

**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 2006-07**

**MARYLAND**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

**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 – *21<sup>st</sup> 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*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

**PART I**

Part I of the CSPR 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 the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

**PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, 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 CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. 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 "SY 2006-07 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 SY 2006-07 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: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report          For          State Formula Grant Programs          under the          Elementary And Secondary Education Act          as amended by the          No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
<p>Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07                      <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07</p>		
<p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:          Maryland State Department of Education</p>		
<p>Address:          200 West Baltimore Street          Baltimore, Maryland 21201</p>		
<p>Person to contact about this report:</p>		
<p>Name: Dr. Ronald A. Peiffer, Deputy State Superintendent for Academic Policy</p>		
<p>Telephone: 410-767-0473</p>		
<p>Fax: 410-333-2275</p>		
<p>e-mail: rpeiffer@msde.state.md.us</p>		
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):          Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick</p>		
		<p>Friday, March 7, 2008, 10:05:43 AM</p>
<p>Signature</p>		<p>Date</p>

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2006-07**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A timeline and framework for reviewing academic standards have been developed and will be implemented with State Board approval. Every five years standards will be reviewed in a process that will ensure standards are aligned to national standards and reflect current research.

At the high school level in reading English/language arts and mathematics Maryland has worked with Achieve Inc. to raise the rigor of high school standards assessments and curriculum and align expectations with the demands of postsecondary education and work. An Algebra II Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC) and a high school English VSC have been developed by Maryland's teachers and representatives from higher education that aligns with the expectations for college and work readiness. Each of these VSC documents has been reviewed by Achieve Inc. for rigor, focus, coherence, specificity and measurability, and compared to the American Diploma Project (ADP) standards to ensure that the State standards align with the expectations for college and the workplace. According to the review, Maryland's standards present student learning expectations that are intellectually demanding and well aligned with the ADP Benchmarks in English language arts (April 2007) and Mathematics (June 2007).

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

#### ASSESSMENTS IN MATHEMATICS AND READING/LANGUAGE ARTS:

Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts Grades 3-8 -

-No changes to Maryland's regular assessment Grades 3-8

-Administer a modified achievement assessment beginning in March 2009 for Grades 3-8

Algebra/Data Analysis and English - End of Course High School Exams that are used as the NCLB High School measure -

-Administer a modified achievement assessment beginning in May 2008

-Eliminate the constructed response items from the regular assessment by May 2009

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

**1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There have been no changes nor are any changes planned for the academic achievement standards in reading and mathematics.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 science curriculum and assessment. The proposed assessment limits were identified and presented to the Maryland state science supervisors on December 7, 2005. These assessment limits were used to develop the science assessment that was field tested statewide in grades 5 and 8 in the spring of 2007. This field test provided data to set standards for the operational assessment that will satisfy the NCLB requirement to be administered in the spring of 2008. A science component has been added to the ALT-MSA at grades 5 and 8 and high school. The science component of the ALT-MSA was field testing in 2007 and will be in operation in 2008.

Teachers from across the State were involved in range finding activities for the purpose of scoring during the summer of 2007. Content review occurred during the fall of 2007 again with the assistance of teachers who are both content experts and have experience with students in the grade range of the assessment.

The grade 10-12 science assessment requirement is being fulfilled by the end-of-course assessment in high school biology. Those students who entered grade 9 in 2005 or later must also earn a passing score to meet their high school graduation requirements. The standards for the advanced score on their high school biology assessment were established by a peer review committee during October 2007. These standards were then reviewed and adjusted by an articulation committee that met December 10, 2007. These standards will be presented to the State Board for acceptance at their January 2008 meeting. A modified form of the High School Assessment in biology will be administered in May 2008 for the two percent of students with IEPs that have been identified by the local school system.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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](http://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.

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."

