

**Office of English Language
Acquisition
Washington, D.C. 20024-6510**



Title III Biennial Report

**State Formula Grants under Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition,
Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act**

(Public Law 107-110)

**CFDA NUMBER: 84.365A
FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 1885-0553, EXP. 8/31/2009**

DATED MATERIAL -- OPEN IMMEDIATELY

DUE DATE: DECEMBER 31, 2006

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for each of these years (2004-05 and 2005-06) must respond to this Title III Biennial Report (TBR) by **December 31, 2006**. This report is based on student performance data and other related information from the two preceding years 2004-05 and 2005-06.

The format states will use to submit the Title III Biennial 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 Title III Biennial Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Title III Biennial Report 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 TBR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the revised TBR form. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the revised TBR 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 "2006 TBR". The main TBR screen will allow the user to select the section of the TBR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the TBR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the TBR. A user can only select one section of the TBR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of the TBR, a lead state user will certify it and transmit it to the Department. Once the form 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 TBR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2006 TBR will be found on the main TBR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1885-0553. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2.50 hours (or 150 minutes) per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-6510. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: OELA, U.S. Department of Education 550 12th Street SW, Room PCP 10-113, Washington, D.C. 20202-6510. Questions about the new electronic TBR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

State Response for Meeting Title III State Biennial Reporting Requirements

Reporting Instructions

States are to provide information for each section required for the Title III Biennial Report. States should respond to the items listed under each of the elements. If any of the information requested is not available, please **explain** why it is not available.

Please note the following:

- ***Specific instructions for each item are shown in bold type and/or enclosed in parentheses in this format.***
- ***Responses are required for all sections in the Title III Biennial Report.***
- ***Note that comment boxes are provided for each response should further information be needed however there is a limitation to the number of characters available therefore it is recommended that written responses be comprehensive and concise. Do not provide web site links or references and no attachments.***

Critical Elements (List of Sections within this Form)

- 1 Types of language instruction educational programs used by subgrantees
[SEC. 3115 (c)(1) p. 1698, 3121(b)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(2) p. 1704]
- 2 Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees [SEC. 3121(a) p.1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]
 - LEP Student Progress Meeting AMAOs for English Language Proficiency
 - Performance of LEP Subgroup in Meeting State AYP Targets
 - LEP Students in Grades not Tested for AYP
 - Content Assessment in Native Languages
 - Accommodations for LEP Students
- 3 Academic content assessment results of monitored LEP students
[SEC. 3121(a)(4) p.1701, 3123(b)(8) p.1705]
 - Number of Former LEP Students by Year Monitored
 - Academic Achievement of Former LEP Students Tested for AYP
- 4 Title III Subgrantee Performance and State Accountability
[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701]
- 5 Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth
[SEC. 3115(e)(1)(A-G) p. 1699]
 - Number of Immigrants and Immigrant Subgrants
 - Subgrantee Programs or Activities
 - Distribution of Funds
- 6 Title III programs or activities conducted by subgrantees, as described in Section 3115 (c, d & e), terminated for failure to reach program goals during the two preceding years [SEC. 3123(b)(7) p.1705]
- 7 Teacher information and professional development activities conducted by the subgrantees [SEC. 3115(c)(1)(B) p. 1698, 3116 (c) p.1701, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705]
 - Number of Teachers
 - Teacher Certification
 - Teacher Language Fluency
 - Professional Development
- 8 State level activities conducted and technical assistance provided to subgrantees
[SEC. 3111(b)(2)(A-D) p.1691-2, 3123(b)(4) p. 1705]
 - Technical Assistance Provided by the State
 - Other State Activities
 - Parental Participation Compliance
- 9 Optional

Title III Biennial Report

State Formula Grants under Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act

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: Mary Gable

Telephone: 410-767-0349

Fax: 410-333-2275

e-mail: mgable@msde.state.md.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick

Signature

Saturday, December 30, 2006, 12:44:27 PM

Date

1. Types of Language Instruction Educational Programs Used by Subgrantees [Sec. 3115 (c)(1) p. 1698, 3121(b)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(2) p. 1704]

1.1 Indicate the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program (as defined in Section 3301(8)) in Table 1.1.

Note: A significant amount of information needed to generate the Biennial Report to Congress will be gathered through other information collections. Specifically, the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for the 2004-2005 (OMB # 1810-0614) and 2005-2006 school years, the Annual Collection of Elementary and Secondary Education Data for the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 (OMB # 1880-0541). Each provides information to the OELA Biennial Report. Information from other collections, which will be utilized in the OELA Biennial Report, has been marked in this collection form with the exact question or element number in the specific data collections.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time for use in the current Biennial Report to Congress.

