hispanic	30206	89.80
Students with Disabilities	8069	58.60
Limited English Proficient	1717	55.10
Economically Disadvantaged	22294	68.80
Migrant	14	78.60
Male	31627	78.60
Female	30325	84.80

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 62,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	63754	73.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	254	72.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3315	91.50
Black, non-Hispanic	24335	59.10
Hispanic	4836	66.30
White, non-Hispanic	31009	83.70
Students with Disabilities	8521	42.00
Limited English Proficient	1685	49.10
Economically Disadvantaged	22845	56.80
Migrant	9	55.60
Male	32691	72.10
Female	31058	74.60

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 64,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	63694	76.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	72.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3301	89.50
Black, non-Hispanic	24334	63.20
Hispanic	4812	66.90
White, non-Hispanic	30991	87.00
Students with Disabilities	8524	49.00
Limited English Proficient	1633	43.40
Economically Disadvantaged	22806	60.70
Migrant	9	55.60
Male	32667	73.40
Female	31026	79.70

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 64,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	65304	65.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	59.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3326	89.00
Black, non-Hispanic	25877	47.90
Hispanic	4701	58.40
White, non-Hispanic	31131	79.40
Students with Disabilities	8612	31.00
Limited English Proficient	1205	35.10
Economically Disadvantaged	23217	45.10
Migrant	12	25.00
Male	33925	63.70
Female	31367	68.10

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 65,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	65051	71.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	71.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3247	87.60
Black, non-Hispanic	25863	57.60
Hispanic	4684	61.50
White, non-Hispanic	31002	83.40
Students with Disabilities	8605	36.90
Limited English Proficient	1166	30.80
Economically Disadvantaged	23176	53.30
Migrant	11	45.50
Male	33751	68.20
Female	31300	75.50

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 65,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	73894	64.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	59.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	4195	89.20
Black, non-Hispanic	27213	41.70
Hispanic	4715	51.60
White, non-Hispanic	37483	79.50
Students with Disabilities	8650	27.40
Limited English Proficient	1132	31.50
Economically Disadvantaged	23365	39.30
Migrant	14	21.40
Male	38068	62.40
Female	35820	66.20

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 74,000 students.

In grade 7 for Math a number of the groupings have been flagged as outside the acceptable range of +/-10%. This has occurred, because last year for the CSPR all End of Course Math students for the High School Assessments (HSA) were reported under the High School grade. This year, the EDEN reporting system has requested for all of the data to be disaggregated and to meet these requirements it was necessary to no longer lump[all of the End of Course HSA students into the High School grade, but to report the students in the actual grade the student too the test.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	66216	71.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	257	71.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3197	85.50
Black, non-Hispanic	26308	55.90
Hispanic	4512	57.40
White, non-Hispanic	31938	84.00
Students with Disabilities	8578	36.40
Limited English Proficient	1054	26.50
Economically Disadvantaged	22813	52.50
Migrant	12	16.70
Male	34055	66.90
Female	32157	75.50

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 66,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	86724	63.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	54.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	4734	86.90
Black, non-Hispanic	31171	39.20
Hispanic	5392	52.80
White, non-Hispanic	45158	78.40
Students with Disabilities	9202	25.70
Limited English Proficient	1196	38.90
Economically Disadvantaged	25261	38.60
Migrant	13	38.50
Male	44103	61.50
Female	42616	64.80

Comments: In grade 8 for Math almost all of the groupings have been flagged as outside the acceptable range of $\pm 10\%$. This has occurred, because last year for the CSPR all End of Course Math students for the High School Assessments (HSA) were reported under the High School grade. This year, the EDEN reporting system has requested for all of the data to be disaggregated and to meet these requirements it was necessary to no longer lump [all of the End of Course HSA students into the High School grade, but to report the students in the actual grade the student took the test.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	68253	67.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	66.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3305	82.70
Black, non-Hispanic	26844	50.60
Hispanic	4389	53.10
White, non-Hispanic	33488	80.40
Students with Disabilities	8792	30.90
Limited English Proficient	975	23.80
Economically Disadvantaged	22091	46.80
Migrant	11	18.20
Male	35247	62.00
Female	33006	72.30

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed $\pm 10\%$ when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 68,000 students.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	53520	53.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	50.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1605	69.50
Black, non-Hispanic	25365	38.50
Hispanic	3680	46.30
White, non-Hispanic	22651	69.20
Students with Disabilities	8279	27.90
Limited English Proficient	1741	32.50
Economically Disadvantaged	15897	41.70
Migrant	5	40.00
Male	27496	50.30
Female	26023	55.90

Comments: In High School Math almost all of the groupings have been flagged as outside the acceptable range of +/- 10%. This has occurred, because last year for the CSPR all End of Course Math students for the High School Assessments (HSA) were reported under the High School grade. This year, the EDEN reporting system has reequested for all of the data to be disaggregated and to meet these requirements it was necessary to no longer lump all of the End of Course HSA students into the High School grade, but to report the students in the actual grade the student took the test.