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State *NCLB* assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for *NCLB* mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who were tested in mathematics. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and it does not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	442480	440175	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1656	1645	99.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	23614	23578	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	170021	168479	99.1
Hispanic	35288	35125	99.5
White, non-Hispanic	211897	211348	99.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	55131	54456	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13451	13401	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	149981	148636	99.1
Migratory students	28	27	96.4
Male	226957	225518	99.4
Female	215519	214657	99.6

**Comments:** There is a difference between the number of all students tested (440,175) and the number for whom a proficiency level was assigned (as reported by grade level) in 1.3.1 (currently 438,881). The difference of 1,294 more participants represents 1,292 recently arrived LEP students who have attended schools in the US for fewer than twelve months, plus 6 students whose test booklets were lost by our testing vendor, and minus 4 records missing race/gender codes in the student data. Section 1.2 and 1.3 will not agree since the instructions are different for each section. Instructions for Section 1.2 includes LEP recently arrived students who have attended schools in the US for fewer than 12 months while Section 1.3 instructions EXCLUDES recently arrived students who have attended schools in the US for fewer than 12 months.

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13545	24.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36290	66.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4621	8.5
Total	54456	
<p><b>Comments:</b> Maryland's SWD tested count of 54,456 includes 7 students that were also recently arrived LEP students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Section 1.3.1 instructions state "DOES NOT include recently arrived LEP students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months." The count provided is accurate based on the CSPR instructions.</p> <p>54,456 - 54,449 = 7 student difference</p>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	440146	437923	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1650	1640	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	23633	23566	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	168054	166614	99.1
Hispanic	34770	34579	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	212038	211524	99.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	54827	54207	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12663	12527	98.9
Economically disadvantaged students	147819	146523	99.1
Migratory students	30	30	100.0
Male	225247	223881	99.4
Female	214898	214042	99.6

**Comments:** There is a difference between the number of all students tested (437,923) and the number for whom a proficiency level was assigned (as reported by grade level) in 1.3.2 (currently 436,471). The difference of 1,452 more participants represents 1,420 recently arrived LEP students who have attended schools in the US for fewer than twelve months, plus 33 students whose test booklets were lost by our testing vendor (have no proficiency levels), and minus 1 record missing race/gender codes in the student data.

Section 1.2 and 1.3 will not agree since the instructions are different for each section. Instructions for Section 1.2 includes LEP recently arrived students who have attended schools in the US for fewer than 12 months while Section 1.3 instructions EXCLUDES recently arrived students who have attended schools in the US for fewer than 12 months.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts 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.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13156	24.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36430	67.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4621	8.5
Total	54207	
<p><b>Comments:</b> Maryland's SWD tested count of 54,207 includes 7 students that were also recently arrived LEP students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Section 1.3.1 instructions state "DOES NOT include recently arrived LEP students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months." The count provided is accurate based on the CSPR instructions.</p> <p>54,207 - 54,195 = 12 student difference (7LEP students in the US fewer than 12 months plus 5 students missing test booklets lost by our testing vendor.</p>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State *NCLB* assessments.