Definitions:

- 1. # of Subgrantees Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may have multiple programs. If multiple programs are used, report each program.
- 2. Type of Program** = type of programs described in the subgrantee local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>

Table 1.1 Summary of Language Instruction Educational Programs

# of Subgrantees Using Program		Type of Program	Language of Instruction % English	Other Language % OLOI*
2004-2005	2005-2006			
		Dual Language		
		Two way immersion		
		Transitional bilingual		
		Developmental bilingual		
4	4	Heritage language		
		Sheltered English instruction		
19	18	Structured English immersion Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)		
11	10	Content-based ESL		
19	19	Pull-out ESL		
10	10	Other (explain)		

Comments: In addition to pull out, inclusion and sheltered ESL classes, school districts in Maryland also offer literacy development classes for students who have experienced interrupted schooling or have low literacy in their first language. Language support in the form of tutoring or classes is also offered on Saturdays and after school in some school districts. Additionally, four school districts offer Spanish heritage classes for native Spanish speakers.

State response 1.1: (Provide further information as to the variations of the types of programs e.g., dual language, two-way/one-way, as implemented by subgrantees, including "Other". In reference to the type of instructional programs, see descriptions listed on NCELA's website: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>)

1.2 Language Instruction Based on Scientific Research

Title III language instruction educational programs must be based on scientific research and proven to be effective (Section 3115 (c)(1)).

1.2.1 Does the State provide written guidance for selecting a scientifically research based language instruction educational programs? (See SEC. 9101(37) for scientifically based research)

No

Comments:

1.2.2 How does the State ensure that subgrantees implement scientifically research based language instruction educational programs?

State response 1.2.2: (Provide narrative here)

The State adheres to the following definition of scientifically based language instruction programs as described in Section 9101(37) of ESEA : scientifically based research is "research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs."

MSDE ensures that all language instructional programs supported with program funds are based on a review of scientifically based research. Documentation on student academic performance is maintained to demonstrate how these activities improve student academic achievement.

MSDE reviews the implementation of scientifically research based language programs through multiple methods, including:

1. Master plan review
2. On-site monitoring
3. Desk monitoring
4. On-site Technical Assistance to help develop local programs
5. State review of program descriptions reported by LEAs on an annual survey conducted in October.

2. Critical Synthesis of Data Reported by Title III Subgrantees [Sec. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

2.1 LEP Student Progress in Meeting State Annual AMAOs for English Language Proficiency

Included in this section are several tables that provide evidence of LEP student progress in meeting the Title III State annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for English language proficiency (i.e., AMAO/making progress; AMAO/attainment) and academic achievement (AMAO/AYP).

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

2.1.1 Number of LEP Students

Note: The figures in this item were taken from the last row of question 1.6.3.1 of the CSPR. If the figures shown do not match your expectations, go into the CSPR and modify question 1.6.3.1 to make sure the last row contains the total unduplicated counts. The information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of "ALL LEP" students in the State for each year.	24811	29778

Comments:

Note: "ALL LEP" students = All students in K-12:

1. who were newly enrolled in the year of reporting and assessed for English language proficiency using a State selected/approved ELP placement assessment and who meet the LEP definition in section 9101(25), and
2. who were assessed by State annual English language proficiency assessment and achieved below "proficient,"
 - a. in the previous year and continued to be enrolled in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency assessment is at the end of the school year); or
 - b. in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency is at the beginning of the school year).

"All LEP" students should include the newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for each year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.

2.1.2 Number of LEP Students who Received Services

Note: The figures in this item were taken from the last row of question 1.6.3.3 of the CSPR. If the figures shown do not match your expectations, go into the CSPR and modify question 1.6.3.3 to make sure the last row contains the total unduplicated counts.

	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of LEP students in the State who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program for each year.	31111	29778

Comments:

2.1.3 Results on Achieving AMAO's in English Language Proficiency

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 2.1

Instructions:

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

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information that each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time for use in the current Biennial Report to Congress.

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. **ELP ATTAINMENT** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended. (If the State is tracking true cohorts of LEP students, the number of monitored former LEP students included in the cohorts can be cumulative from year to year for up to two years.)
4. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each of "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
5. **AMAO 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.
6. **Met AMAO Target** = Designation of whether the LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs did or did not meet the AMAO targets for the year.

2.1.3 Title III LEP Student Language Proficiency Results

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

	2004-2005				2005-2006			
	AMAO TARGET	AMAO RESULTS		Met AMAO Target	AMAO TARGET	AMAO RESULTS		Met AMAO Target
	%	#	%	Y/N	%	#	%	Y/N
MAKING PROGRESS					79.70	8938	70.60	N
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS						3731		
ELP ATTAINMENT					87.00	7824	24.60	N

Comments:

2.1.4 Monitored Former LEP Students

Check the answer to the following question:

Are **monitored former LEP** students reflected in Table 2.1.3 "Attainment"/"AMAO Results"? (**Note:** ONLY if the State is using true cohort data, i.e., the State tracked the same LEP students in the same groups for progress each year and has longitudinal data available.)