- 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 2005-2006
All Students	66984	60.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	242	55.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3522	76.40
Black, non-Hispanic	24324	42.60
Hispanic	3908	48.50
White, non-Hispanic	34988	72.10
Students with Disabilities	7178	21.10
Limited English Proficient	936	20.30
Economically Disadvantaged	14365	40.50
Migrant	4	75.00
Male	33496	52.10
Female	33488	68.20

Comments: Data outside the acceptable range has been verified. It is not statistically improbable that a relative small grouping of students tested will not exceed +/- 10% when the total number of students for that grade is approximately 67,000 students.

There is a slight difference over 10% (11%) for Hispanic High School Reading. This difference is because for High Schools we phased out MSA Grade 10 Reading and replaced it with the HSA English 2.

- 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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 School Year Data	1348	1037	76.90

Comments:

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 2005-2006 School Year Data	24	21	87.50

Comments: Section 1.4.1 District Accountability update reflects the most current information.

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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 School Year Data	387	268	69.30

Comments:

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 2005-2006 School Year Data	24	21	87.50

Comments: Following conversations with USDE staff Maryland now defines a Title 1 system as any system receiving Title I funds. Previously, we defined a Title I system, as a system in which all schools within the system received Title I funds. Our new definition began with the 2005-06 school year and now is consistent with the USDE Title I System definition.

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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 (LSS) also describe the steps being taken at the system, school, or classroom level, as applicable, to overcome the areas of concern. Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) reviews and the State Board approve annual updates. Approved updates contain the mid-course corrections that are necessary to improve student achievement.

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.

If the school misses AYP for the third time and progresses from Year 1 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.

If a school progresses from Year 2 to 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.

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 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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

Prince George's County was a school system in improvement. MSDE is in the process of reviewing their Master Plan. As a system in improvement, a Review Meeting is required to allow the school system the opportunity to resolve any clarifying questions from the review team. As of the October 2006 Board Meeting, Prince George's was designated a school system in Corrective Action for SY 2006-07. Upon final Master Plan submission, the Maryland State Board of Education will determine what further measures should be taken to address the achievement problems in Prince George's County.

Baltimore City is a school system in Corrective Action for SY 2006-07. The Maryland State Board of Education issued corrective actions because of this status. These actions are in five areas: instruction, leadership, school safety, low-performing schools and high school graduation and student support. These directives are compatible with those issued through the Master Planning process. Some actions assist with capacity building; others enhance the system's current capacity by bringing in expertise from outside the system. The actions are indicated below:

Instruction

- Adopt new middle and high school curricula in specified subjects.
- Hire independent evaluator.

Leadership

- Evaluate and, as necessary, replace Area Academic Officers (AAO) relevant to the failure to make AYP.
- AAOs will work with MSDE to customize leadership program.

School Safety

- Develop a comprehensive training for school staff on improving school safety.
- Identify students who exhibit chronic, severe, and escalating misbehavior and implement case management.

Low-Performing Schools

- Hire two full-time specialists in school improvement, reporting to MSDE, whose written job descriptions will establish that they have specific authority to oversee schools in restructuring.

High School Graduation and Student Support

- Develop Student Support Plans for students at risk of failing the High School Assessment.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
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 2005-2006 school year.	82
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 2005-2006 school year.	73
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
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 2005-2006 school year.	1497
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 2005-2006 school year.	42527
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 2005-2006 school year.	1633
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 2005-2006 school year.	1497
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
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 2005-2006 school year.	76
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	10718
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	26709
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 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: Re: #3 The number of students who were eligible AND FUNDABLE to receive SES during the SY 2005-06 was 15,837.	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 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	141295	112371	79.50
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	9617	5999	62.40
Low-Poverty Schools	8197	7699	93.90
All Elementary Schools	34065	27908	81.90
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	16658	9953	59.70
Low-Poverty Schools	22948	20073	87.50
All Secondary Schools	107230	84463	78.80
Comments:			

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, 2006, 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 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 classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
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	24.20
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	8.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	65.90
d) Other (please explain)	1.90
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	9.80
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.80
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	67.70
d) Other (please explain)	1.70
Comments: Other includes certified teachers who are teaching in a grade that is not included in their certification.	