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does not include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	58962	46467	78.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	190	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3250	3030	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	22310	14786	66.3
Hispanic	5083	3662	72.0
White, non-Hispanic	28080	24799	88.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7330	4029	55.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2575	1609	62.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21868	14275	65.3
Migratory students	6	2	33.3
Male	30184	23458	77.7
Female	28778	23009	80.0
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	58975	47602	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	241	194	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3243	2970	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22333	15744	70.5
Hispanic	5072	3721	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	28086	24973	88.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7336	4585	62.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2546	1635	64.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21864	14976	68.5
Migratory students	6	3	50.0
Male	30187	23408	77.5
Female	28788	24194	84.0
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59769	51494	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	234	203	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3388	3248	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22493	17322	77.0
Hispanic	5137	4177	81.3
White, non-Hispanic	28516	26544	93.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7851	4917	62.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2231	1569	70.3
Economically disadvantaged students	21887	16711	76.4
Migratory students	7	7	100.0
Male	30778	26257	85.3
Female	28990	25237	87.1
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59770	51488	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	234	203	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3371	3200	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22505	17458	77.6
Hispanic	5134	4147	80.8
White, non-Hispanic	28526	26480	92.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7860	5290	67.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2188	1513	69.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21872	16636	76.1
Migratory students	8	4	50.0
Male	30784	25766	83.7
Female	28986	25722	88.7
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61242	48153	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	160	77.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3288	3068	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22861	15173	66.4
Hispanic	5156	3681	71.4
White, non-Hispanic	29730	26071	87.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7905	4080	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1768	981	55.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21564	13962	64.8
Migratory students	3	1	33.3
Male	31249	24007	76.8
Female	29992	24146	80.5
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61209	47134	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	153	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3276	2956	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	22870	14727	64.4
Hispanic	5148	3423	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	29709	25875	87.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7909	4189	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1735	749	43.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21554	13275	61.6
Migratory students	3	1	33.3
Male	31238	23238	74.4
Female	29971	23896	79.7
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	62177	44961	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	251	163	64.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3247	2972	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23792	13752	57.8
Hispanic	4896	3195	65.3
White, non-Hispanic	29990	24879	83.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8041	3253	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1455	661	45.4
Economically disadvantaged students	21974	12070	54.9
Migratory students	4	2	50.0
Male	31941	22291	69.8
Female	30235	22670	75.0
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.8 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	62158	47790	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	188	74.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3234	2938	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23790	15442	64.9
Hispanic	4890	3337	68.2
White, non-Hispanic	29991	25885	86.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8049	3795	47.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1417	623	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21961	13416	61.1
Migratory students	5	3	60.0
Male	31946	23705	74.2
Female	30211	24085	79.7
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63842	39503	61.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	143	60.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3271	2896	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	25099	10322	41.1
Hispanic	4827	2503	51.9
White, non-Hispanic	30406	23639	77.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8097	2476	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1182	351	29.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21770	8592	39.5
Migratory students	1	0	0.0
Male	33030	19780	59.9
Female	30811	19723	64.0
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.10 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63848	45093	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	170	71.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3250	2836	87.3
Black, non-Hispanic	25130	13883	55.2
Hispanic	4811	2860	59.5
White, non-Hispanic	30420	25344	83.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8120	2995	36.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1147	295	25.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21785	11139	51.1
Migratory students	1	0	0.0
Male	33040	22192	67.2
Female	30808	22901	74.3
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	64954	37281	57.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	133	54.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3240	2752	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	25507	9206	36.1
Hispanic	4631	2054	44.4
White, non-Hispanic	31331	23136	73.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8069	2196	27.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1153	334	29.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21368	7484	35.0
Migratory students	4	0	0.0
Male	33272	18388	55.3
Female	31682	18893	59.6
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.12 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	64974	44645	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	163	66.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3227	2725	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	25552	13535	53.0
Hispanic	4625	2568	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	31325	25654	81.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8091	2850	35.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1120	258	23.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21393	10594	49.5
Migratory students	4	0	0.0
Male	33288	21433	64.4
Female	31686	23212	73.3
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	67935	47556	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	152	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3629	3182	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	26166	12878	49.2
Hispanic	4770	3020	63.3
White, non-Hispanic	33141	28324	85.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7156	2671	37.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1745	823	47.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17404	9194	52.8
Migratory students	2	2	100.0
Male	34346	23886	69.6
Female	33589	23670	70.5
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.14 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65537	46936	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	156	70.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3652	2984	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	24164	13466	55.7
Hispanic	4226	2450	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	33274	27880	83.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6830	2492	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	954	220	23.1
Economically disadvantaged students	15212	8035	52.8
Migratory students	3	0	0.0
Male	32601	21828	67.0
Female	32936	25108	76.2
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified as correct.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1361	1050	77.2
Districts	24	7	29.2
<b>Comments:</b> Data verified as correct.			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	373	256	68.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	316	213	67.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	57	43	75.4
<b>Comments:</b> There is one additional Title I school in Maryland, 30-0328 Southwest Baltimore Charter School. Southwest Baltimore Charter School has students in K-2, no students participated in the Maryland Assessments.			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

**Note:** New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
24	7	29.2
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>1</sup>
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1\\_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 approves Annual Updates. Approved Updates contain the mid-course corrections that are necessary to improve student achievement.