No

Note: Monitored former 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.

State Response 2.1.4: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

2.1.5 Unduplicated count of Title III LEP students in the State.

Definitions:

1. **# Total LEP Enrolled** = the unduplicated count of LEP students who enrolled in a Title III language instruction educational program in the State.
2. **# Tested/State Annual ELP** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment.
3. **# Not Available for State Annual ELP** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who were enrolled at the time of testing, but were not available for State annual English language proficiency assessment for an excusable reason, acceptable "excusable reason" being the student was seriously ill, injured or in some way physically incapacitated state, to the point of keeping the student from attending school.
4. **Subtotal** = the sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Available for State Annual ELP."
5. **# LEP/One Data Point** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment for the first time. This number should be part of the total number of "Tested/State Annual ELP" in 2 above.

2.1.5 Title III LEP Student/Testing Status		
	2004-2005	2005-2006
# Total LEP Enrolled	31111	29778
# Tested/State Annual ELP	24811	29778
# Not Available for State Annual ELP Test		
Subtotal		
# LEP/One Data Point	9962	10956
Comments: The number of LEP students not available for the State Annual ELP test will be collected beginning in SY 2006-07.		

2.2 Report performance of the LEP subgroup in meeting the State adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets in math and reading/language arts in Table 2.2.

Instructions:

Fill in the number and percentage of LEP subgroup scoring at "Proficient & Advanced" compared to the State's AYP targets for math and reading/language arts, for grades tested in 2004-2005 and for all grades listed in 2005-2006.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

1. **Grade** = the grade tested for AYP
2. **3-HS not proficient** = the number of LEP students in all grades 3-8 and the HS grade tested for the year who were below proficient.
3. **Total # Tested** = the number of students in the LEP subgroup in all grades tested for the year. Provide the State aggregate number in the column labeled "Proficient & Advanced #"
4. **Total # 3-HS LEP not tested** = the total number of LEP students not tested and/or not counted as participating for AYP in grades 3-8 and the HS grade for the year
5. **Proficient & Advanced** = the number and the percent of the students in the LEP subgroup that achieved "proficient" and "advanced", in each of the content areas for the year
6. **Target** = the AYP target established by the State for that subject in that year

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time. Note that the information from the CSPR and accountability workbooks shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. Revisions to the accountability workbook information can only be made by working with Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) to submit a revised workbook. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

2.2 LEP Subgroup Content Results								
	2004-2005				2005-2006			
	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		TARGET	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		TARGET
		#	%	%		#	%	%
MATHEMATICS	3	1285	55.90	58.00	3	1370	59.00	63.00
	4	1002	52.30		4	1067	60.50	
	5	672	38.90		5	827	49.10	
	6	410	33.40		6	422	35.10	
	7	280	26.70		7	356	31.50	
	8	348	32.40	58.00	8	465	38.90	63.00
	HS	526	41.90	58.00	HS	565	32.50	63.00
	3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	6033			3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	5975		
	TOTAL # TESTED	10556			TOTAL # TESTED	11047		
	TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED				TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED			
READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	3	1073	47.40	54.00	3	1255	55.50	59.00
	4	1016	54.20		4	946	55.10	
	5	657	38.80		5	708	43.40	
	6	344	29.10		6	359	30.80	
	7	243	24.20		7	279	26.50	
	8	215	20.70	54.00	8	232	23.80	59.00
	HS	180	17.80	54.00	HS	190	20.30	59.00
	3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	6352			3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	5775		
	TOTAL # TESTED	10080			TOTAL # TESTED	9744		
	TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED				TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED			
Comments:								
Does the State exercise the LEP flexibility afforded States by the Secretary for recent arrivals in AYP determination? (http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2006-3/091306a.html)							Yes	
Comments:								

2.3 LEP Students in Grades not Tested for AYP

Instructions:

Provide the total number of LEP students in grades that were not tested for AYP. These figures reflect all students in grades K-2 and in the high school grades not tested for AYP.

2.3 LEP Students/Non-AYP Grades		
Grade	2004-2005	2005-2006
# LEP K-2	13352	11880
# LEP HS	6184	5896
# LEP Other Grades	3755	3767
Comments:		

2.4 Content assessment in Students' Native Language

2.4.1 Does the State offer the State academic content tests in the students' native language(s)?
No

(If no, go to 2.5. If yes, complete Tables 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.)
Comments:

2.4.2 If the answer is **yes to 2.4.1**, list the languages other than English, of the academic content tests provided in the State by the grades for which these native language tests are available, in Table 2.4.2. If more than one language is available for the grade, place a hard return (if electronic) in the row to add more space.

State should only report tests used for AYP purposes in the table.