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 (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	61.00	15.90
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for free/reduced price meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
Secondary Schools	41.20	7.50
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for free/reduced price meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	

Comments:

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 2005-2006 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
2005-2006 School Year	88.00

Comments:

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	<u>Yes</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>Yes</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>Yes</u>

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

The writing of Maryland English Language Proficiency Standards began with a presentation at the February 23, 2005 local program managers briefing, at which time the intent and timeline for standards writing and related assessment issues were presented. During the subsequent four week interval, LEAs submitted names, letters requesting release of staff were sent to Assistant Superintendents, and writers were notified as to the logistics of the project.

A briefing for participants was held on March 23, 2005 at the Maryland State Department of Education Building in Baltimore, MD. At this time, the writers received materials and were given a detailed explanation about the expected outcome of the project. Maryland's Director of Curriculum spoke about the process of creating the Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC).

In preparation for the intensive month of standards writing, groundwork was laid by reviewing documents and seeking input from local school systems, reviewing TESOL and other state standards, and reviewing a variety of English Language Proficiency Assessments such as ETAP and CELLA. During the month of April, the elementary and secondary teams met alternatively for two week periods at the Johns Hopkins Center in Columbia, Maryland, to create the first draft of Maryland ELP Standards (Exhibit I .3.1).

The University of Maryland, Baltimore County, was contracted to provide outside expert review. At a June 2, 2005 Standards Review for program managers, UMBC representatives worked with a cadre of writers and other representatives to give a critical review of the documents. This was followed by revision meetings and an internal review, held on June 15 at the Maryland State Department of Education.

During July 11-15, the teams of elementary and secondary writers reconvened with state and local experts in the content areas to create and solidify the links to the Maryland VSC in Reading and Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies.

The final draft of the Elementary and Secondary ELP Standards was posted on our Title III web page online as a link within the Maryland State Department of Education homepage. A linked toolkit, with lesson seeds, descriptions of what English Language Learners know and can do at the five levels (Low Beginner to Advanced), as well as resources including current research, instructional strategies and links to our professional organization, TESOL, will be made available during the 2006-07 school year.

During the summer of 2006, panels of Maryland educators, professionals in the field of TESOL, met to review and revise the Standards as they had been written. The final revisions will be posted to the MSDE webpage during the fall of 2006. The RFP for an independent outside review will be posted during the winter of 2006-07. Finally, June 2007 marks our target for seeking Maryland State Board of Education acceptance of the document.

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

Panels of content/ESOL educators met starting the summer of 2005 to explore the relationship of the Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum in the content areas of Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and English Language Arts to the new Maryland English Language Proficiency Standards.

Connections were made that served to illustrate the relationship between the above- mentioned content areas and the ELP standards. These included an illustration of the forms and function of the language as it would look as related to the content in the five proficiency levels. An additional document, entitled Expectations for English Language Learner in Content Area Classes, was developed to assist the general education teachers in providing appropriate instruction by means of research-based strategies and accommodations for their English language learners.

The completed documents have been extensively used in professional development around the state and serve to help the classroom teacher understand what his/her ELL student knows and can do at the five proficiency levels as identified in our standards: Low Beginning, High Beginning, Low Intermediate, High Intermediate, and Advanced.

Additionally, the Content Links can be used by ESOL teachers as a guide to the Voluntary State Curriculum in those districts in which high school credit is awarded for content-based ESOL classes.

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 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u> No </u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u> Yes </u>
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:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12; 2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; 3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards; 4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)
STATE RESPONSE
<p>All LEP students are assessed using the new Language Assessment Scales (LAS)- Links summative test starting in the Spring of School Year 2005-2006. New students enrolled will be tested for placement using the LAS diagnostic test. This will ensure statistical compatibility with the placement and summative test scores. An alignment study was done by CTB McGraw Hill and a group of ESL specialists and teachers from local school districts. The cost of augmenting the test to completely align all the test items with the objectives on the ELP standards was found to be cost prohibitive. In the revision of the standards this summer any items that were being tested but were not in the original standards were included, resulting in an excellent match. A standards setting was also done in the summer of 2006 to align the proficiency levels and cut scores generated by the test. LAS Links measures listening, speaking, reading, writing and provides a comprehension score derived from listening and reading domains. The test uses scale scores which are reported on a common scale, therefore student growth can be easily tracked across grade levels.</p> <p>LAS Links was referenced on a group size of 63,000 students, out of which about 10% were native English speakers and 30% of the sample came from students outside the US. This large sample and common K-12 scale ensures accurate, reliable results in measuring the progress of ELL students in their attainment of English. The test is technically sound and a valid measure of what ELL students are learning in their ESL and content classrooms.</p>

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	13208	66.60
2. Korean	672	3.40
3. Chinese	603	3.00
4. Urdu	412	2.10
5. Tagalog	413	2.10
6. Vietnamese	428	2.20
7. Russian	329	1.70
8. Arabic	220	1.10
9. English based Creole	321	1.60
10. Amharic	148	0.80
Comments:		

- 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 1.6.3.2.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data														
2005-2006 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 (8)	
			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)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (7)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
LAS-Links	29778	100.00	5009	16.80	6177	20.70	7986	26.80	5889	19.80	4582	15.40	4442	14.90
Comments: 135 students were not assigned proficiency levels. All students identified as LEP receive Title III services in Maryland.														