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

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

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

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

The Restructuring Implementation Technical Assistance (RITA) Initiative was developed in January 2007 by the Program Improvement and Family Support (PIFS) Branch in the Division of Student Family and School Support (DOSFSS). This initiative is part of MSDE's Statewide System of Support for schools in improvement. Specifically, the RITA Initiative targets those schools that have been in Restructuring Implementation status of school improvement for three or more years. The RITA process is designed to assist Restructuring Implementation schools in identifying programs and systems that are effective in advancing student achievement and programs and systems that need to be improved or eliminated in order to ensure delivery of an effective education for students in the Maryland Public School System.

RITA addresses that requirement for Restructuring Implementation schools by establishing school support teams of skilled and experienced educators to provide struggling schools with practical applicable technical assistance in order to increase the opportunity for all students to meet the State's academic content and student achievement standards. RITA team members are charged with reviewing and analyzing all facets of the school's operation, collaborating with school staff, district staff, and parents to design, implementing, and monitoring the school improvement plan, monitoring the implementation of the plan, and providing feedback to the district and the school about the effectiveness of the entire school program.

The primary function of the RITA Team is to identify obstacles to improve teaching and learning for all students by reviewing student achievement data and intermediate progress measures; visiting classrooms; and interviewing teachers, principals, district staff; and parents, family, and community leaders. Based on RITA's nine standards and accompanying indicators, the RITA team shall issue a written report. The report will include recommendations for improvement for the school and school district. After the school and district receive the report the school district will have thirty days to respond to each recommendation for improvement.

The Breakthrough Center

A team of MSDE Assistant Superintendents under the direction of the Deputy State Superintendent for Instruction and Academic Acceleration met monthly to enhance the design of Maryland's system of school support. The new design will coordinate the

existing work and services generated throughout the Department, create efficiencies in their execution, and provide clarity and cohesiveness around their outcomes. The improved statewide system of support will be called The Breakthrough Center. The Breakthrough Center will focus on its mission to provide a framework for intervention in underperforming districts and schools that is coordinated across the Maryland State Department of Education Divisions. It will deploy resources consistent with need, which will have direct impact on student and school performance, and establish measures for effectiveness.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	5
Extension of the school year or school day	8
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	6
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	2
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	31
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1\\_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 State Board Meeting Prince George's was designated a school system in Corrective Action. 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. 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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	1
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	10/04/07	10/04/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		
<b>Comments:</b> Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations of schools was done at two levels. Elementary and Middle schools were notified on June 6 2007. High schools were notified on August 14 2007.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	177	96
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	10/04/07
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds**

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Priorities in allocating funds to school:

MSDE allocates these funds to each school system with schools in improvement, corrective actions, and restructuring. Schools exiting improvement do not receive these funds. Systems are required to complete an application containing the following components: Executive Summary, Needs Assessment, Plan of Operation, Measuring Progress, Coordination of Resources and Sustainability, Management Plan, and Key Personnel, Budget Narrative, Proposed Budget (C-1-25), General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), and General Assurances. An MSDE team reviews each application to ensure the funds are used to address the identified need of the participating school(s).

Methods for distributing these funds: (formula)

School systems with between 1 to 7 schools in school improvement receive \$100 thousand per school. This amount is subtracted from the total allocation first. The remaining funds are divided among the school systems with greater than 7 schools in school improvement.

Types of activities supported by the funds:

School systems have had an array of activities to support their schools in improvement. Some activities are as follows: summer programs, providing professional development to teachers while instructing students; Supplemental Educational Services; reading consultants for monthly Saturday Training sessions and classroom observations; teacher specialist to implement professional development; consultants for math and reading to conduct model lessons at grade levels and debrief with teachers; conduct data gathering sessions to identify student needs; plan instruction to address specific needs bi-weekly grade level specific data results meetings; examination of the VSC; examine accommodations and modifications; and consultants to conduct onsite demonstration lessons to assist teachers in adopting scientifically based teaching strategies.