Definitions:

- Grade** = grades for which the native language version of the academic content test is offered
- Language(s)** = name of the language in which the academic content test is offered

2.4.2 Test in Student's Native Language

	GRADE	LANGUAGE		GRADE	LANGUAGE
		3			
	4			4	
	5			5	
	6			6	
	7			7	
	8			8	
MATHEMATICS	HS		RDG/LANGUAGE ARTS	HS	

Comments:
 State response 2.4.2: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Instructions:

If State response to 2.4.1 is YES, fill in the number and percentage of LEP subgroup scoring at "Proficient & Advanced" compared to the State's AYP targets for math and reading/language arts, for grades tested in 2004-2005 and for all grades listed in 2005-2006.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

This table is populated only if the state's response to 2.4.1 is YES.

Definitions:

1. **Grade** = grades in which the native language versions of the State academic content assessment is provided for LEP students
2. **Proficient & Advanced** = the number and the percent of students of the LEP subgroup that achieved "proficient" and "advanced", for each year
3. **Total Tested** = total number of ALL LEP students in all grades tested for each year through native language versions of the State academic content assessments

2.4.3 Native Language Version of State Academic Content Assessment Results						
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	
		#	%		#	%
MATHEMATICS	3			3		
	4			4		
	5			5		
	6			6		
	7			7		
	8			8		
	HS			HS		
	TOTAL TESTED			TOTAL TESTED		
		#	%		#	%
READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	3			3		
	4			4		
	5			5		
	6			6		
	7			7		
	8			8		
	HS			HS		
	TOTAL TESTED			TOTAL TESTED		

Comments:

State response 2.4.3: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

2.5 Accommodations on State academic content assessments for LEP students

If the State allows accommodations for academic content assessments, check the accommodations used by subgrantees for LEP students in Table 2.5.

Note: if the State has provided information regarding academic content assessment in the students' native language in Table 2.4, check "Assessment in the native language" in this table.

2.5 Test Accommodations			
Accommodations to Presentation		Accommodations to Response	
<u>No</u>	Assessment in the native language	<u>No</u>	Answers written directly in test booklet
<u>No</u>	Text changes in vocabulary	<u>Yes</u>	Answers dictated
<u>No</u>	Modification of linguistic complexity	<u>No</u>	Responses in native language
<u>No</u>	Addition of visual supports		
<u>No</u>	Use of glossaries in native language	Accommodations to Timing/Scheduling	
<u>Yes</u>	Use of glossaries in English	<u>Yes</u>	Extra assessment time
<u>No</u>	Linguistic modification of test directions	<u>Yes</u>	Breaks during testing
<u>No</u>	Additional example items/tasks	<u>Yes</u>	Administration in several sessions
<u>No</u>	Oral directions in the native language		
<u>Yes</u>	Use of dictionaries	Accommodations to Setting	
<u>Yes</u>	Reading aloud of questions in English	<u>Yes</u>	Small-group or individual administration
<u>Yes</u>	Directions read aloud or explained	<u>Yes</u>	Separate room administration
		<u>No</u>	Other (Explain)
<small>Rivera, C. and C. Stansfield (2000). <i>An analysis of state policies for the inclusion and accommodation of English language learners in state assessment programs during 1998-1999</i> (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: Center for Equity and Excellence in Education, The George Washington University.</small>			
State response 2.5: (Provide narrative here if "Other" is checked and/or provide additional information as needed.)			

3. Academic Content Assessment Results of Monitored Former LEP Students [Sec. 3121(a)(4) p.1701, 3123(b)(8) p1705]

Monitored former 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

Note: Monitoring of these students is required for 2 consecutive years and results must be reported whether or not they are in a grade counted for AYP.

3.1 Provide the count of "monitored former LEP students" in Table 3.1 below.

Definitions:

1. **# year one** = number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored
2. **# year two** = number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored
3. **Non-AYP Grades 3+** = Grades 3 and above not tested for AYP.
4. **Total** = The sum of the subtotal of monitored LEP students in grades tested for AYP and the number of former LEP students in grades not tested for AYP.

Table 3.1 Former LEP Student by Year Monitored

GRADE	2004-2005		2005-2006	
	# YEAR ONE	# YEAR TWO	# YEAR ONE	# YEAR TWO
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
HS				
Subtotal				
Non-AYP Grades 3+				
TOTAL				

Comments:

3.2 Academic achievement results by grade of monitored former LEP students tested for AYP.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

1. **Subject** = academic content subject areas in which former LEP student achievements are monitored
2. **Grade** = grade of the monitored former LEP students
3. **# monitored** = number of former LEP students being monitored for each year (year 1 plus year 2)
4. **# Proficient & Advanced** = the sum of the number of monitored former LEP students who achieved the "Proficient" level and the number of monitored LEP students who achieved the "Advanced" level on the State content tests
5. **# Below proficient** = the number of monitored former LEP students who did not achieve proficient level on the State academic content test at grade level
6. **Total** = the total numbers for each column and each subject