- (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 2005-2006 school year.
- (3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 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

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
13399	9737	5

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), 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 2005-06 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 2004-2005), 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 2005-06 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 2004-2005), 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

Maryland has not changed the definition of cohort. However, for the data to be meaningful and for reporting purposes we have consolidated the data into three cohort groups instead of six.

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

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	
2005-2006 School Year	% 79.70	# 10093	% 70.60	# 8938	% 8.20	# 2617	% 24.60	# 7824

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.

The above chart has been completed with the compiled information.

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	79.70	8938	70.60
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		3731	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	8.20	7824	24.60
TOTAL		20493	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? Yes No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	22
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	22
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	22
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	21
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	21
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	22
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	22
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, 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 2005-2006 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	1355	77.80
4	1268	80.90
5	1282	71.80
6	1070	56.40
7	955	48.70
8	696	44.50
H.S.	843	43.10

Comments:

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	1354	82.20
4	1268	82.70
5	1284	72.40
6	1073	58.60
7	996	47.20
8	878	54.60
H.S.	434	50.00

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 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 2006-2007 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
2006-2007 School Year	5

Comments:

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 2004-2005 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	84.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	82.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.60
Black, non-Hispanic	78.20
Hispanic	82.30
White, non-Hispanic	88.60
Students with Disabilities	77.60
Limited English Proficient	91.70
Economically Disadvantaged	81.60
Migrant	
Male	81.70
Female	88.00

Comments: Migrant: We need four years of data to report migrant graduation rates. Collection of migrant graduation data started in 2003. We will begin reporting this category in 2006.

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 2004-2005 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.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.30
Black, non-Hispanic	5.60
Hispanic	4.80
White, non-Hispanic	2.40
Students with Disabilities	5.10
Limited English Proficient	1.40
Economically Disadvantaged	4.70
Migrant	13.80
Male	4.40
Female	3.00

Comments: The percentages for All Students, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Male and Female have been verified.

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.

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

Schools are to be open for pupil attendance for at least 180 actual school days and a minimum of 1,080 school hours during a 10-month period each year. Annotated Code of Maryland Section 7-103

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	12	12
LEAs with Subgrants	12	12

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	46	596
1	64	595
2	52	640
3	39	522
4	44	557
5	49	601
6	32	566
7	28	586
8	27	582
9	41	680
10	18	411
11	12	320
12	12	310

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	87	2031
Doubled-up	140	4971
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	0	91
Hotels/Motels	86	637
Unknown	149	611

Comments: The discrepancies between sections 1.9.1.3 and 1.9.1.4 of the CSPR are due to the following three reasons.

First, data are reported by LEAs to MSDE as aggregated totals. MSDE does not collect individual-level data. Thus, we cannot report data that is not collected. Second, because the LEAs gather their data from separate sources, variances will occur. Finally, the data are collected at different times during the year by the LEAs. Enrollment data is based on the September 30 "official enrollment count", while the number of students by nighttime residence is an ongoing count, as this data is based on "time of initial identification."

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	596
1	595
2	640
3	520
4	557
5	601
6	566
7	586
8	582
9	680
10	411
11	320
12	310

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

476

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

194

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

39

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	1125
English Language Learners (ELL)	176
Gifted and Talented	192
Vocational Education	206

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	9
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	11
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	5
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	7
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	11
Referral to other programs and services	5
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	4
Other (optional)	1

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School selection	0
Transportation	1
School records	1
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	2

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	447	263
Grade 4	Yes	431	281
Grade 5	Yes	477	256
Grade 6	Yes	472	227
Grade 7	Yes	454	215
Grade 8	Yes	472	229
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	127	52
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: Reading at the high school level is assessed by an English 2 end of course exam. Typically, English 2 is taken in the 10th grade.

Mathematics Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	447	258
Grade 4	Yes	434	267
Grade 5	Yes	475	226
Grade 6	Yes	470	184
Grade 7	Yes	456	148
Grade 8	Yes	498	112
Grade 9			
Grade 10			
Grade 11			
Grade 12		376	128

Comments: Mathematics at the high school level is assessed through an algebra end of course exam. Typically, these students are in grades 8-12 and are being reported as Grade 12 students on this chart.

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.