Source – Manual input by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	98
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	82
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	44664
Who applied to transfer	1497
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	1373

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>No</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2868222
<b>Comments:</b> Revised on 2/26/08 due to Harford County clarifying that choice was paid out of local dollars.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	76
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

#### FAQ about supplemental education services

*How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"?* States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	24834
Who applied for supplemental educational services	12483
Who received supplemental educational services	10948
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 10980914
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	122653	100875	82.2	21778	17.8
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	6331	4191	66.2	2140	33.8
Low-poverty schools	5722	5427	94.8	295	5.2
All elementary schools	23250	19592	84.3	3658	15.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	16144	10229	63.4	5915	36.6
Low-poverty schools	25873	23040	89.1	2833	10.9
All secondary schools	99403	81283	81.8	18120	18.2

**Comments:** Elementary teachers prior to the 2006-07 school year were reported with multiple classes. We received guidance from the U.S. Department of Education to report one record for regular teachers and special area teachers in self-contained classrooms to avoid over-duplication of classes at the elementary level. This decreased the number of classes for elementary schools.

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/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.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded 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]
- c. *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].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the 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 of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *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.
- f. *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 the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

### 1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are **NOT** highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
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	22.1
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	8.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	67.7
Other (please explain)	1.5
Total	100.0

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	17.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	8.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	72.1
Other (please explain)	1.8
Total	100.0
<b>Comments:</b> Other includes certified teachers who are teaching in a grade that is not included in their certification.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	62.2	17.4
Poverty metric used	Eligible for free/reduced price meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
Secondary schools	47.2	12.5
Poverty metric used	Eligible for free/reduced price meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four 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.
- b. *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 through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs** (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

**Note:** Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's 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>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
0	Dual language			
0	Two-way immersion			
0	Transitional bilingual			
0	Developmental bilingual			
0	Heritage language			
12	Sheltered English instruction			
2	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
10	Content-based ESL			
19	Pull-out ESL			
17	Other (explain)			

**Comments:** 17 LEA's reported using Push-in ESL and 7 LEA's reported using Newcomer Program as the type of program. The Newcomer Programs include all newly enrolled LEP students and all received Title III funds.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	34332
<b>Comments:</b> We have aligned the data points for 1.6.2. The number in Section 1.6.2.1 of students who receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K - 12 include 1, 010 students who enrolled after the ELP testing window had started and were given the diagnostic/placement test and received Title III services until the end of the school year. Thirty-four thousand, three hundred thirty-two (34,332) students as noted in Section 1.6.2.1 compose the comprehensive total of all students who received Title III services for the school year. Thirty-three thousand, three hundred twenty-two (33,322) students as noted in Section 1.6.3.1.2 compose the number of students who were enrolled during the administration of the ELP test.	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	22516
French	1475
Chinese	1314
Korean	1241
Vietnamese	916

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

#### 1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

##### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

##### Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

<b>ALL LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	29782
Not tested/State annual ELP	3540
Subtotal	33322
LEP/One Data Point	12829
<b>Comments:</b> See the comment in Section 1.6.2.1. the state counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for the "No Progress" is the "Subtotal" in Section 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:**

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

<b>Title III LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	29782
Not tested/State annual ELP	3540
Subtotal	33322
LEP/One Data Point	12829
<b>Comments:</b> See the comment in Section 1.6.2.1. the state counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for the "No Progress" is the "Subtotal" in Section 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

**1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs** (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of 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.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	40.0	20738	71.0	Y
No progress		12584		
ELP attainment	30.0	9116	53.0	Y
<b>Comments:</b> See the comment in Section 1.6.2.1. The number who did not make progress is according to the directions given and is accurate.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

### 1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number 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.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress	40.0	20738	71.0	Y
No progress		12584		
ELP attainment	30.0	9116	53.0	Y
<b>Comments:</b> See the comment in Section 1.6.2.1. The number who did not make progress is according to the directions given and is accurate.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

**1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results** (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

**1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility**

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP)** (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

**Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:****1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

**2. Total MFLEP =** State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	12521
MFLEP/AYP grades	6773
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades** (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

**Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:****1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	17257
LEP HS/Non-AYP	4533
LEP other grades	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language** (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

\* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given** (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
<b>Comments:</b> MD does not offer native language mathematic assessments.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given** (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
<b>Comments:</b> MD does not offer native language reading/language arts assessments.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

##### Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
<b>Comments:</b> MD does not offer native language mathematic assessments.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

##### Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
<b>Comments:</b> MD does not offer native language reading/language arts assessments.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored** (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 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. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
6486	6035	12521
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics** (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6370	4435	69.6	1935

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts** (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6773	4424	65.3	2349

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance** (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) reserved funds for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	23
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	22
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	1
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability** (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs** (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students** (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

- 1. Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301 (6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
- 2. Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = 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. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
- 3. 3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
17417	14121	9

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

**Comments:**

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

**Note:** This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds** (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

#### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

**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.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	943
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	943
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	589

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**  
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Professional Development Activity** = Subgrantee activities for professional development required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	22	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	23	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	15	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	16	
Other (Explain in comment box)	7	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	21	3877
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	19	21027
PD provided to principals	15	678
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	16	518
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	16	714
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	11	312
Total		27126
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

##### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/06	07/01/06	0
<b>Comments:</b> The rationale for "0 days delay" is that the LEA sub-grantees are informed that the funds are available and are awarded with a start date of July 1.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

N/A See the comment in Section 1.6.7.1
---

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	5
<b>Comments:</b> Six schools were originally named as persistently dangerous, one school closed (Highlandtown Middle School).	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
All Students	85.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	82.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	78.9
Hispanic	81.3
White, non-Hispanic	89.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	76.8
Limited English proficient	85.4
Economically disadvantaged	81.8
Migratory students	100.0
Male	82.5
Female	88.4
<b>Comments:</b> Data has been verified as correct.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* 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.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* 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.

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5.4
Hispanic	5.0
White, non-Hispanic	2.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5.6
Limited English proficient	1.2
Economically disadvantaged	3.1
Migratory students	4.6
Male	4.4
Female	2.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

*What is a dropout?* A dropout is 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.

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	13	13
LEAs with subgrants	11	11
Total	24	24
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)**

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	75	254
K	230	468
1	221	549
2	179	561
3	178	533
4	142	527
5	127	517
6	115	597
7	86	589
8	91	580
9	71	672
10	33	372
11	21	334
12	27	307
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1596	6860

**Comments:** The total for grades K-12:

#of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants = 1521

# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants = 6606

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	134	1313
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1171	4654
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	46	105
Hotels/Motels	170	534
Total	1521	6606

**Comments:** These figures do not include Pre-K.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	250
K	457
1	541
2	551
3	524
4	518
5	512
6	582
7	585
8	567
9	662
10	362
11	333
12	300
Ungraded	0
Total	6744
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	251
Migratory children/youth	10
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1148
Limit English proficient students	160
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	9
2. Expedited evaluations	1
3. Staff professional development and awareness	9
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
5. Transportation	10
6. Early childhood programs	3
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	8
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	7
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	9
12. Counseling	1
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
15. School supplies	10
16. Referral to other programs and services	5
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	0
2. School Selection	0
3. Transportation	1
4. School records	1
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	1
7. Other Barriers	3
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	440	270
4	422	294
5	435	242
6	506	269
7	446	196
8	464	190
High School	364	146
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	437	242
4	428	290
5	435	229
6	511	213
7	445	123
8	471	101
High School	484	169
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS**

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Please note that in submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

**FAQs on Child Count:**

*How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

*How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	74
K	20
1	29
2	15
3	8
4	16
5	13
6	16
7	12
8	12
9	11
10	5
11	8
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	306
Total	546
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	9
1	10
2	9
3	4
4	4
5	4
6	7
7	5
8	3
9	5
10	1
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	80
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Key reasons for decrease in Category 2 count:

1. Continue to have a decrease of eligible school age students and the increase of single male workers
2. Drought conditions limited available work
3. Limited housing for families
4. The largest migrant camp continues to limit families, housing families in Virginia
5. Price of gasoline has made travel prohibitive for many families
6. Immigrant issues - families are afraid to move

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MIS2000 is used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

This is the same system used for the last reporting period.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Collected and maintained the same as Category 1 count