3.2 Monitored Former LEP Student Results by Grade

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2004-2005			2005-2006		
		# MONITORED	# PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	# BELOW PROFICIENT	# MONITORED	# PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	# BELOW PROFICIENT
MATHEMATICS	3		928			1354	
	4		1007			1268	
	5		701			1284	
	6		485			1073	
	7		370			996	
	8		262			878	
	HS		298			434	
	TOTAL		4051			7287	
RDG/LANGUAGE ARTS	3		868			1355	
	4		1043			1268	
	5		739			1282	
	6		547			1070	
	7		383			955	
	8		272			696	
	HS		205			843	
	TOTAL		4057			7469	

Comments: We are unable to provide the information for Section 3.1 until we have established a unique student id. Further, we need guidance on how to address AYP and non-AYP grades in high school since Maryland has end of course not grade level assessments at the high school level.

3.2.3 Does the State include the students reported in Table 3.2 in the calculations for the LEP subgroup AYP?

Yes

Comments:

3.2.4 Provide the number of the Year 1 and Year 2 monitored former LEP students in grades not tested for AYP who met grade level academic achievement standards in Math and Reading/Language Arts based on State/local criteria.

3.2.4 Performance of Monitored Former LEP Students /Non-AYP Grades			
2004-2005		2005-2006	
# Achieved Grade Level Standards		# Achieved Grade Level Standards	
Monitored Year 1	Monitored Year 2	Monitored Year 1	Monitored Year 2

Comments: We need further guidance on how to address AYP and non-AYP grades in high school since Maryland has end of course not grade level assessments at the high school level.

Is there a definition for the time spans of year 1 and 2?

We need further explanation on the "grade level academic achievement standards in Math and Reading/Language Arts" at the high school level when all assessments are end of course.

State response 3.2.4: (Describe how the monitored former LEP students in the State are performing at grade level or meeting grade level standards.)

3.2.5 What percentage of the monitored former LEP students were returned to LEP services, if the State exercise such practice?

State response 3.2.5: (Explain the criteria and process of returning monitored former LEP students to LEP services.)

Out of the total exited 1.72% were returned to LEP services.

The decision is made by the LEAs at the school level based on teacher evaluation and assessment results. If teachers responsible for a student determine that the student needs more ESL services then a decision is made by a LEP committee consisting of the classroom teachers, ESL teachers, the parent of the student and an administrator.

3.2.6 If monitored former LEP students were returned to LEP services, how does this impact the performance of the subgrantees and the State in meeting Title III AMAO for "Attainment" of English proficiency?

State response 3.2.6:

The AMAO for attainment is calculated based on the status of the students at the time of testing. Since the percentage of students in this category has been less than 2% it has not had any significant impact on the overall performance of the state in meeting Title III AMAO.

3.3 What is the State's policy on monitored former LEP students when they fail to meet state academic achievement standards? What technical assistance does the State provide to subgrantees whose monitored former LEP students do not meet State academic achievement standards during the 2 years while those students were being monitored?

State response 3.3: (Provide narrative here)

The policy on monitoring former LEP students and technical assistance provided by the state to subgrantees is embedded in the State Accountability and Master Planning Processes.

4. Title III Subgrantee Performance and State Accountability [Sec. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701]

4.1 Provide the count for each year in Table 4.1

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

Table 4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance Information		
	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of subgrantees for each year	23	22
Total number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	20	21
Total number of subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs only		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP		
Total number of subgrantees that met 1 AMAO only		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Attainment of ELP		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP		
Total number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO		
Total number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years		
Total number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs		1
Total number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)		
Comments:		

4.2 Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs in 2005-2006? *

No

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

Comments:

State response 4.2.1: **(Provide narrative here if needed.)**

4.3 Describe the State plan to provide technical assistance in developing improvement plans and other technical assistance to subgrantees that have failed to meet Title III AMAOs for two or more consecutive years.

State response 4.3: **(Provide narrative here.)**

The Maryland State Department of Education's goal is to increase the English proficiency of ELL children by providing high-quality language instruction educational programs that are based on scientifically based research demonstrating effectiveness of the programs in increasing English proficiency and student academic achievement in the core academic subjects. [section 3115 (c)(1)]

The following activities are representative of those that are provided to Maryland's subgrantees who failed to meet AMAOs for 2 or more consecutive years:

Â· Technical Assistance in improving the instructional programs for English Language Learners (ELLs) by identifying, acquiring, and upgrading curricula, instructional materials, educational software, and assessment procedures.

Â· Technical Assistance in providing supplementary Educational Services to

English language in districts that have been so identified.

Â· Technical Assistance in providing tutorials and academic or vocational education for ELLs.

Â· Technical Assistance in incorporating educational technology and electronic networks into curricula and programs for ELLs, especially in the content areas of Reading and Math.

Â· Professional development designed to enhance the ability of teachers to understand and use curricula, assessment measures, and instruction strategies for ELL children.

5. Programs and Activities for Immigrant Children and Youth [Sec. 3115(e)(1)(A-G) p. 1699]

5.1 Complete Table 5.1

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

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

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

Table 5.1 Education Programs for Immigrant Students

2004-2005			2005-2006		
# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants	# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
17936	12272	5	13399	9737	5

Comments:

State response 5.1: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, or sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

5.2 Provide information on the programs or activities conducted by subgrantees for immigrant children and youth.

Instructions: Provide the number of subgrantees who have conducted each of the activities in Table 5.2 for the education enhancement of immigrant children and youth. A subgrantee may conduct more than one such activity. This table requires the aggregated number of activities conducted in the 2 years covered by this biennial report. The State should provide more detailed information for each year in the narrative if needed.

5.2 Subgrantee Activities for Immigrant Youth and Children	
# subgrantees	Activity conducted
22	family literacy, parent outreach, and training
19	support for personnel, including teacher aides, to provide services for immigrant children and youth
14	provision of tutorials, mentoring, and academic career counseling
19	identification and acquisition of curricular materials, software, and technologies
21	basic instructional services
12	other instructional services, such as programs of introduction to the educational system and civics education
13	activities coordinated with community based organizations, institutions of higher education, private sector entities, or other entities to assist parents by offering comprehensive community services
	Other authorized activities for the education of immigrant children and youth (Describe)

Comments:

State response 5.2: (Summarize the most common activities conducted and discuss the effectiveness of the activities in meeting the needs of the immigrant children and youth and in achieving the goals of this program.)

5.3 Distribution of Funds

How does the State distribute the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees? (Check those that apply)

	<u>No</u>		<u>No</u>
Annual		Competitive	
	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>
Multi-year		Formula	

Comments:

State response 5.3: (Provide additional information on the State's subgrant process, as needed)

6. Title III Programs or Activities (as described in Section 3115 (c, d & e)) Conducted by Subgrantees Terminated for Failure to Reach Program Goals During the Two Preceding Years [Sec. 3123(b)(7) p.1705]

6.1 Programs/Activities for Immigrant Children and Youth Terminated for Failing to Reach Program Goals
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs OR programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals during the two preceding years in the State?
<u>No</u>
(If NO, proceed to 7. If YES, provide the number in 6.1.2.)
Comments:
6.1.2 Number of terminated programs or activities
0
State Response 6.1.2: (Provide a summary explaining why these programs or activities did not reach program goals.)

7. Teacher Information and Professional Development Activities Conducted by Subgrantees [Sec. 3115(c)(1)(B) p. 1698, Sec. 3116 (c) p.1701, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705]

7.1 Provide the number of teachers in the State who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in SEC. 3301(8) and reported in Table 1.1.

Note: Section 3301(8) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course -- (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency, and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.)

Total number of certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs in the State.	1210
Total estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers that the State will need for the Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years *	857

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next five years. **Do not** include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

State response 7.1: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

7.2.1 Does the State require special certification/licensure/endorsement for teachers who teach in language instruction educational programs (Section 3301(8))?

Yes

If **yes**, describe the eligibility requirements for teachers to teach in language instruction educational programs in the State.

If **no**, does the State plan to develop eligibility requirements for teachers to teach in language instruction educational programs?

State response 7.2.1: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Teachers teaching ESL classes must be certified in ESL. MSDE has published certification requirements including the list of courses needed and passing score on the Praxis I and Praxis II exam needed in order to be certified in ESL in Maryland.

7.2.2 Does the State have specific qualification requirements in addition to those cited in Section 1119(3)(g) for paraprofessionals who assist teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs?

No

State response 7.2.2: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

7.3 How is teacher language fluency determined for English and any other language of instruction used in Title III language instruction educational programs? (SEC. 3116(c))

Instructions:

Fill in the number of subgrantees that use each of the following methods. This table requires the aggregated data for the 2 years covered by this biennial report. The State should provide additional information for each year in the narrative response, if needed.

7.3 Methods of Determining Language Fluency	
# of Subgrantees	Methods
	State required English fluency exam for oral and written skills
	State required exam for fluency in another language for oral and written skills
22	State certification/recertification/licensing requirement
	LEA required English fluency exam for oral and written communication skills
	LEA required fluency exam for another language for oral and written skills
	LEA testing/interview during hiring
	LEA endorsed, based on professional development and other training
	LEA determined other evidence of language fluency (explain)
	Other (explain)

State response 7.3: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Teacher language fluency is demonstrated by achieving a passing score on two Praxis examinations: the Praxis I exam, a basic assessment of reading, mathematics and writing and, Praxis II, an assessment of content-area knowledge in English language learning.