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland operates a central database. All COE forms are processed at the State Migrant Education Service Center. All data (enrollments, withdrawals, supplemental programs, needs assessments) submitted to the Center are entered and maintained in one system (MIS2000). (Trained migrant recruiters can only complete COEs.) COEs are sent to the Center and reviewed by the State Data Specialist. The Specialist is responsible for input into MIS2000. The Specialist searches the database using the information on the DOE to determine if an existing record is on file. If no record is found then the existing student number is issued by the system. If a record is found then the existing student number is used. The record is reviewed to verify a change in the Last Qualifying Move Data-if no change has occurred only one COE remains on file. Student's enrollment is evaluated annually. Students are not counted automatically from one year to the next. The recruiter/advocate and local summer recruiters are required to visit the family at least once a year to determine eligibility.

Summer program staff received in-service prior to opening of programs outlining required documentation. Program checklists are sent to administrators to remind them of submission requirements.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data is collected and maintained the same as category 1.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MIS 2000 logic used to produce Maryland's Count:

Select distinct count (distinct schlhist.studentseq) from ":MIS2000:student" student0

For a given student you can, and most likely will, have multiple school enrollments.

In many cases, several of a student's enrollments will fall within the twelve-month reporting period.

The word "distinct" as used in context of the above sentence will count only one of several possible matches based on the criteria outlined below

MIS2000:student refers to that part of the database containing "one time" information on students such as name, address, etc.

":MIS2000:schlhist" schlhist0

MIS2000:schlhist refers to that part of the database containing multiple occurrences of school related information (school history lines) associated with a particular student record. This includes the School ID, enrollment date, withdrawal date, etc.

Where student0.StudentSeq=schlhist0.StudentSeq

This statement is linking, for example, Juan Garcia's student Record with his related school history records.

The !StartDate and !EndDate fields referenced below contain the beginning and ending dates of the performance report period. These dates are usually September 1st of a given year and August 31st of the following year.

The following statements check certain dates to ensure that at least one of them is within the twelve-month report period therefore establishing that the child was there for one or more days.

And ((schlhist0.FundingDate>=!StartDate and schlhist0.Funding Date <=!EndDate)

Determines if Funding Date is within the period

or

(schlhist0.WithdrawDate>=!StartDate and schlhist0.WithdrawDate<=!EndDate)

Determines if Withdraw Date is within the period

or

(schlhist0.LQMDate>=!StartDate and schlhist0.LQMDate <=!EndDate)

Determines if LQM Date is within the period

or

(schlhist0.ResDate>=!StartDate and schlhist0.ResDate <=!EndDate))

Determines if Residence Date is within the period

In addition to satisfying one of the above date criteria, the following statements must all be true before the student is counted.

And (schlhist0.LQM3Date>=!StartDate)

LQM3Date is the last qualifying move date plus 3 years. This date is compared with the report period start date and must be equal to or greater than to ensure that the student had at least one day of eligibility remaining during the report period.

And (student0.ThirdBDay<=!EndDate)

The ThirdBDay field is the date the student will be three years Old and is compared with the end of the report period to ensure that the child turned three before the end of the period.

And (student0.TwentySecondBDay>=!StartDate)

The TwentySecondBDay field is the date the student will turn twenty two and is

compared with the start of the report period to ensure that the student was still eligible. There is a filter on this report for "Type=S." Maryland gives summer Students with migrant-funded supplemental programs an SH type of "S". So the "Type=S" filter is added to the above logic to generate the A-2 count.

In addition, the enrollment type field must contain an "S" for the student to be counted as a summer school enrollment.

#### Definitions

LQM3Date is the date on which the student's End of Eligibility (EOE) is reached.

Start Date and End Date allow the user to enter variable dates at runtime.

Maryland used a start date of September 1st and an end date of August 31st of funding year on this A-1 count report.

Funding Date is a field that MIS 2000 uses to find students who don't have an enroll date. Funding date equals enroll date if there is an enroll date. If there is no enroll date, funding date equals the residency date on that particular school history line.

StudentSeq is a number that MIS 2000 assigns to each student in the database to

uniquely identify each student.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Use of the same system (MIS2000)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State in-service training is provided for all recruiters preseason and during the season. Staff development is critical to ensure that all recruiters understand the process for identification and recruitment as well as how and when a child can be enrolled into a program.