7.4 Provide information on the subgrantees that conducted professional development activities that met Title III requirements (SEC. 3115 (c)(2 A-D)) in Table 7.4.

Instructions:

Report professional development activities that are funded under Title III and/or related to Title III required activities ONLY. The table covers the period of this report.

Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Activity** = subgrantee activities for professional development required under Title III [SEC. 3115(c)(2)(A-D)]
2. **# subgrantees** = the number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity.
3. **Total Number of Participants** = the total number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities

7.4 Subgrantee Professional Development Activities		
Type of PD Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	20	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	20	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	19	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	14	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	12	
Other (Explain)	11	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	Total Number of Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	18	5215
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	20	1882
PD provided to principals	15	472
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	13	465
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	13	424
PD provided to community based organizational personnel	11	445

Comments:

7.4 State response: (Explain what the State did to ensure that PD activities conducted by subgrantees meet the Title III requirements under Section 3115 (c)(2)(A-D), including how the PD activities were based on scientific research and were effective in enhancing teacher knowledge and skills in teaching LEP students.)

Explanation of Other activities reported in table 7.4: Other types of professional development activities included monthly briefing sessions for non- tenured ESOL teachers on a variety of topics selected by the participants. Training for interpreters on understanding educational jargon. Workshops for parent liaisons to work effectively with ELL parents. ESOL courses for mainstream teachers and Spanish courses for educators working with ELL students in predominately Spanish speaking neighborhoods.

Maryland has developed professional development standards that align with NCLB criteria for professional development activities. As a part of these standards, 32 indicators of quality (IOQs) have been developed to guide local education agencies in planning, delivering and evaluating professional development. All local Title III/ESOL supervisors have been trained in the use of these standards. LEA's are surveyed annually on their professional development plan for ELL's to ensure that the 32 IOQs have been used to guide their plan.

8. State Level Activities Conducted and Technical Assistance Provided to Subgrantees [Sec. 3111(b)(2)(A-D) p.1691-2, 3123(b)(4) p. 1705]

8.1 Technical Assistance Provided by the States

During the two preceding years, what technical assistance was provided by the State to subgrantees?

(Check all that apply)

The State provided technical assistance to subgrantees in:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Identifying and implementing English language instructional programs and curricula based on scientific research
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Helping LEP students to meet academic content and student academic achievement standards expected of all students
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. Identifying or developing and implementing measures of English language proficiency
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4. Promoting parental and community participation in programs that serve LEP children

Comments:

State response 8.1: (Describe how the State evaluates the effectiveness of State level technical assistance (TA), including how the TA has improved subgrantees' performance in assisting LEP students to achieve English proficiency and academic standards.)

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has provided technical assistance at both the state and the local level targeted at helping LEP students meet academic content and standards expected of all students. Specific activities have included:

- Administrative briefings held three times yearly to provide information regarding best practices and strategic planning. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the briefings is performed by review and analysis of on-site evaluation documents as well as long term review of local school districts' application of subject matter presented.
- Ongoing communication with LEAs through site visits, e-mail, telephone, fax, and United States Postal Service provides the State with a means by which the application of new concepts and procedures are monitored (desk monitoring).
- Training events demonstrating best practices for both ELL teachers as well as other teachers and administrators who work with LEP students are evaluated by means of after-training evaluation documents.
- LEA and school audits of ELL programs provide the State with information as to the integration of State approved procedures at the local school district level
- Comprehensive Master Plan review
- o As part of the Master Plan, each system must articulate the needs and the programs intended for a number of student subgroups, including ELL students. The state specialists provide ongoing technical assistance to LEAs during the development of the Master Plan and upon submission, conduct a technical review of the Title III programs and provided assistance to review teams regarding ELL issues.
- o The effectiveness of the technical assistance provided as part of the Bridge to Excellence Program has been measured in through the acceptance of both the five-year Master Plans as well as the Master Plan Updates submitted by each of the 24 LEAs in Maryland. These system plans for implementing Maryland's educational goals articulate the allowable activities and the federal, state, and local funding for ELL programs in Maryland schools.
- The State conducts periodic review of progress of students who participate in Title III programs in both English language acquisition and academic gains in content areas, especially in reading and mathematics.
- The State reviews and evaluates data that reflect how the implementation of a program or any component of a program affects student achievement gains provides evidence of effectiveness

8.2 Other State activities conducted during the two preceding years, and the effectiveness of such activities.

Check all that apply

8.2.1 Professional development and other activities to assist personnel in meeting certification requirements	
<u>No</u>	Increased the number of certified/licensed/endorsed teachers for language instruction educational programs in the State
<u>No</u>	Increased the number of teachers trained in teaching LEP students by course credits or professional development points towards certification/endorsement
<u>Yes</u>	Increased teacher knowledge and ability in using State ELP standards and assessment
<u> </u> Yes <u> </u> No	Other (explain)
Comments: Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination is facilitated by the State through indirect service (telephone, email) as well as directly (on site visits). The effectiveness of such activity is judged in terms of the subject matter of the activity and the procedures that the local school districts and the State mutually agree to implement.	