The COE arrives at the Service Center and is reviewed, by the Data Specialist (Maryland's Data Specialist is the State Director's Administrative Specialist III) and the State Director if necessary. The Data Specialist uses a COE checklist with every COE, if the COE needs additional clarification, the recruiter completing the form is called for clarification and the COE is sent back if additional information is needed (using the COE correction form) . This process may result in the need for another interview and completion of another COE with an attachment sheet. The State Director requires re-interviews for validation of any COE that appear in question, or the recruiter could not give sufficient information.

If the Director deems the COE invalid, the recruiter is informed of the decision during the discussion with the recruiter. Invalid COE forms are not entered into the State Data Base. This season one COE was deemed not eligible during the review process and did not get enrolled into the system or into a program supported by MEP Funds.

Random Sampling of new COEs is being done this season to monitor the quality of work as well as determine training needs.

Any student that has been in Maryland's system (MIS2000) is checked against the local system enrollment information to assure that there in fact was a break in residency from the district or state.

The following data elements are searched to ensure that duplicate entries do not exist on an individual child: Student Name, Birth date, Parent/Guardian, and Place of Birth.

To determine is a child that if 2 years old turned 3 before leaving the state the Data Specialist runs a Performance A-1 Exception Report. This report is part of the validations run prior to the completion of the annual performance report.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland is in the process of random sampling of the new COEs from the summer of 2007. All COEs were reviewed for accuracy. Several families were interviewed that did not meet the requirements and the COE was never completed nor the students served. The State Director and the Data Specialist reviewed enrollments at each Center to assure that all students served had been identified on a qualifying COE.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland has one central database. Enrollment information is validated on a regular basis. Child count data is monitored using Snap Reports. (Reports that have been prewritten for use in MIS 2000 that runs temporary table of all data elements)

List of Snap Reports

This list of MIS2000 Snap reports is used to validate for our Performance Report.

Table I Population Data Table III MEP Participation Table IV School Data

Count Regular Count

A-1 List Regular G-1 List Random Sample List for

State Recruiter

B-1 List Regular G-2 List

C-1 List Regular G-3 List List for Re-Enrollment list generated of students that were here in the regular school year)

D-1 List Regular G-4 List

E-1 List Regular G-5 List Summer Identified for local programs

E-2 List Regular G-6 List

E-3 List Regular G-8 List Student List by Facility for local Boards of Education

E-4 List Regular G-10 List

Ethnicity

Homebase Summer Count

Summer H-1 List

Table II Academic Status Summer H-2 List

Grade/age Summer H-3 List

Summer H-4 List

Summer H-5 List

Summer H-6 List

Summer H-8 List

Summer H-10 List

(All of these reports are used to validate student enrollment and insure accurate counts - they enable staff to review data and correct any missed information or items that were "human error" in data entry)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Summer enrollment flag is attached to students who receive direct services. Students who do not meet the requirements for summer enrollment are residency enrolled.

A student list is generated showing summer enrollment flags but not having supplemental service reported. The student missing supplemental service was checked against the summer sites attendance rosters and supplemental input form. Students that were missing input information are updated: students that did not receive services had the summer flag removed and counted in Category 1.

Missing information reports are generated to ensure grade race and sex codes are entered on all eligible students. The data specialist runs a report after COE forms are input or after student data is updated to see if information is missing. If there is information missing then a list of students and the missing information is sent to the recruiter by the data specialist to obtain the information. The recruiter obtains the information then sends it back to the data specialist.

Summer services in Maryland only are provided after the regular school year. Enrollment into a summer program must correspond to the summer start dates. That is to say that a summer enrollment date cannot be before the approved project start date.

MIS 2000 system allows for the compiling and editing of data used to generate Category 1 and Category 2 child counts. The system assures unduplicated count and eliminates the margin of human error.

Migrant students are enrolled in regular program and the migrant child advocate validates enrollment and attendance. Updates are done on a monthly basis.

The State Director reviews the data reports. Monthly meetings with recruiters and the Data Specialist allows for continued staff development and validation of data.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No corrective actions were identified for eligibility determinations.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.