8.2.2 Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination related to subgrants	
<u>Yes</u>	Planning: facilitated comprehensive services for LEP students
<u>Yes</u>	Planning: facilitated utilizing all professional development resources for the training of all teachers on the teaching and learning of LEP students
<u>Yes</u>	Evaluation: informed improvement of Title III program implementation
<u>Yes</u>	Interagency Coordination: facilitated establishing State level standards and/or guidelines for instructional and other educational services for LEP students
<u>No</u>	Consolidating Title III SEA Administrative Funds: provided additional resources for Title III program implementation/administration
<u> </u> Yes <u> </u> No	Other (explain)
Comments: Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination is facilitated by the State through indirect service (telephone, email) as well as directly (on site visits). The effectiveness of such activity is judged in terms of the subject matter of the activity and the procedures that the local school districts and the State mutually agree to implement.	

8.2.3 Recognition of subgrantees that exceeded AMAOs	
<u>No</u>	
Comments: Yes- Provide stipends for representatives such as parents and liaisons from local school districts to attend the OELA Summit	
Yes- Provide stipends for representatives such as parents and liaisons from local school districts to attend the OELA Summit	
Yes- Provide stipends for representatives such as parents and liaisons from local school districts to attend the OELA Summit	

8.2.4 Other state level authorized activities	
<u>No</u>	
Comments:	
State response 8.2: (Describe how the State evaluates the effectiveness of State level activities conducted, including how these activities have improved subgrantees' performance in assisting LEP students to achieve English proficiency and academic standards.)	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
1) The State examines gains made by ELLs in content area State assessment in districts and evaluates the performance against previous years.	
2) The State consults with LEAs regarding best practices and program models.	
3) The State investigates ELLs academic performance in tested areas.	
4) The state reviews and analyses local evaluation documents reflecting Professional Development meetings and activities.	

8.3 Compliance with parental notification and parental participation requirements under Section 3302. Describe how the State ensured that subgrantees:

1. complied with parental notification provisions for identification and placement. Ensured that parents were informed on all the requirements specified in [SEC. 3302(a)(1-8) p. 1732]
2. complied with parental notification when the LEA failed to meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives each year within prescribed time frame [SEC. 3302(b) p. 1732]
3. provided parental notifications in an understandable and uniform format, and, to the extent practical, in a language that the parent could understand. [SEC. 3302(c) p. 1732-3]
4. fulfilled the parental participation and outreach provisions. [SEC. 3302(e) p. 1732-3]

State response 8.3: (Address each of the items above.)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

State response 8.3: (Address each of the items above.)

1.

A sample of the Parent Notification of Placement Letter is available at www.marylandpublicschools.org. It was developed by the State with significant input from the local school systems to use after testing English language learners for appropriate services and placement. This letter is used throughout the state to inform every new parent regarding the identification and placement of their children in an ESL program. This letter is kept in the student's cumulative folder.

2.

This is the first year that MSDE has notified LEAs of failure to meet Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives. Guidance has been provided regarding the format of the notification. Notification letter templates have been discussed. Desk and on-site monitoring will ensure that the LEAs are in compliance with this Federal requirement.

3.

Parent Notification letters are available for LEAs online at http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/title_III in the following languages:

English | Amharic | Arabic | Chinese (Simplified)

Chinese (Traditional) | French | Korean | Russian | Spanish | Tagalog | Urdu |

Vietnamese

Additional resources are also available for LEAs and parents regarding various aspects of the Title III program at this website. Title III and local funds are used provide interpretation service as needed by local school districts.

4.

The Title III office provides annual scholarships for parents to attend the OELA Summits in Washington DC. MSDE is publishing an online parent resource guide through Maryland PTA and the MSDE homepage. The Title III office works collaboratively with the Title I Family Involvement Specialist Program Improvement and Family Support Branch to provide services to ELL parents.

9. Optional Questions

RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE NOT REQUIRED, BUT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE DEPARTMENT IN UNDERSTANDING SERVICES TO LEP STUDENTS IN THE STATE.

9.1 Do LEAs provide information to the State on mobility rates for all students? (Mobility rate has been collected by NCES. It is defined in the Common Core of Data collection and in the national education data dictionary.)

Yes No

(If yes, please provide that rate.)

Comments:

9.2 Does the State calculate a State LEP mobility rate?

Yes No

(If yes, please provide that rate.)

Comments:

9.3 Does the State calculate the difference between the LEP subgroup AYP status with or without the inclusion of monitored former LEP students' achievement results?

Yes No

(If yes, what is the difference?)

Comments: