MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES

Making AYP Determinations for No Child Left Behind

UPDATED April 2011

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Maryland State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
www.marylandpublicschools.org

FOREWORD

The *Implementation Procedures for Making AYP Determinations for No Child Left Behind* articulate, in detail, the procedures that the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) will follow to meet the accountability requirements of the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. This document serves as a procedural reference to MSDE and local school system staff to ensure consistent implementation. In its entirety, the *Implementation Procedures* document explains how Maryland's accountability system will both measure and support the achievement of adequate yearly progress (AYP).

The State Board of Education on April 29, 2003, authorized the State Superintendent of Schools to complete and disseminate procedures that govern Maryland's implementation of its statewide system of accountability for schools, school systems, and the State. This document was first distributed in May 2003. As Maryland moves through the implementation process and the U.S. Department of Education further interprets the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*, the *Implementation Procedures* are revised accordingly.

The Maryland State Department of Education takes pride in its nationally recognized accountability system and looks forward to further improving this accountability system through *No Child Left Behind* implementation. The *Implementation Procedures* satisfy the high accountability standards set by *No Child Left Behind* and assist the State, school systems, and schools in achieving adequate yearly progress for all students. These procedures may be found on the Department's Web site at www.marylandpublicschools.org.

Nancy S. Grasmick
State Superintendent of Schools
Maryland State Department of Education

Implementation Procedures for Making AYP Determinations for No Child Left Behind

Table of Contents

Attachments

1. Determining Starting Points

1.1. ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

1.1.1. Assessing All Students

Schools and school systems will test all students and measure progress of those enrolled for the full academic year on the aggregate and by the following subgroups as required by federal law beginning in 2011: Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, Two or more races, free and reduced-price meals (FARMS), special education, and limited English proficient (LEP)**.** Prior to 2011 the subgroups were: American Indian, Asian, African American, White, Hispanic, FARMS, special education, and LEP. Individual student reports are distributed to parents and indicate the student's actual performance on the assessment.

All students with disabilities are tested. Students pursuing a course of study based on Maryland content standards participate in the administration of Maryland School Assessments and the algebra/data analysis and English 2 end-of-course exams. Students pursuing an alternate course of study based on their Individualized Education Program (IEP) participate in Maryland's alternate assessment, Alt-MSA. Students in excess of the allowable 1%, by definition, will be classified as performing at the basic level and their scores will be combined with the results from the MSA and for determining AYP at the school, LEA and state levels. Modified assessments (Mod-MSA*) were administered to qualifying students in high school for the first time in June 2008, to students in grades 6-8 for the first time in 2009, and to students in grades 3-5 in 2010. The Mod-MSA is based on modified achievement standards aligned with the state's content standards. Maryland includes the proficient scores from the Mod-MSA in calculating AYP and caps the scores at 2% of the total tested population. Prior to full implementation of the Mod-MSA for all eligible students, an appeals process took into consideration the impact that the planned Mod-MSA would have had on AYP if a modified assessment had been administered.

Students eligible for taking the modified academic achievement assessments will be counted according to the following criteria:

- Not more than 2% of students at the LEA and state level will be classified as achieving at the proficient or advanced level according to modified academic assessment performance standards. These scores will be combined with results from the MSA and Alt-MSA for determining AYP at the school, LEA and state levels.
- Students in excess of the allowable 2%, by definition, will be classified as performing at the basic level and their scores will be combined with the results from the MSA and Alt-MSA for determining AYP at the school, LEA and state levels.
- If the LEA or the State exceeds the 2% threshold of proficient or advanced performers on the modified academic achievement assessment, then a strategic randomization procedure will be applied to determine which student scores will be converted to "basic" and attributed back to the school, LEA and/or state for the purposes of calculating AYP.

*Mod-MSA includes modified high school assessments.

Students with limited English proficiency (LEP) and non-English-proficiency (NEP) are required to participate in assessments. The tests required and the inclusion of scores in Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculations are covered below.

- Reading MSA Requirement—A student enrolled for at least a full calendar year in a U.S. school will meet student participation requirements in reading MSA by taking the English language proficiency assessment. This student would not be included in AYP calculations for performance for the Reading MSA.

- Math MSA Requirement—A student enrolled for at least a full calendar year in a U.S. school meets student participation requirements in math by sitting for the math MSA. The school would not be required to include this student's score when determining AYP for performance. Students participating in the math MSA are eligible to receive appropriate accommodations as determined in their LEP Plan.

- Exited LEP Students—Exited LEP students' scores on MSA reading and math assessments must be included in AYP calculations for the LEP subgroup for two years following their exit from active LEP services.

Test proctors must provide LEP and NEP students with the opportunity to take the assessments with appropriate accommodations, including the following NEP accommodations:

- Test proctors will be required to observe the student as he or she takes the assessment to determine the extent to which the student is able to perform with comfort and in a productive manner.
- If, after attempting several test questions, the proctor finds that the student is unable to complete the test, the proctor will be directed to terminate the student's testing session.
- At the close of testing, the test booklet will then be returned to the vendor for scoring along with all other completed student assessment booklets.
- The student will receive the score achieved during the testing session. The score will be included in AYP calculations for the school in which the student is enrolled as well as the school system and the state if the student meets the full academic year requirement (see 3.3.1).

  This procedure will ensure that the student is not subjected to undue stress during the testing situation while permitting an opportunity to at least preliminarily gauge the extent to which the student's language limitations affect his or her ability to perform in the assessment.

1.1.2. Measuring Student and School Performance in Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8

The MSA are administered in grades 3 through 8. In school year 2002-2003, the assessments were administered for the first time in grades 3, 5, and 8. Achievement levels were established by the State Board of Education in July 2003. Starting points were set separately for reading and mathematics at each grade level (3, 5, and 8).

In school year 2003-2004, the assessments were administered for the first time in grades 4, 6, and 7. Achievement levels were established by the State Board of Education in July 2004. Starting points were set separately for reading and mathematics at each grade level (4, 6, and 7). MSA results from grades 4, 6, and 7 were included in 2005 AYP calculations; they were not included in 2004 AYP calculations as the proficiency levels for grades 4, 6, and 7 were set after 2004 AYP calculations were made.

1.1.3. Measuring Student and School Performance in High School Reading

Prior to 2002-2003, Maryland did not administer a reading assessment in the 10 through 12 grade band. Maryland administered the MSA in grade 10 reading in school years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. This test was also administered in January 2005 to a limited number of students in schools following a 4-period-day schedule. Achievement levels were established by the State Board of Education in July 2003. Starting points were established for grade 10 reading in July 2003 based on results of the first administration.

In August 2004, the State Board of Education authorized the State Superintendent and Maryland State Department of Education to merge the Grade 10 reading MSA with the English Grade 9 High School Assessment to create the English 2 High School Assessment. The English 2 assessment was administered for the first time in May 2005 to students completing their second high school English credit. (For most students, this is grade 10.) The State Board of Education set performance standards and proficiency levels for the English 2 assessment in 2005. The 2005 AYP starting point was calculated based on combining the May 2005 administration of English 2 results and the limited number of students in the four-period day schedule taking the reading grade 10 assessment in January 2005. Results from the 2005 English 2 assessment were included in 2005 AYP calculations. In 2006, the AYP starting point was recalculated utilizing only the May 2005 administration of English 2 as the baseline.

The test merger saved the Maryland State Department of Education time and money on test development and scoring and reduced testing time at the high school level by a minimum of three hours of annual instructional time. The English 2 High School Assessment meets the high school reading test requirement associated with the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and fulfills the English assessment requirement identified in Maryland regulations for graduation requirements.

1.1.3.1. Calculations of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Reading

The majority of Maryland students take the English 2 course, and therefore the English 2 assessment, in grade 10. Some students take the English course and assessment earlier. If a student takes the English 2 assessment in a school for which high school level reading is not included in the school's AYP calculation (e.g., an eighth grader taking the assessment in a middle school), the student's score and participation will count toward the AYP calculation for reading at the local school, school system and state levels when the student enters high school.

1.1.4. Measuring Student and School Performance in High School Mathematics

Maryland began using algebra/data analysis—an end-of-course assessment—to measure high school mathematics in the 2005-06 school year. The MSA in algebra/data analysis is based on the tenth-grade level course and is a graduation requirement for all students (Attachment I: Office of the Attorney General correspondence). Achievement levels were established by the State Board of Education in October 2005. Starting points were established for the MSA in algebra/data analysis using the 2004-05 school year algebra/data analysis results. Prior to the 2005-06 school year, Maryland used the end-of-course geometry assessment as the mathematics measure.

1.1.4.1. Calculations of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in High School Math

The majority of Maryland students take the algebra/data analysis course, and therefore the assessment in algebra/data analysis, in high school. Some students take the algebra/data analysis course and assessment earlier. If a student takes the assessment in algebra/data analysis in a school for which high-school level math is not included in the school's AYP calculation (e.g., an eighth grader taking the assessment in a middle school), the student's score and participation will count toward the AYP calculation for mathematics at the local school, school system and state levels when the student enters high school.

1.2. Other Academic Indicators

1.2.1. Elementary and Middle Schools

1.2.1.1. Attendance Rate will be the other academic measure for elementary and middle schools. In order to make AYP decisions and announcements in a timely matter, attendance rates are calculated based on attendance data from the first three quarters of the school year.

1.2.1.2. Setting the Performance Standard for Attendance

In 1989 Maryland defined the satisfactory school performance standard for attendance in its school accountability program. Schools were deemed to be performing at the satisfactory level if their aggregate attendance rate was 94% or higher. This measure will be used as the other academic measure for AYP. For purposes of AYP, subgroups, schools, school systems, and the state will be expected to achieve a proficiency level of at least 94% at the end of school year 2013-2014. A separate starting point based on 2002 results was set at each grade level for grades 1-12. Disaggregated attendance rates are incorporated into Safe Harbor determinations for elementary and middle schools.

1.2.2. High Schools

1.2.2.1. Graduation Rate is the other academic measure for high schools as specified in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

2003-2010
From 2003-2010, Maryland used the National Center for Education Statistics synthetic graduation rate formula.

$$GR_i = \frac{G_i}{G_i + D_i + D_{(i-1)} + D_{(i-2)} + D_{(i-3)}}$$

Where: GR_i is the graduation rate for a given year (i) between 2002 and 2014
- G_i is the number of students achieving a regular high school diploma (excluding special education certificates, GEDs, and other non-standard diplomas) for year i.
- D_i is the number of dropouts in grade 12 for year i.
- $D_{(i-1)}$ is the number of dropouts in grade 11 for the first previous year (i-1).
- $D_{(i-2)}$ is the number of dropouts in grade 10 for second previous year (i-2).
- $D_{(i-3)}$ is the number of dropouts in grade 9 for the third previous year (i-3).

2011
In 2011, Maryland will use a cohort graduation rate for AYP calculations for the "all students" group only for the state, school systems, and schools.

Definitions:
Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate:
As required by 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(i)-(iv), Maryland defines the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. Students entering the grade 9 for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently adjusted by adding any students who transfer into the cohort later during grade 9 and the next three years and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during that same period.

For schools with grade configurations other than the traditional 9-12, the definition is adjusted accordingly. For those schools that do not have five years of data, attendance rate will be the other academic indicator. For schools with a grade 12 that have more than four grades (e.g. K-12 or 7-12), the four-year graduation rate is calculated as it is for high schools with only four grades, by taking the number of first-time grade 9 students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class.

The following definitions are used for counting students:
Regular High School Diploma: The standard high school diploma awarded to students in Maryland is fully aligned with the Maryland academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Dropout:	Students leaving school not otherwise classified as completers or transfers (see transfers out) prior to completion.
Transfers in:	From other schools, LEAs, states, or countries.
Transfers out:	To other schools, LEAs, states, or countries requires documentation.
Death:	Self-explanatory.

Calculations: The adjusted cohort graduation rate (GR) is calculated according to formula 1 below.

$$GR = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} G_i}{C_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (I_i - O_i - D_i)}$$

Where: i = year and n = number of years the cohort is tracked – 4 or 5
C_1 = Number of students entering grade 9 for the first time in year 1
G_i = Number of students awarded a regular diploma in year i
I_i = Number of students transferring into a school in year i
O_i = Number of students transferring out with documentation in year i
D_i = Number of students who died in year i

The four-year rate is calculated by setting n to the value of 4.

$$GR_4 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} G_i}{C_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{4} (I_i - O_i - D_i)}$$

Extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate: Students tracked for five years after first entry into grade 9 comprise the cohort for calculating the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

$$GR_5 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{5} G_i}{C_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{5} (I_i - O_i - D_i)}$$

Lagged rates to include summer graduates: Lagged rates including summer graduates during the fourth year involve adjusting the cohort for summer student events. Students awarded regular high school diplomas are added to the numerator (G_s). Students transferring in (I_s) are added to the denominator. Students transferring out with documentation (O_s) or are deceased (D_s) are subtracted from the denominator.

$$GR_{4L} - \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^{4} G_i) + G_s}{C_1 + [\sum_{i=1}^{4}(I_i - O_i - D_i)] + I_s - O_s - D_s}$$

1.2.2.2. Setting the Performance Standard for Graduation

In July 2003, the State Board of Education established a graduation rate performance standard of 90% based on the NCES formula. The performance standard represents the expected graduation rate for satisfactory performance for subgroups, schools, LEAs, and the state. The methodology for setting the performance standards was the same as was used to set the attendance standard. For purposes of AYP, subgroups, schools, LEAs and the state were expected to achieve at least this proficiency level by the end of school year 2013-2014. Maryland used an N of 30 for determining graduation rate for the all students group for 2010. Disaggregated graduation rates are incorporated into Safe Harbor determinations for high schools. (Attachment II: Establishing Standards for Maryland's School Systems: A Systematic Approach)

In 2011, Maryland will use a cohort graduation rate for the all students group for the State, school systems, and schools. Standards for 2011 for the cohort graduation rate were set by the State Board of Education in March 2011 using data from 2009. Standards will be revisited for 2012 as Maryland moves to including disaggregated subgroups in the calculation of graduation rate for AYP.

Definitions:

Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate:

As required by 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(i)-(iv), Maryland defines the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. Students entering the grade 9 for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently adjusted by adding any students who transfer into the cohort later during grade 9 and the next three years and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during that same period.

For schools with grade configurations other than the traditional 9-12, the definition is adjusted accordingly. For schools with fewer than four grades (10-12 or 11-12), the adjusted cohort graduation rate is modified to reflect the number of grades for the school. Three-year or two-year adjusted cohort graduation rates are used. For schools with a grade 12 that have more than four grades (e.g. K-12 or 7-12), the four-year graduation rate is calculated as it is for high schools with only four grades, by taking the number of first-time grade 9 students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class.

The following definitions are used for counting students:
Regular High School Diploma: The standard high school diploma awarded to students in Maryland is fully aligned with the Maryland academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Dropout:	Students leaving school not otherwise classified as completers or transfers (see transfers out) prior to completion.
Transfers in:	From other schools, LEAs, States, or Countries.
Transfers out:	To other schools, LEAs, States, or Countries requires documentation.
Death:	Self-explanatory.

Calculations: The adjusted cohort graduation rate (GR) is calculated according to formula 1 below.

$$GR = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} G_i}{C_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (I_i - O_i - D_i)}$$

Where: i = year and n = number of years the cohort is tracked – 4 or 5
C_1 = Number of students entering 9th grade for the first time in year 1
G_i = Number of students awarded a regular diploma in year i
I_i = Number of students transferring into a school in year i
O_i = Number of students transferring out with documentation in year i
D_i = Number of students who died in year i

The four-year rate is calculated by setting n to the value of 4.

$$GR_4 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{4} G_i}{C_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{4} (I_i - O_i - D_i)}$$

Extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate:
Students tracked for five years after first entry into grade 9 comprise the cohort for calculating the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

$$GR_5 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{5} G_i}{C_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{5} (I_i - O_i - D_i)}$$

Lagged rates to include summer graduates:
Lagged rates including summer graduates during the fourth year involve adjusting the cohort for summer student events. Students awarded regular high school diplomas are added to the numerator (G_s). Students transferring in (I_s)

are added to the denominator. Students transferring out with documentation (O_s) or are deceased (D_s) are subtracted from the denominator.

$$GR_{4L} = \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^{4} G_i) + G_s}{C_1 + [\sum_{i=1}^{4}(I_i - O_i - D_i)] + I_s - O_s - D_s}$$

The 2011 AMO for the cohort graduation rate will be used for one year only and will apply to the all students group only. In 2012, as required by federal rules, AYP will be based on graduation rates for disaggregated subgroups by race and special services as well as the aggregated all students group. The subgroups are: Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races as well as three special services subgroups: Free and Reduced Priced Meals (FARMS), Special Education, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP). In order for the 2011 AYP determinations to be applied appropriately, a standards-setting process was conducted to project AMOs and goals through 2020. The State Board of Education approved cohort graduation standards for 2011 in March 2011 and plans to revisit cohort graduation rate standards in 2011 for 2012 when federal law requires that the graduation rate be disaggregated and included in AYP calculations. The State Board of Education also set the 2011 AYP standard for the cohort dropout rate for the 2010 graduating class for the very limited number of high schools unable to produce adequate data to support a cohort graduation statistic.

Standards for the aggregated graduation rate for 2011 were set using graduation data from 2009 and a process involving key stakeholders, the recommendation of the State Superintendent of Schools, and approval by the Maryland State Board of Education. Maryland will use a minimum group size of 30 students (N of 30) for graduation rate in determining AYP for the all students group for 2011.

For 2011, the graduation requirement can be met by one of the following methodologies:

A calculation is first made to determine if the 2010 AMO is met for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. If unable to meet this AMO, a calculation is made to determine if the 2011 AMO is met for the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. If unable to meet this AMO, a calculation is made to determine if growth in the cohort graduation rate has occurred over the previous year. The 2011 four-year cohort growth target is determined by a calculation method similar to the one used in 2010 using the NCES or leaver graduation rate. This methodology is described above under Measuring Progress for 2010.

Standards setting for 2011 involved the determination of the following:

	Cohort Graduation Rate	Standard Set	Cohort Dropout Rate	Standard Set
2010	4-year cohort rate for 2010 graduating class*	81.5%	4-year cohort dropout rate for 2010 graduating class	13%
2011	5-year cohort rate for 2011 graduation class	84.4%	N/A	
2020	2020 Goal used to set four-year cohort rate** 2020Goal used to set five-year cohort rate	95% 97%	2020 Goal used to set cohort dropout rate	1%

* This will be a lagged rate and will include the summer 2010 graduates.

**This includes the 2019 four-year cohort graduation rate goal (because lagged four-year graduation rates will be used for AYP in 2020, the 2019 four-year rate will be used in 2020 AYP determinations.) and the 2020 five-year cohort graduation rate goal. (By definition, the 2020 five-year cohort graduation rate will essentially track the non-graduates from the 2018-2019 senior year an additional year.)

In 2011, Maryland will report the four-year graduation rate in the aggregate and disaggregated by subgroups as required by federal law. The 2011 report will include the results of assessments for the 2010-11 school year and the graduation rate based on the four-year cohort rate for the class of 2010.

For the 2012 cohort graduation rate, Maryland will calculate AYP on the basis of disaggregated subgroups by race/ethnicity, using the seven race/ethnicity subgroups required by federal law, and three special services subgroups: FARMS, special education, and LEP. Standards for 2012 will be set in late fall of 2011 for the all students groups, the seven race/ethnicity subgroups, and the three special services subgroups. Standards and supporting documentation will be submitted to USDE for review following approval by the Maryland State Board of Education. Maryland anticipates using a minimum group size of 30 students (N of 30) for graduation rate for the all students group and disaggregated subgroups in determining AYP.

For 2012, the graduation requirement can be met by applying a three-step process as follows to each of the subgroups and the all students group:

A calculation is first made to determine if the 2011 AMO is met for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. If unable to meet this AMO, a calculation is made to determine if the 2012 AMO is met for the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. If unable to meet this AMO, a calculation is made to determine if growth in the cohort graduation rate has occurred over the previous year. The 2012 one-year growth is determined by a calculation method comparing cohort results of 2010 with results of 2011. This methodology is described above under Measuring Progress for 2010. Maryland will apply this three-step process to the all students group and to each subgroup. If by the end of the three-step process, the all students group and all the subgroups have met the target, then the graduation rate target will be fully met.

The standards-setting process will determine the following:

	Cohort Graduation Rate	Standard Set	Cohort Dropout Rate	Standard Set
2011	4-year cohort rate for 2011 graduation class*	TBD	4-year cohort dropout rate for 2011 graduation class	TBD
2012	5-year cohort rate for 2012 graduation class	TBD	N/A	
2020	2020 Goal	TBD	2020 Goal	TBD

*This will be a lagged rate and will include the summer 2011 graduates.

For 2012, Maryland will report the Leaver Rate, the Four-Year Cohort Rate, and the Five-Year Cohort Rate, all in aggregated and disaggregated form.

The following table displays the Annual Measurable Objectives through 2020 that were reviewed by the State Board and served as the basis for discussion and subsequent approval of the 2011 graduation rate standards:

2011-2020 Annual Targets for
Cohort Graduation Rate AYP Determinations for the All Students Group

Measure	2011*	2012	2013	2014*	2015	2016	2017*	2018	2019	2020*
4-Yr. Cohort Grad Rate	81.5	81.5	81.5	86.0	86.0	86.0	90.5	90.5	90.5	95.0
5-Yr. Cohort Grad Rate	84.4	84.4	84.4	88.6	88.6	88.6	92.8	92.8	92.8	97.0

*Federal rules permit stepwise increases in 2011 and 2014, with Maryland extending the stepwise progression through 2017 and 2020.

1.2.2.3. Dropout Rate is the other academic measure for high schools administering the Alternative MSA (Alt-MSA) as their only performance measure because they have no graduation rate. It is the number and percentage of students who leave school for any reason, except death, before graduation or completion of a Maryland approved educational program and who are not known to enroll in another school or state-approved program during the current school year. The dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of students in grades 9-12 served by the school. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer and students dropping out of evening high school and other alternative programs. Students who re-enter school during the same year in which they dropped out of school are not counted as dropouts.

From 2003-2010, Maryland used the event dropout rate for the current year. Beginning in 2011, Maryland will replace the event dropout rate with the cohort dropout rate. The State Board of Education set standards for 2011 in March of 2011 for the cohort dropout rate when it is used as the other

academic measure for those high schools administering the Alt-MSA as their only performance measure.

The following definitions are used for counting students:
Dropouts are defined as students leaving school not otherwise classified as completers or transfers (see transfers out) prior to completion.

Dropouts:	Students leaving school not otherwise classified as completers or transfers (see transfers out) prior to completion.
Transfers in:	From other schools, LEAs, states, or countries.
Transfers out:	To other schools, LEAs, states, or countries with required documentation.
Death:	Self-explanatory.

Calculations: The adjusted cohort dropout rate (CDO) is calculated according to the formula below.

$$CDO = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} DO_i}{C_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (I_i - O_i - D_i)}$$

Where: i = year and n = number of years the cohort is tracked – 4
C_1 = Number of students entering grade 9 for the first time in year 1
DO_i = Number of students dropping out in year i
I_i = Number of students transferring into a school in year i
O_i = Number of students transferring out with documentation in year i
D_i = Number of students who died in year i

The adjusted cohort for the cohort dropout rate which includes summer activity is the same as the adjusted cohort for the 4-year lagged graduation rate.

1.2.2.4. Setting the Performance Standard for Dropout Rate
Maryland used the event dropout rate through 2010 in the following manner: In 1989 Maryland defined the satisfactory school performance standard for dropouts in its school accountability program. Schools were deemed to be performing at the satisfactory level if their aggregate dropout rate was 3.00% or lower. This measure was used as the other academic measure for AYP for schools administering the Alt-MSA as their only assessment. For purposes of AYP, subgroups, schools, school systems, and the state were expected to achieve a proficiency level of at least 3.00% at the end of school year 2013-2014. Separate starting points based on 2004-2005 school year were set at each grade level of 9-12 (see chart below). Disaggregated dropout rates are incorporated into Safe Harbor Determinations for High Schools administering the Alt-MSA as their only assessment.

AMOs for Dropout Rates 2005-2010

AMO %	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
K-12 and 9-12	3.81	3.81	3.81	3.54	3.54	3.54	3.27	3.27	3.27	3.00

Beginning in 2011, Maryland will use the four-year cohort dropout rate in the same manner as the event dropout rate was used previously with high schools administering the Alt-MSA as their only assessment. Standards for 2011 were ~~will be~~ set in late winter of 2011 for the cohort dropout rate.

	Cohort Dropout Rate	Standard Set
2010	4-year cohort dropout rate for 2010 graduating class	13%
2011	N/A	
2020	2020 Goal used to set cohort dropout rate	1%

The following table displays the Annual Measurable Objectives through 2020 that were reviewed by the State Board and served as the basis for discussion and subsequent approval of the 2011 dropout rate standard.

2011-2020 Annual Targets for
Cohort Dropout Rate AYP Determinations for the All Students Group

Measure	2011*	2012	2013	2014*	2015	2016	2017*	2018	2019	2020*
4-Yr. Cohort Dropout Rate	13.0%	13.0%	13.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	1.0%

*Federal rules permit stepwise increases in 2011 and 2014, with Maryland extending the stepwise progression through 2017 and 2020.

2012

All the above procedures will be expanded to subgroups in 2012. In fall 2011, Maryland will reset the 2012 Annual Measurable Objective based on the adjusted four-year cohort graduation rate. Standards for the graduation rate will be set for the all students group and for disaggregated subgroups by race/ethnicity, using the seven race/ethnicity subgroups required by federal law, and three special services subgroups: FARMS, special education, and LEP.

2. Setting Starting Points for AYP Measures

Given the wide variation in grade structures in schools, Maryland decided to use a single set of starting points for each unique grade structure. The starting points were computed by averaging the starting points across grades for each AYP component—reading, mathematics, and attendance. Thus, a school's starting points were calculated by averaging all applicable starting points based on the grade structure and enrollments within grades of the school. This methodology ensures that all schools are held to meeting all appropriate AYP targets.

2.1. CALCULATING STARTING POINTS

2.1.1. Including All Public Schools and School Systems

Public school regulations apply to all public school students, all public schools, all local public school systems in Maryland, and alternative education programs and schools operated by local school systems, juvenile institutions, nonpublic schools, the Maryland School for the Blind, the Maryland School for the Deaf, and The SEED School of Maryland which public school students are attending. Public school student means a student enrolled in a local public school system and attending a public school, an alternative education program, or alternative school operated by a local school system, a juvenile institution, a nonpublic school, the Maryland School for the Blind, the Maryland School for the Deaf, or The SEED School of Maryland. Data from public school students attending for less than a full academic year (alternative education programs operated by local school systems, juvenile institutions, nonpublic schools, the Maryland School for the Blind, the Maryland School for the Deaf, or The SEED School of Maryland) are included in the performance reports of the school system. Data from public school students attending for a full academic year alternative schools operated by local school systems, juvenile institutions, nonpublic schools, the Maryland School for the Deaf, the Maryland School for the Blind, or The SEED School of Maryland are included in the performance reports of the attending school, the school system, and the state.

2.1.2. Methods of Calculating Starting Points

The starting points for academic assessments and attendance rate were determined by the following methodology:

- Compute the percent proficient for each subgroup separately for reading, mathematics, and attendance rate at each grade level using all students. Identify the lowest performing subgroup separately for each AYP component.

- Rank the schools from lowest to highest separately for reading, mathematics, and attendance rate at each grade level. Identify the performance (percent proficient or attendance rate) for the school at the 20^{th} percentile in terms of enrollment separately for reading, mathematics, and attendance at each grade level.

- Select the higher of the two as the starting point (SP).

These computations yielded separate starting points for each grade level and AYP component. The grade level starting points were used to compute three starting points – reading, mathematics, and attendance rate for each school.

Graduation Rate
For AYP purposes, for the time period 2003 through 2010, the starting point for graduation rate was computed using graduates in grade 12 and the annual grade-specific dropout rate for grades 9-12 according to NCES' synthetic completion rate formula. The starting point for graduation rate for schools with grade 12 but without the full complement of grades 9-12 was computed based on the available grades. Starting points for schools with grade structures including two or more assessed grades were computed by taking the weighted average of the grade-specific starting points for reading and mathematics separately and the unweighted average of the grade-specific attendance across all grades.

Beginning in 2011, Maryland will use the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Standards for 2011 were set in March 2011 by the State Board of Education. In fall 2011, Maryland will reset the 2012 Annual Measurable Objective based on the adjusted four-year cohort graduation rate and other substitute rates as described in the procedures and will apply to subgroups for AYP determinations. Standards for the graduation rate will be set for the all students group and for disaggregated subgroups by race/ethnicity, using the seven race/ethnicity subgroups required by federal law, and three special services subgroups: FARMS, special education, and LEP.

2.1.3. Data Used to Determine the School Specific Starting Points

The data sources for the components for determining the school specific starting points are summarized in Table A. Reading and mathematics starting points for grades 3, 5, and 8 were based on the 2003 MSA. Reading and mathematics starting points for grades 4, 6, and 7 were based on the 2004 MSA. In the 2005-06 school year, algebra/data analysis replaced geometry as the high school mathematics measure. The starting point for high school math was then recalculated using the 2004-05 school year algebra/data analysis results. The 2005 starting point for high school reading was calculated by combining the May 2005 administration of English 2 results and the limited number of students in the four-period day schedule taking the reading grade 10 MSA in January 2005. In 2006 the starting point for high school reading was recalculated utilizing the May 2005 administration of English 2 as the baseline.

2.1.4. Determining Attendance Rates for Each Grade Level

Attendance rate starting points for each of the grade levels were determined by the three-step process outlined above. For example, in grade 1 in 2002, economically disadvantaged students (free and reduced-priced meals) had the lowest attendance rate of all subgroups (93.78%). This figure was lower than the attendance rate (94.18%) of the school at the 20^{th} percentile in terms of enrollment. Therefore, 94.18% was established as the starting point for grade 1. Table A includes the source of the starting point determination for attendance by grade level in parentheses.

2.1.5. Starting Point Calculations

2.1.5.1. Data Sources for Each Starting Point

Table A summarizes the data sources for each starting point.

Table A

Starting Point Determinations for Each Grade Level*

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
1			94.18 (20th %ile)	
2			94.54 (20th %ile)	
3	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.75 (20th %ile)	
4	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)	
5	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)	
6	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	93.42 (20th %ile)	
7	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	92.92 (20th %ile)	
8	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	92.48 (20th %ile)	
9			91.08 (20th %ile)	80.99 (20th %ile)*
10	2005 English 2		92.13 (20th %ile)	
11			91.81 (20th %ile)	
12		2006 Algebra	90.43 (20th %ile)	
Ungraded Elementary			89.03 (20th %ile)	
Ungraded Secondary			87.75 (20th %ile)	

***Graduation Rate standards were reset in March 2011 as Maryland transitions to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the all students group in 2011. A second standards setting will take place in fall 2011, as Maryland plans to use subgroup cohort graduation rates for AYP determinations beginning in 2012. The 2011 four-year cohort graduation rate AMO for the all students group is 81.5%. In fall 2011, the AYP procedures for 2012 will be revised to reflect the addition of subgroup accountability for graduation rate beginning in 2012, based on new 2012 cohort graduation rate standards to be set in late 2011. (See page 15 for AMOs for cohort graduation rates 2011-2020.)**

2.1.5.2. Typical Elementary Schools With Grades K through 5

For elementary schools with a typical K-5 grade structure, the three starting points applicable to the school are the weighted average of the grade 3, 4, and 5 starting points for reading and mathematics computed separately and the unweighted average of the grade 1-5 attendance rate starting points (Table B).

Table B

Starting Points for K-5 Elementary Schools

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance
1			94.18 (20th %ile)
2			94.54 (20th %ile)
3	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.75 (20th %ile)
4	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)
5	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)
Starting Point	**Weighted Average of grades 3, 4, and 5**	**Weighted Average of grades 3, 4, and 5**	**94.55 (unweighted average)**

2.1.5.3. Typical Middle Schools With Grades 6 through 8

For middle schools with the typical grade structure of 6-8, the starting points are the separate starting points for reading and mathematics based on the grade 6,7, and 8 assessments and the unweighted average of the grade 6 though 8 attendance rate starting points (Table C).

Table C

Starting Points for Typical Grades 6-8 Middle School

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance
6	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	93.42 (20th %ile)
7	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	92.92 (20th %ile)
8	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	92.48 (20th %ile)
Starting Point	**Weighted Average of grades 6,7, and 8**	**Weighted Average of grades 6, 7, and 8**	**92.94 (unweighted average)**

2.1.5.4. Typical High Schools with Grades 9 through 12

For high schools with the typical 9-12 grade structure, the three starting points are the separate starting points for reading and mathematics based on the English 2 end-of-course assessment, the algebra/data analysis end-of-course assessment, and graduation rate (Table D).

Table D

Starting Points for Typical Grades 9-12 High School

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Graduation Rate
9			80.99 (20th %ile)*
10	2005 English 2		
11			
12		2006 Algebra	
Starting Point	**2005 English 2**	**2006 Algebra**	**80.99 20th %ile***

***Graduation Rate standards were reset in March 2011 as Maryland transitions to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the all students group in 2011. A second standards setting will take place in fall 2011, as Maryland plans to use subgroup cohort graduation rates for AYP determinations beginning in 2012. The 2011 four-year cohort graduation rate AMO for the all students group is 81.5%. In fall 2011, the AYP procedures for 2012 will be revised to reflect the addition of subgroup accountability for graduation rate beginning in 2012, based on new 2012 cohort graduation rate standards to be set in late 2011. (See page 15 for AMOs for cohort graduation rates 2011-2020.)**

2.1.5.5. Elementary/Middle Schools With Grades K through 8

For elementary/middle schools with the typical K-8 grade structure, the three starting points were computed by finding the weighted average of the grade 3 through 8 starting points for reading and mathematics separately and the unweighted average of the grade 1 though 8 attendance rate starting points (Table E).

Table E

Starting Points for Typical Grades K-8 Schools

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance
1			94.18 (20th %ile)
2			94.54 (20th %ile)
3	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.75 (20th %ile)
4	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)
5	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)
6	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	93.42 (20th %ile)
7	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	92.92 (20th %ile)
8	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	92.48 (20th %ile)
Starting Point	**Weighted Average of grades 3 through 8**	**Weighted Average of grades 3 through 8**	**93.95 (unweighted average)**

2.1.5.6. Schools With Grades K through 12

For elementary/middle/high schools with the typical K-12 grade structure, four starting points are applicable: reading, mathematics, attendance, and graduation rate (Table F)

Table F

Starting Points for K-12 Schools

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
1			94.18 (20th %ile)	
2			94.54 (20th %ile)	
3	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.75 (20th %ile)	
4	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)	
5	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)	
6	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	93.42 (20th %ile)	
7	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	92.92 (20th %ile)	
8	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	92.48 (20th %ile)	
9			91.08 (20th %ile)	80.99 (20th %ile)*
10	2005 English 2		92.13 (20th %ile)	
11			91.81 (20th %ile)	
12		2006 Algebra	90.43 (20th %ile)	
Starting Point	**Weighted Average of grades 3 through 8 and English 2**	**Weighted Average of grades 3 through 8 and Algebra**	**93.09 (unweighted average)**	**80.99 (20th %ile)***

***Graduation Rate standards were reset in March 2011 as Maryland transitions to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the all students group in 2011. A second standards setting will take place in fall 2011, as Maryland plans to use subgroup cohort graduation rates for AYP determinations beginning in 2012. The 2011 four-year cohort graduation rate AMO for the all students group is 81.5%. In fall 2011, the AYP procedures for 2012 will be revised to reflect the addition of subgroup accountability for graduation rate beginning in 2012, based on new 2012 cohort graduation rate standards to be set in late 2011. (See page 15 for AMOs for cohort graduation rates 2011-2020.)**

2.1.5.7. Atypical Structures

There are three types of schools that present unique challenges: Schools lacking grades in which assessments are administered, high schools without a complete complement of grades 9-12, and alternative high schools administering only the Alt-MSA.

2.1.5.7.1. Schools lacking assessed grades are held accountable for student performance based on their students' first assessed grade in the next school the students attend. For example, a K-2 school is held accountable for the academic performance of their students in grade 3 at their subsequent school. The attendance measure is computed based on the unweighted average for each of the grades present in the school. In this example, the attendance measure would be the unweighted average of grade 1 and 2. Thus, a K-2 school's AYP determination in 2003 would be based on the grade 3 performance of students who last

attended the school in school year 2001-2002 and the attendance rate of students in the school in the 2002-2003 school year.

2.1.5.7.2. High schools lacking the full complement of grades 9-12 fall into two categories: schools with grade 12 and schools without grade 12. For schools with grade 11-12 structures, three starting points were applicable: algebra/data analysis, attendance, and a modified graduation rate based on grades 11 and 12 (Table G). For schools lacking grade 12 but including grade 10, three starting points can be computed: reading, attendance, and geometry (Table H).

Table G

Starting Points for Schools with Grade 12

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
11			91.81 (20th %ile)	80.99 (20th %ile)*
12		2006 Algebra	90.43 (20th %ile)	
Starting Point		**2006 Algebra**	**91.12 (unweighted average)**	**80.99 (20th %ile)***

***Graduation Rate standards were reset in March 2011 as Maryland transitions to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the all students group in 2011. A second standards setting will take place in fall 2011, as Maryland plans to use subgroup cohort graduation rates for AYP determinations beginning in 2012. The 2011 four-year cohort graduation rate AMO for the all students group is 81.5%. In fall 2011, the AYP procedures for 2012 will be revised to reflect the addition of subgroup accountability for graduation rate beginning in 2012, based on new 2012 cohort graduation rate standards to be set in late 2011. (See page 15 for AMOs for cohort graduation rates 2011-2020.)**

Table H

Starting Points for Schools without Grade 12

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
9			91.08 (20th %ile)	
10	2005 English 2		92.13 (20th %ile)	
11			91.81 (20th %ile)	
Starting Point	**2005 English 2**	**2006 Algebra**	**91.67 (unweighted average)**	

2.1.5.7.3. High schools administering only the Alt-MSA

A small number of alternative high schools serve student populations for whom the Alt-MSA is the only appropriate assessment. For these schools, graduation rate is not an appropriate other academic indicator for AYP; therefore, the other academic indicator for alternative high schools administering only the Alt-MSA is dropout rate (Table I).

Table I

Starting Points for High Schools Administering Only Alt-MSA

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance Rate	Dropout Rate
9	**2004 Alt-MSA**	**2004 Alt-MSA**		
10	**2004 Alt-MSA**	**2004 Alt-MSA**		
11	**2004 Alt-MSA**	**2004 Alt-MSA**		
12	**2004 Alt-MSA**	**2004 Alt-MSA**		
Starting Point	**Weighted Average**	**Weighted Average**		**(20th %ile)***

*Cohort dropout rate standard was reset in March 2011 as Maryland transitions to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the all students group in 2011. The 2011 four-year cohort dropout rate AMO for the all students group is 13.0%. (See page 17 for AMOs for cohort dropout rate 2011-2020.)

2.1.5.8. LEAs and the State

The state and each LEA have four starting points: reading, mathematics, attendance, and graduation rate (Table J). Maryland used the same procedure that was used for elementary/middle/high schools with the typical K-12 grade structure (Table F).

Table J

Starting Points for LEAs and the State

Grade	Reading Percent Proficient	Mathematics Percent Proficient	Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate
1			94.18 (20th %ile)	
2			94.54 (20th %ile)	
3	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.75 (20th %ile)	
4	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)	
5	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	94.64 (20th %ile)	
6	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	93.42 (20th %ile)	
7	2004 MSA	2004 MSA	92.92 (20th %ile)	
8	2003 MSA	2003 MSA	92.48 (20th %ile)	
9			91.08 (20th %ile)	80.99 (20th %ile)*
10	2005 English 2		92.13 (20th %ile)	
11			91.81 (20th %ile)	
12		2006 Algebra	90.43 (20th %ile)	
Ungraded Elementary			89.03 (20th %ile)	
Ungraded Secondary			87.75 (20th %ile)	
Starting Point	**Weighted Average of grades 3 through 8 and English 2**	**Weighted Average of grades 3 through 8 and Algebra**	**92.41 (unweighted average)**	**80.99 (20th %ile)***

***Graduation Rate standards were reset in March 2011 as Maryland transitions to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the all students group in 2011. A second standards setting will take place in fall 2011, as Maryland plans to use subgroup cohort graduation rates for AYP determinations beginning in 2012. The 2011 four-year cohort graduation rate AMO for the all students group is 81.5%. In fall 2011, the AYP procedures for 2012 will be revised to reflect the addition of subgroup accountability for graduation rate beginning in 2012, based on new 2012 cohort graduation rate standards to be set in late 2011. (See page 15 for AMOs for cohort graduation rates 2011-2020.)**

2.1.6. Accountability for Newly Created Schools in their First Year

Newly created schools are held to the same annual measurable objectives as all schools with the same grade structure and, thus, in the first year of operation, subgroup and school level AYP decisions will be based on comparisons of the school and subgroup performance levels with the statewide annual measurable objectives. Safe Harbor cannot be applied for a newly created school in its first year as there is no previous data for the school.

2.2 ENSURING 100% PROFICIENCY BY 2013-2014

Ensuring that 100% of students achieve proficiency by school year 2013-2014 is accomplished by the following methodology:

- **Compute the annual targets so that 100% of students achieve proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.** By applying the general formula below separately for reading at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and mathematics at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, expectations for growth were established.

(2) $$ATi = SP + \left\{ (Yi - 2002) \left[\frac{(100 - SP)}{(2014 - 2002)} \right] \right\}$$

Where: *ATi* is the annual target for a given year between 2003 and 2014.
SP is the starting point for any grade and content combination.
Yi is the year between 2003 and 2014 for which the annual target is to be computed.

The same general formula was used for reading at grade 10. However, the baseline year was 2003 instead of 2002. Beginning in 2005, the same general formula was used for English 2; the baseline year was 2005. (The 2005 AYP starting points for high school reading were calculated based on combining the May 2005 administration of English 2 results and the limited number of students in the 4-period day schedule taking the reading grade 10 assessment in January 2005. In 2006, AYP starting points were recalculated utilizing only the May 2005 administration of English 2 as the baseline. In school year 2005-06 algebra/data analysis replaced geometry as the high school mathematics measure. The starting points for high school mathematics were recalculated using the 2004-05 school year algebra/data analysis results.)

- Application of the above methodology ensures that at the end of school year 2013-2014 all students must achieve proficiency.

3. Setting Intermediate and Annual Measures

3.1 INTERMEDIATE GOALS

Intermediate goals were set for school years 2004-2005, 2007-2008, 2010-2011, and 2013-2014 based on formula 2 page 21 resulting in equal growth expectations over the 12-year period.

- Intermediate Goal 2004-2005:

$$IG_{2005} = SP + \left\{ 3 \left[\frac{(100 - SP)}{(2014 - 2002)} \right] \right\} \tag{3}$$

- Intermediate Goal 2007-2008:

$$IG_{2008} = SP + \left\{ 6 \left[\frac{(100 - SP)}{(2014 - 2002)} \right] \right\} \tag{4}$$

- Intermediate Goal 2010-2011:

$$IG_{2011} = SP + \left\{ 9 \left[\frac{(100 - SP)}{(2014 - 2002)} \right] \right\} \tag{5}$$

- Final Goal 2013-2014

$$FG_{2014} = SP + \left\{ 12 \left[\frac{(100 - SP)}{(2014 - 2002)} \right] \right\} \tag{6}$$

$$FG_{2014} = 100$$

The intermediate goals for reading grade 10 were computed using the same procedures. However, the baseline year is 2003 instead of 2002. The intermediate goals for English 2 were computed using the same procedures with 2005 as the baseline. The intermediate goals for algebra/data analysis were computed using the same procedures with 2005 as the baseline.

3.2. ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Except for the 2004-2005 intermediate goal, annual measurable objectives for determining AYP were set as equal increments based on the difference between adjacent intermediate goals for the later intermediate goals. During the implementation period for Maryland's assessment system, the annual measurable objective increases at a non-linear rate between 2002 and 2005 to allow schools and school systems time to adjust their instructional strategies to the new standards and assessments. The annual measurable objectives were determined as follows:

- **2002-2003.** For 2002-2003 subgroups, schools, LEAs, and the state were expected to at least maintain 2001-2002 performance levels. The annual measurable objective was equal to the starting point.

- **2003-2004.** For 2003-2004 the annual measurable objective was one third of the difference between the starting point and the 2004-2005 intermediate goal.

(7) $$AMO_{2004} = SP + \left[\frac{\left(IG_{2005} - SP\right)}{3}\right]$$

- **2004-2005.** For 2004-2005 the annual measurable objective was the 2004-2005 intermediate goal.

(8) $$AMO_{2005} = IG_{2005}$$

Table K

Estimated Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO)
For the Typical Elementary, Middle, and High School
2002-2003 through 2013-2014

The following chart displays the percent of students that must be performing at the proficient level in each of reading and mathematics for a school to achieve the Annual Measurable Objective. The chart first shows targets for the state of Maryland and systems (grades K-12 aggregated); subsequent rows show the targets for the typical K through 5 elementary school, for the typical grades 6 through 8 middle school, and for the typical grades 9 through 12 high school. Schools with different grade configurations are calculated based on the AMOs for the tested grades in the school. At the high school level, new AMOs were published when the high school reading test was replaced with the English 2 test administered beginning in the spring of 2005 and when geometry was replaced with algebra/data analysis in the spring of 2006. Any other test changes made in the years ahead will necessitate additional changes in the AMOs. The AMOs for attendance and graduation rates are also provided.

AMO %	2002-2003	2003-2004	**2004-2005**	2005-2006	2006-2007	**2007-2008**	2008-2009	2009-2010	**2010-2011**	2011-2012	2012-2013	**2013-2014**
MD/System Rdg.	43.4	45.9	54.8	59.6	64.7	69.7	74.8	79.8	84.9	89.9	95.0	100
MD/System Math	30.7	34.6	44.1	47.8	54.3	60.9	67.4	73.9	80.4	87.0	93.5	100
K-5 Rdg.	43.8	46.3	57.8	62.5	67.2	71.8	76.5	81.2	85.9	90.6	95.3	100
K-5 Math	41.4	44.1	53.6	58.8	63.9	69.1	74.2	79.4	84.5	89.7	94.8	100
K-5 Attend.	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0
6-8 Rdg.	43.0	45.6	56.7	61.5	66.3	71.1	75.9	80.8	85.6	90.4	95.2	100
6-8 Math	19.0	22.7	35.8	42.9	50.0	57.2	64.3	71.4	78.6	85.7	92.9	100
6-8 Attend.	92.9	93.0	93.2	93.3	93.4	93.5	93.6	93.6	93.7	93.8	93.9	94.0
K-8 Rdg.	43.5	46.1	57.2	62.0	66.7	71.5	76.2	81.0	85.7	90.5	95.2	100
K-8 Math	33.9	36.9	44.7	50.8	57.0	63.1	69.3	75.4	81.6	87.7	93.9	100
K-8 Attend.	93.6	93.6	93.7	93.7	93.8	93.8	93.8	93.9	93.9	93.9	94.0	94.0
9-12 Rdg.*	42.9	45.5	40.0	45.3	52.2	59.0	65.8	72.7	79.5	86.3	93.2	100
9-12 Math*	20.9	27.5	40.7	29.8	38.6	47.3	56.1	64.9	73.7	82.4	91.2	100
9-12 Attend.	91.4	91.6	92.0	92.2	92.5	92.7	92.9	93.1	93.3	93.6	93.8	94.0
K-12 Rdg.*	The AMOs for K-12 reading and K-12 math are the same as the AMOs for the State.											100
K-12 Math*												100
K-12 Attend.	92.9	93.0	93.1	93.2	93.3	93.4	93.5	93.6	93.7	93.8	93.9	94.0
Grad.	80.99	80.99	83.24	83.24	83.24	85.50	85.50	85.50	87.75**	87.75**	87.75**	90.0**

* In the out years, the AMO targets may undergo some slight adjustment based on test substitution at the high school level, but the pace of improvement should be essentially the same.
**Graduation Rate standards will be reset in late February 2011 and again in 2012 as Maryland transitions to the four-year adjusted cohort rate.

3.3. DETERMINING ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

3.3.1. Determining Adequate Yearly Progress for School, School System, or State

All schools and school systems are held to the same AYP criteria. A school, school system, or the state is only accountable for student performance proficiency when the student has been enrolled in the respective school, system, or state from September 30 through the first day of testing or any portion of testing, the **Full Academic Year**.

For end-of-course algebra/data analysis and English 2 assessments, students must be enrolled for the duration of the course: Students taking the course during fall semester must be continuously enrolled from the September 30 enrollment count through January testing; students taking the course during spring semester must be continuously enrolled no later than the fifth day of that semester through May testing; students taking the course during the summer term must be continuously enrolled from the second school day of the course through August testing; students taking the course during a 180-day term must be continuously enrolled from the September 30 enrollment count through May testing.

For MSA in algebra/data analysis (high school math) and English HSA (high school reading), only scores of first time test-takers were included in AYP calculations prior to 2008. Beginning in 2008, Maryland used a status model to report results for high school students on the basis of the student's highest score on the NCLB-required assessments regardless of the grade in which the student took the test. In all other MSA tests, scores of all students participating in testing will be included in AYP. Students moving among schools in same system count for system and state AYP; students moving among systems count for state AYP. Students moving among states do not count for AYP. Maryland's accountability system tracks student enrollment and withdrawals at the school and system level to ensure appropriate school-specific and system-specific accountability for purposes of measuring AYP of students enrolled for full academic year. Under NCLB, a school makes AYP when the following are met:

1. The percentage of students in the aggregate meets or exceeds the annual measurable objective for the other academic indicator (attendance rate or graduation or dropout rate) or if progress is made in the other academic area in the amount of: .01% for dropout rate, .1% for attendance rate. For 2011, the graduation requirement is met if the annual measurable objective (AMO) for 2010 for the four-year cohort graduation rate is met, or the 2011 AMO is met for the five-year cohort graduation rate, or the 2011 four-year cohort growth target is met. The growth target is determined by comparing cohort rates from 2009 and 2010 using a process similar to the one used in 2010. A school's growth in 2010 will be measured against the graduation rate for 2009 to determine if the school is on a trajectory to meet the target by 2014. The trajectory is determined mathematically according to the distance the 2010 graduation rate is from the 2014 goal divided by the number of years left to achieve the goal. Schools are categorized into four equal quarters according to the gap to the goal. If the school falls short of the 2010 expected growth trajectory, then it does not meet the graduation rate target for that year. The growth rate target for schools in a quarter is the incremental change the highest performing school in the quarter needs to achieve annually to reach the state goal by 2014. All schools in a quarter have the same growth target. Growth targets are recalculated annually. Maryland uses an N of 30 for

determining the graduation rate for the all students group. Dropout and graduation rate have precision to two decimal places; attendance rate is published at one decimal point.

2. For students enrolled the full academic year, the percentage in the aggregate achieving at the proficient level separately for reading and mathematics meets or exceeds the annual measurable objectives.
3. The participation rate for the academic assessments in reading and mathematics, computed separately, both in the aggregate and for each subgroup, is 95% or greater.
4. For students enrolled the full academic year, the percentage in each subgroup achieving at the proficient level separately for reading and for mathematics meets or exceeds the annual measurable objective.

   Or, for any subgroup failing to meet the annual measurable objective, the percentage of students in that subgroup achieving below the proficient level decreases by 10%, provided that the subgroup meets or exceeds the annual measurable objective for the applicable other academic indicator or makes progress toward the annual measurable objective for the other academic indicator (Safe Harbor).

3.3.2. The 95% Participation Requirement for Academic Assessments

The participation rate calculation is based on the number of students enrolled on the day of testing. Maryland checks for the 95% participation rate for schools and LEAs in state assessments.

The participation rate is computed for each subgroup, and in the aggregate, for each of the reading and mathematics assessments by dividing the number of students present in each testing group by the number of enrolled students in that group. The participation rate is calculated for each subgroup and for the aggregate separately in each of reading and mathematics assessments where a group includes at least:

i. 30 students for schools with one grade tested,
ii. 60 students for schools with two or more grades tested, or
iii. 60 students for school systems.

Groups not meeting the minimum criteria listed above are not checked for participation rate.

Maryland will use data from the previous two years and the current year to average the participation rate data for a school and/or subgroup. If the average meets or exceeds 95%, the school will meet this AYP requirement. Students will be omitted from the participation rate calculation when such students cannot take the state assessment during the entire testing window, including the make-up dates, because of a significant medical emergency. School systems will maintain appropriate documentation that such students have been determined by a medical practitioner to be incapacitated to the extent they are unable to participate in the appropriate state assessment.

This procedure ensures that subgroups are appropriately included in the participation check, and it protects schools and school systems from the effects of the absences of a few students in very small subgroups.

Students with disabilities pursuing a course of study based on the Maryland content standards must participate in the MSA assessments, including algebra/data analysis, and the end-of-course English 2 assessment, with appropriate accommodations. Their scores will be included in AYP calculations for the school in which the student is enrolled as well as for the school system and the state according to the full academic year criteria. Students with disabilities pursuing a course of study based on alternative goals specified in their IEPs are required to take an alternate assessment. Their scores will be included in AYP calculations for the school in which the student is enrolled as well as for the school system and the state according to the full academic year criteria. No more than 1% of students (by content and grade) at the LEA and state levels can be classified as proficient or advanced by taking the alternative assessment.

Maryland has implemented the Modified-MSA (Mod-MSA) for students with disabilities. The proficient scores from the Mod-MSA will be capped at 2% of the total tested population. Participation rates and performance levels of students with disabilities on the MSA, Alt-MSA, and Mod-MSA are included in AYP determinations. Criteria for identifying students with disabilities for the Mod-MSA are contained in Attachment III.

Students with limited English proficiency (LEP) and non-English proficiency (NEP) who meet full academic year criteria are included in the participation check and will have their scores included for AYP determinations. Test proctors must provide LEP and NEP students with the opportunity to take the assessments with appropriate accommodations, including termination of the exam for any NEP students unable to perform.

In sum, Maryland ensures maximum participation on assessments by requiring 95% participation of all students and subgroups. Maryland enters "basic scores" for the number of students with disabilities taking alternative assessments and earning proficient or advanced scores that exceeds 1% of the student population and for the number of students with disabilities taking the Mod-MSA and earning proficient or advanced scores that exceeds 2% of the total tested population at the LEA and state level.

3.3.3. Determining Intermediate Goals and Annual Objectives

Intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives were determined separately for reading, mathematics, and attendance at each grade level using data at the state level. Each measure, reading, mathematics, and attendance, has a single value for each grade that is applicable to all schools. The intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives for individual schools were computed by averaging the grade specific intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives across the grades present in a school. The averages are unweighted.

Graduation rate intermediate goals and annual objectives were determined for the specific grade structures of schools with grade 12. Currently there are two sets of schools: typical high schools with grades 9-12 and technical high schools with grades 11 and 12.

3.3.4. Minimum Group Size for AYP Determinations for Subgroups

For performance proficiency data only, Maryland used a minimum subgroup size of 5 from 2003-2010 and statistical significance tests to ensure that AYP determinations are

fair and accurate for subgroups of varying sizes. (See 3.3.7: Determining the Cell Value Significance). Beginning in 2010, Maryland used an N of 30 for graduation rate.

3.3.5. Annual Objectives and Intermediate Goals for Which Schools Are Accountable

Schools with no subgroups of 5 or more members are held accountable for the aggregate performance of students in reading, mathematics, and attendance as long as there are at least five members in the aggregate group. At the other extreme, schools with five or more members in all subgroups are held accountable for the aggregate performance of students in each of the 10 subgroups separately for reading and mathematics. The maximum case is presented in the unshaded cells in Table L. Most schools have to meet only one of two other academic measures, depending on the school's grade configuration.

The following tables show the required subgroups beginning in 2011. Prior to that, the subgroups were: American Indian, Asian, African American, White, Hispanic, FARMS, special education, and LEP. Tables will be reconfigured for 2012 at the high school level to include graduation rate or dropout rate for the all students group and for each of the 10 subgroups.

Table L

Schools with Typical Grade Structures
Maximum: 23 Performance Measures and 22 Participation Measures

	Reading		Mathematics		Other Academic Measure
	% Proficient	% Participation	% Proficient	% Participation	
All students					
Hispanic/Latino					
Am Ind/Alaskan Nat					
Asian					
Black/African Am.					
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac Isl					
White					
Two or more races					
FARMS					
Sp Ed					
LEP					

Exceptions: high schools with atypical grade structures, K-12 schools, LEAs, and the state. High schools with atypical grade structures are held accountable for the unshaded cells in Tables M and N. In 2012, all shaded boxes will be added for all high schools.

Table M

Schools with Grades 11 and 12 Only
Maximum: 13 Performance Measures and 11 Participation Measures

	Reading	Mathematics		Attendance Rate	Graduation Rate*
	% Proficient	% Proficient	% Participation		
All students					
Hispanic/Latino					
Am Ind/Alaskan Nat					
Asian					
Black/African Am.					
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac Isl					
White					
Two or more races					
FARMS					
Sp Ed					
LEP					

*All schools with grades 11 and 12 only will use attendance rate for all subgroups for the other academic indicator in 2012.

Table N

Schools with Grades 9, 10, and 11 Only
Maximum: 23 Performance Measures and 22 Participation Measures

	Reading		Mathematics		Attendance Rate
	% Proficient	% Participation	% Proficient	% Participation	
All students					
Hispanic/Latino					
Am Ind/Alaskan Nat					
Asian					
Black/African Am.					
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac Isl					
White					
Two or more races					
FARMS					
Sp Ed					
LEP					

K-12 schools, LEAs, and the state are held accountable for a minimum of four measures and a maximum of 20 measures depending on the number of subgroups with five or more members. The maximum case is presented in the unshaded cells in the Table O.

Table O

K-12 Schools, LEAs, and the State
Maximum: 24 Performance Measures and 22 Participation Measures

	Reading		Mathematics		Attendance Rate	Grad Rate*
	% Proficient	% Participation	% Proficient	% Participation		
All students						
Hispanic/Latino						
Am Ind/Alaskan Nat						
Asian						
Black/African Am.						
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac Isl						
White						
Two or more races						
FARMS						
Sp Ed						
LEP						

*All K-12 entities will include subgroup graduation rates in AYP determinations beginning in 2012.

3.3.6. Determining Satisfaction of the Annual Measurable Objective

The decision-making procedure involves four steps:

1. Determine which subgroups have 5 or more members and are therefore applicable for applying step 3.
2. Determine if any of the percent proficient values in the cells in the "all students" row are significantly less than the annual measurable objective.
3. Determine if any of the percent proficient values in the applicable subgroup cells are significantly less than the annual measurable objective.
4. For each subgroup in which the percent proficient value is significantly less than the annual measurable objective apply the Safe Harbor provision:
    a. Determine if the subgroup met the annual measurable objective on the other indicator(s), or made progress toward the annual measurable objective.
    b. If the subgroup has met the annual measurable objective on the other indicators, determine if the percentage of students below proficient decreased by 10%.

Schools, LEAs, and the state will be said to have failed to meet their annual measurable objective if any cell in the "all students" row is significantly less than the annual measurable objective or if the percent proficient of any subgroup in reading and mathematics is significantly less than the annual measurable objective and safe harbor criteria are not met.

3.3.7. Determining Cell Value Significance

For reading and mathematics measures, statistical procedures are used in all tests of AYP determinations to ensure that decisions (AYP and safe harbor) take into account inherent measurement error present in all accountability systems and adjust for differences the number of students on which the performance measures are based. The statistical approach adjusts for accuracy of decisions by holding constant the probability of making

a classification error over the range of the number of students in a group (n). It does so by adjusting the width of the confidence interval as a function of n and the expected variability of scores within the subgroup, school, LEA, and state. Fairness is ensured by holding the probability of a Type I error constant for all subgroups, schools, LEAs, and the state. The procedure, a one-sample Z test, uses a standard approach for testing the significance of differences between a sample and a known population parameter. The annual measurable objective of percent proficient is the known population parameter of a binomial distribution, P. The percent proficient value calculated on the performance of students in a subgroup represents p of a sample drawn from the population. The binomial distribution is normal and therefore the difference between the observed percent proficient and the annual measurable objective (p-P) can be transformed to Z.

$$(9) \qquad Z = \frac{p - P}{\sqrt{\frac{P*(1-P)}{n}}}$$

Where: P= annual measurable objective (percent proficient)
p= observed percent proficient in a subgroup
n= number of students in a subgroup, school, LEA, or the state.

The null hypothesis for each test is *Ho*: $p \geq P$. The alternative hypothesis is *HA*: $p < P$. It is a directional hypothesis and is tested with a one tailed test since we are only interested in knowing if the observed percent proficient (p) is significantly less than the annual measurable objective (P). *Ho* will be tested against the conventional probability of making a Type I error (α) set at 0.05. Given that multiple tests may be performed for each school α will be adjusted according to the number of subgroups with 5 or more members in a school using the Bonferroni procedure. Rejecting *Ho* indicates that significantly fewer students achieved at the proficient level than expected by the annual measurable objective.

The Bonferroni procedure holds α at a constant 0.05 for each test of *Ho* given that the number of subgroups and hence the number of statistical tests may vary among schools depending on the number of subgroups with five or more members present. For schools with all subgroups — seven race/ethnicity, LEP, special education, and FARMS — 11 statistical tests are required for each content area (10 subgroups plus all students) to determine if the school and the 10 subgroups met the annual measurable objective. Testing mathematics and reading separately doubles the number of required tests to 20. In addition, attendance rate and/or graduation rate for all students will be tested. This addition increases the number of significance tests for a typical school from 20 to 21. It is common practice that when more than one statistical test is performed to classify a school as meeting or not meeting the AYP criteria, a correction factor will be used. This is necessary because with each test the probability making a Type I error in any one test increases. The correction is made by dividing the selected α (0.05) by the number of tests that need to be performed for a single school. Thus, for a school with all subgroups α for each test is 0.0026 (0.05/21).

Statistical tests of the Safe Harbor criteria to determine if the percentage of students within a subgroup performing below the proficient level decreased by 10% from the

previous year will be conducted using the same approach. The target value *(P)* is computed as:

(10) $$P = 0.90\, p_{(i-1)}$$

Where: p = percent of students performing below proficient in the previous year (i-*1*).
i = year.

The statistical test is:

(11) $$Z = \frac{p_i - P_{(i-1)}}{\sqrt{\frac{P_{(i-1)} * \left(1 - P_{(i-1)}\right)}{n}}}$$

Where: P = target, a 10% reduction in students performing below proficient in the previous year (i-1)
i = year
p = percent of students performing below proficient in the year i
n = number of students in a subgroup, school, LEA, or the state.

The null hypothesis is *Ho*: $p \geq P$. The alternative hypothesis is *HA*: $p < P$.
It is a directional hypothesis and is tested with a one tailed test since we are only interested in knowing if the observed percent below proficient (p) is significantly less than the target (P). *Ho* will be tested against the conventional probability of making a Type I error (α) set at 0.05. Given that we have already adjusted for the impact of multiple tests α will be remain at 0.05. Rejecting *Ho* indicates that the required 10% reduction in the number of students at the below proficient level did not occur between the current and previous years.

4. Identifying Schools and School Districts in Need of Improvement

4.1. IDENTIFICATION IN THE 2002-2003 SCHOOL YEAR

Using the 2003 MSA as the baseline, the following criteria were used:

- All Title I schools previously identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring failing to make progress (according to the old criteria) based on the 2001-2002 SPI were classified as having failed to make progress consistent with NCLB. Schools remained in improvement, corrective action or restructuring status for school year 2002-2003.
- Any Title I school previously identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring failing to make AYP in school year 2002-2003 was classified as failing to meet AYP for three or more consecutive years. Therefore, these schools were classified as schools in improvement-year two, corrective action or restructuring.
- All Title I schools identified as making progress (according to the old criteria) for the second consecutive year based on the 2001-2002 SPI exited school improvement status as of January 2003.
- All Title I schools identified as making progress (according to the old criteria) based on the 2001-2002 SPI and met AYP in school year 2002-2003 exited school improvement status in school year 2003-2004.
- All schools in which students in the aggregate or in any subgroup performed below baseline and /or failed to meet the 95% participation requirement were classified as having failed to meet AYP for the 2002-2003 school year. (Note that "safe harbor" did not apply since it assumes a linking of MSPAP with MSA.)

4.2. IDENTIFICATION IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS

4.2.1 Schools in Need of Improvement

Individual schools that do not achieve AYP in all of the categories for which they are accountable are subject to a progression of accountability expectations. Table P reflects the progression of accountability expectations and the placement of schools in the Schools in Need of Improvement continuum when they do not meet the expectations.

Table P

School Progression

Failure to make an AMO in the subgroups of reported areas under reading and mathematics or for the other academic indicator for the first time.	=	**Local Attention**
Failure again to make an AMO in one or more of the subgroups of the same reported area (reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) where it failed previously.	=	**School Improvement Year 1**
Failure again to make any AMO in the same reported area (reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) after one year in improvement.	=	**School Improvement Year 2**
Failure to make the AMO in the same reported area (reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) after two years in improvement.	=	**Corrective Action**
Failure to make the AMO in the same reported area (reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) after a full year in corrective action.	=	**Restructuring Planning**
Failure to make the AMO in the same reported area (reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) after a full year in restructuring planning status.	=	**Restructuring Implementation**

A school that is in School Improvement remains at the same School Improvement status if it achieves AYP for one year. A school exits School Improvement only after it achieves AYP for two consecutive years.

The following definitions will be used to determine the School Improvement status of "new" schools that evolve from schools that are already in the restructuring planning or restructuring implementation phase of School Improvement:

- Only those students who were enrolled in a middle school the previous year will be considered in determining the status of a middle school in improvement. Only those students who were enrolled in a high school the previous year will be considered in determining the status of a high school in improvement.
- One school sending to another school:

  65% of the students at a school that is closed in its entirety or is in a phasing-out process to be closed will be in attendance at one school and will comprise 50% or more of the enrollment of the receiving school. The receiving school is a derivative school and takes on the School Improvement status of the sending or receiving school whichever is the more serious regardless of the number of students and/or subgroups that caused the sending school to not

make AYP. No receiving school will be placed in School Improvement beyond the corrective action stage in the Comprehensive Priority Needs or Focused Priority Needs Pathways even if the schools final enrollment shows that 50% of the school's students are from a sending school in improvement.

- Multiple schools sending to the same receiving school:
  If the enrollment at a receiving school is comprised of 50% or more students from more than one school in School Improvement that is being closed, phased out or reconfigured, the receiving school is a derivative school. The School Improvement status of the derivative school will be based on the final student enrollment of the "new" receiving (derivative) school and will be determined by the status of the school, including the receiving school, whose students make up the largest percentage of the final student enrollment. The receiving school will not be placed in School Improvement beyond the corrective action stage in the Comprehensive Priority Needs or Focused Priority Needs Pathways unless the receiving school is already beyond the corrective action stage of School Improvement and the largest percentage of students are already enrolled there. Such a school may need to modify its School Improvement Plan.

4.2.2 School Systems in Need of Improvement

Local school systems are identified for improvement for failing to meet the AMO for two consecutive years in the same content area (or for failure to progress toward the other academic indicators) in each of the three grade bands (elementary, middle, high) in either the all students group or in one of the subgroups. School systems identified for improvement are subject to a progression of accountability expectations according to Table Q.

Table Q

School System Progression

Failure to meet the AMO in reading and/or math (or progress toward the other academic indicator) in all three grade bands in either the all students group or in one of the subgroups.	=	No status assigned
Failure to meet the AMO for two consecutive years in the same content area (or failing for two consecutive years to progress toward the other academic indicators) in each of the three grade bands (elementary, middle, high) in either the all students group or in one of the subgroups.	=	A system in ***"improvement" [Year 1]***
Failure to meet the AMO for three consecutive years in the same content area (or failing for two consecutive years to progress toward the other academic indicators) in each of the three grade bands (elementary, middle, high) in either the all students group or in one of the subgroups.	=	A system in ***"improvement" [Year 2]***
Failure to meet the AMO for four consecutive years in the same content area (or failing for two consecutive years to progress toward the other academic indicators) in each of the three grade bands (elementary, middle, high) in either the all students group or in one of the subgroups.	=	A system in ***"corrective action"***

A local school system exits System Improvement once it meets the AMOs in the reported area in at least one grade band for two consecutive years *and* continues to meet objectives in other reported areas in at least one grade band. A school system that meets the AMOs in the reported area for which it was identified for System Improvement but does not meet the AMOs in another reported area at all three bands for two consecutive years will not exit System Improvement.

5. Accountability System Review and Appeal Process

5.1. System Review

Maryland will review its procedures every five years or as necessary to ensure that the accountability system continues to address the needs of all students. Content standards, assessments, proficiency levels, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives will be reviewed and if necessary appropriate adjustments made. The review will also include a critique of the statistical methodology to ensure that the decisions resulting from these procedures are reliable and valid and are achieving the desired outcome of improving student achievement for all students. Particular attention will be paid to impact on the performance of subgroups.

5.2 The Appeal Process for Schools and LEAs

Before identifying a local school or school system for improvement, the State shall provide an opportunity to review the data on which the proposed identification is based. A school or local school system can appeal its Improvement designation to the Assistant State Superintendent for Academic Policy if there is reason to believe coding or mathematical errors resulted in the identification of the school or school system. Appeals must include appropriate documentation, including photocopies of appropriate student records and a detailed explanation of the rationale for the appeal outlining the suspected source of error. Each year, the Assistant State Superintendent for Academic Policy will send a detailed memo to local school system superintendents outlining the appeal process, documentation requirements, and due dates for school and school system appeals. See Attachment IV.

Attachment I

To: Local Superintendents of Schools

From: Nancy S. Grasmick

Date: January 17, 2003

Re: Letter of Advice Regarding High School Assessments

Enclosed is a letter of advice prepared by Valerie Cloutier, Principal Counsel, Maryland State Department of Education. This letter relates directly to our discussion at the January 10 Superintendent's Meeting on ESEA requirements and testing. The letter provides legal advice on applying state regulations for high school level core courses, credits, and assessments.

I thought you would find it useful to review this letter in advance of discussions on ESEA requirements and testing at the extended Superintendent's Meeting planned for February 7.

NSG:lkp

Office of the Attorney General

Maryland State Department of Education
200 St. Paul Place
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
(410) 576-6465

January 10, 2003

TO: Nancy S. Grasmick
State Superintendent of Schools

FROM: Valerie V. Cloutier
Principal Counsel, MSDE

SUBJECT: High School Level Core Courses, Credits, Assessments

You have asked for advice on the following matter. Some local school officials are questioning whether all students must take the high school level courses that have the Phase I Maryland High School Assessments attached or whether a student must take a particular High School Assessment only if the student takes the relevant course. An example given is science in which the regulation on specified credits for the Maryland High School Diploma requires "three credits from the earth, life, or physical sciences, or all of the above, in which laboratory experiences are an integral component." Because biology is not specifically listed, some local school staff believe that they have the discretion to assign three lab courses, none of which includes biology, and still award the student who has not taken biology a Maryland High School Diploma.

Likewise, some local school staff believe that high school level credit may be given for algebra and geometry courses that are not aligned with the Core Learning Goals. They believe further that students who take those courses do not have to take the Maryland High School Assessments in algebra/data analysis and geometry.

With respect to these issues, you indicate that the Core Learning Goals describe the skills and knowledge that are measured on the Maryland High School Assessments at grades 9 - 12.[1] Further, you have advised that all 24 local school superintendents/chief executive officers have certified in writing that the high school level courses for which their systems are giving high school level credit are aligned with the Core Learning Goals.

For the following reasons, I believe that beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, in order to be awarded a Maryland High School Diploma each student who receives high school level credit for English, mathematics, science, and social studies must have preparation in

[1]The Core Learning Goals are a subset of the Maryland Content Standards from which the voluntary State curriculum is being developed.

courses aligned with the Core Learning Goals and must take the Maryland High School Assessments in English I, Algebra/Data Analysis, Geometry, Biology, and Government.

It is a well established legal principle that where a statute or regulation to be construed is a part of a statutory or regulatory scheme, the intent and meaning of the statute or regulation is not determined from the statute or regulation alone. Rather, it is to be discerned by considering the statutory provision or the regulation in light of the whole statutory or regulatory scheme. *See, e.g., State v. Crescent Cities Jaycees Foundation*, 330 Md. 460, 468 (1993); *Government Insurance Company v. Insurance Commissioner*, 332 Md. 124, 132 (1993) and cases cited therein. Further, the Maryland Court of Appeals has explained that where statutes or regulations address the same subject matter, they must be read together and harmonized, to the extent possible, both with each other and with other provisions of the statutory or regulatory scheme. *Id.*

With respect to the issues raised by the local school officials, the following provisions in the State Board regulations on graduation requirements are pertinent:

COMAR 13A.03.02.03 Graduation Requirements.

C. Credit Requirements.

(1) A credit under this regulation shall be defined as locally determined clock hours or successful demonstration of established learning outcomes for all original credit instruction.

(2) To be awarded the Maryland High School Diploma a student shall have earned a minimum of 21 credits at the completion of grades 9—12. At least four of these credits shall be earned after the completion of grade 11 unless one of the alternatives in §H or I of this regulation is satisfied.

(3) Specified Credits for Maryland High School Diploma. To be awarded the Maryland High School Diploma, a student shall earn the following specified core credits as part of the 21-credit requirement:

(a) English—four credits of organized instruction in listening and speaking, reading and literature, and written composition and use of language;

. . .

(c) Mathematics as follows:

(i) Three credits, one with instruction in fundamental or advanced algebraic concepts and topics and one

with instruction in fundamental or advanced geometric concepts and topics;

(ii) Other mathematics instruction may be substituted for the two specified credits by an Admission, Review, and Dismissal Committee as the Individualized Education Plan is developed for identified high school special education students;

. . .

(f) Science—three credits from the earth, life, or physical sciences, or all of the above, in which laboratory experiences are an integral component;

(g) Social studies—three credits including one credit in United States History, one credit in world history, and one credit in local, State, and national government;

. . .

E. Maryland High School Assessments.

(1) Beginning with the 2001—2002 school year, to be awarded the Maryland high school diploma all students including middle school students who take high school level courses shall take the Maryland High School Assessment for English I, government, biology, algebra/data analysis, and geometry after the student completes the appropriate course.

(2) Beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, for students entering the ninth grade and middle school students who take high school level courses, the student's performance on the Maryland High School Assessments, except for geometry, shall be reported as percentile rankings on the student's transcripts.

In construing these provisions in a manner consistent with the principles of statutory and regulatory construction set out above, I find as follows. Under COMAR 13A.03.02.03C, high school level courses are courses for which specified core credits are awarded. Further, in order to be awarded a Maryland High School Diploma students must earn specified core credits in English, mathematics, science, and social studies as part of the 21-credit requirement. Moreover, beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, in order to receive a Maryland High School Diploma all students including middle school students who take high school level courses must take the Maryland High School Assessments for English I, government, biology, algebra/data analysis, and geometry after the student completes the core credit course.

Given that each student must take three credits of science, all school systems have certified that core credit science courses are aligned with the Core Learning Goals upon which the High School Assessments were developed, and each student must take the biology test after completing the relevant high school level course, it follows that beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, as one of the three science credits each student must take a biology course aligned with the Core Learning Goals and must take the High School Assessment in biology in order to receive a Maryland High School Diploma. The same analysis applies to the mathematics courses and the algebra/data analysis and geometry tests. In effect, the revision to the graduation requirement regulations adding the requirement for taking the Phase I Maryland High School Assessments, modified subsection .03C specifying the core credits. [2]

To summarize:

(1) Beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, all core courses for which high school level credit is given must be aligned with the Core Learning Goals.

(2) Beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, in order to get high school level credit for science, one of the three science credits must be in biology; and to get high school level credit in mathematics, one of the three mathematics credits must be in algebra/data analysis and one must be in geometry, with the courses aligned with the Core Learning Goals.

(3) Beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, in order to be awarded a Maryland High School Diploma, each student including middle school students who take high school level courses must take the Maryland High School Assessments in English I, government, biology, algebra/data analysis, and geometry after the student completes the core credit course.

I hope this analysis is helpful to you. Please call me if you have any questions or need further guidance in this matter. Thank you.

c: Executive Team

[2]The revisions to the State Board regulations on graduation requirements were approved by the State Board in September, 2001; published in the Maryland Register on November 16, 2001; with final notice published in the Maryland Register on March 8, 2002.

Attachment II

Establishing Standards for Maryland's School Systems: A Systemic Approach

(A copy of this attachment may be obtained by calling the Office of Academic Policy, Maryland State Department of Education, 410-767-0473.)

Attachment III

Maryland State Department of Education

Proposal

Developing
A
Modified Maryland School Assessment
Based on
Modified Achievement Standards
for Students with Disabilities

Submitted To
United States Department of Education
June 15, 2005

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROPOSAL

Developing A Modified Maryland School Assessment Based
On Modified Achievement Standards for Students with Disabilities

Introduction

Maryland plans to develop a Modified-Maryland School Assessment (Mod-MSA) for reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3-8. The proposed modified assessments will be on-grade-level versions of the existing MSA and would measure the content standards appropriate to the assigned grade level for a student. However, we anticipate that the content coverage and cognitive demand of the Mod-MSA will be somewhat reduced as appropriate. For each grade level, we will be examining the existing content standards for the MSA and making modifications to those standards. Conceptually, students taking the Mod-MSA will always then be tested on grade level. However, the decision for a student to participate in the Mod-MSA instead of the MSA will always be made through the student's IEP team process.

As with Maryland's content standards development process with other assessments, the modified content standards will be developed with full stakeholder engagement. Our psychometric council has examined the Maryland School Assessment and the research surrounding modified standards and believes that this assessment can be developed, though with some challenge, by the 2006 assessment administraton. Throughout the assessment planning period, we will be exploring the existing research further. However, it currently appears that the assessments developed would essentially be a modified version of the existing grade-level assessments. The psychometric council advises us that the most viable model to be developed under this timeline involves reduced numbers of reading and math objectives with assessments coming from the lower range of cognitive demand.

Students participating in the Mod-MSA would have all of the assessment accommodations available as specified on their IEPs. While the accommodations are the same for all students with disabilities, only those students meeting the narrow eligibility criteria for Mod-MSA would be eligible to participate in the assessment. The special focus of these modifications to the assessment would be to assist the Mod-MSA test taker to access grade-level content in reading and math and demonstrate proficiency.

Maryland's high school students take end-of-course exams as a graduation requirement and to meet NCLB testing requirements. Consequently, we believe that these assessments would not be modified in the same way as the tests in grades three through eight would be modified. At this time, we believe that the High School Assessments would not be modified for students identified for the Mod-MSA assessments in elementary and middle school. It is more likely students will still be expected to demonstrate proficiency or passing on the end-of-course assessments, but perhaps on a fundamentally different (later) timeline than that of the typical high school student.

Summary of Modified Assessments Proposal

We believe that Maryland fully qualifies for the new flexibility because of the work that has been done to ensure accountability for all schools and school systems for NCLB. Maryland has established a minimum group size for subgroup accountability at five students. This minimum group size is the smallest in the nation and truly meets the intent of NCLB that no child is left behind. We believe that you will find this proposal supports our petition for

the implementation of an alternate (modified) assessment based on modified achievement standards. Additional information may be found on the MSDE report card website, www.mdreportcard.org or by contacting Dr. Ron Peiffer at 410-767-0473.

We are requesting permission to begin work on the proposed modified assessment and expect that USDE will provide further guidance in this area. As in the past, we will be happy to modify our anticipated course of action in accordance with that forthcoming direction. Meanwhile, we would like to move forward with developing modified academic achievement standards and modified assessments for students with persistent academic disabilities and served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act based on our current understanding of USDE intentions.

Beginning as early as the 2005-2006 school year and no later than the 2006-2007 school year, Maryland would include the proficient scores from the modified assessments in calculating AYP and cap the scores at 2% of the total population testing proficient as indicated in your May 10, 2005 published papers. While we were awaiting your approval to pursue the development of modified assessments and standards, we began preliminary work on the assessments. Our preparations have included discussions with our psychometric experts, experts on IDEA, and experts in instruction and assessment of students with disabilities.

Maryland plans for modified assessments based on modified achievement standards to be in place no later than the 2006-2007 school year. The modified achievement standards will be aligned with the State's content standards, promote access to the general grade level curriculum, and reflect professional judgment on the highest achievement standards possible as required by 34 CFR §200.1(d).

Maryland has taken an aggressive approach to ensure that students with disabilities have access to the general grade level curriculum and are tested appropriately and that educators maintain high expectations for students with disabilities. Maryland will continue to use alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Proficient scores from these assessments will still be capped at 1% of the total tested population for making AYP decisions.

Details of Maryland's proposal for identification of qualifying students for the Modified MSA (Mod-MSA) are contained in *Attachment A: Identification of Students with Disabilities for the Mod-MSA.*

The following outlines how AYP calculations will be completed once the new assessments are implemented:

- **Proposed Permanent AYP Approach for 2006-2007**
  - To be used as early as spring 2006 and no later than the spring 2007 assessments and after.
  - 97% of students are still tested with MSA.
  - 2% of students would now be tested with the Modified MSA (Mod-MSA).

- 1% of students would continue to be tested with the Alt-MSA.
- MSA, Mod-MSA, and Alt-MSA results would be combined to determine the percent of students who are proficient in reading and mathematics.

Maryland's responses to the 17 questions contained in the May 10, 2005 USDE publication *Accountability for Students with Disabilities: Accountability Plan Amendments for 2004-2005* follow.

I. Core Principles.

The following five core principles, provided in our May 31, 2005 letter to USDE, clearly show Maryland's commitment to a quality assessment and accountability system.

1. **Participation Rates for students with disabilities**. In Maryland **ALL** students are required to participate in AYP assessments in either the primary or make-up test windows. Students who are absent from both testing windows are assigned the LOSS (lowest obtainable scale score) for the purpose of calculating AYP. Thus, 100% of students are included in accountability decisions. This is a powerful incentive for schools to fully include students with disabilities in instructional programs. Even when those students with disabilities who were assigned the LOSS were subtracted from the participation rate calculation, the participation rate of students with disabilities is 98%.

2. **Availability of alternate assessments.** Maryland's alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities is the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA). In 2004-2005 the Alt-MSA was administered at grades 3-8 and 10 and student's reading and mathematics performance was determined. Maryland included Alt-MSA assessment technical documentation as part of the State's submission for the USDE Peer Review of state standards and assessments.

3. **Reporting of results from alternate assessments.** Alt-MSA scores in reading and math are used in school, school system, and State accountability decisions and reported on school, school system, and State report cards and on www.mdreportcard.org – the state's online report card. Parent home reports for Alt-MSA are produced and distributed annually. In addition, at the start of the school year schools are asked to include parents in reviewing and identifying "mastery objectives" for their child's reading and math Alt-MSA portfolio and to also include parents in reviewing the end-of-school-year performance of their child on those mastery objectives.

4. **Availability of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.** Testing accommodations are described in Maryland's *Requirements for Accommodating, Excusing, and Exempting Students in Maryland Assessment Programs*. This document is available on the Web at http://marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/5F4F5041-02EE-4F3A-B495-5E4B3C850D3E/3911/AccommodationsDocument200405final1.pdf. It is reviewed and revised annually by Maryland State Department of Education staff in special education, instruction, and assessment. It is reviewed by the Psychometric Council (Maryland's Technical Advisory Committee) and published as both hard copy and electronic copy. It is used by IEP teams when determining appropriate accommodations. MSDE annually conducts audits of accommodations and monitors implementation during testing.

5. **Minimum group sizes for making AYP decisions.** Maryland uses **5** as a minimum group size for **ALL** AYP subgroup accountability decisions.

II. Student Achievement.

Student performance for students with disabilities for the 2002-2003, 2003-2004, and 2004-2005 school years has shown very good improvements. Please see the following charts outlining performance for students on both the Maryland School Assessment and the Alt-MSA, Maryland's alternative assessment for students with disabilities.

6. **Student achievement in reading, for students with disabilities, 2002-2003 school year**
7. **Student achievement in mathematics, for students with disabilities, 2002-2003 school year**
8. **Student achievement in reading, for students with disabilities, 2003-2004 school year**
9. **Student achievement in mathematics, for students with disabilities, 2003-2004 school year**

Student Performance Summary

Maryland State Department of Education Special Education Student Performance
Division of Accountability and Assessment
Maryland School Assessment
CRT Scores – Percent Proficient Report

Special Education

LEA	LEA Name	Grade	Subject	Special Ed Title	2003	2004	2005
					CRT Prof/Adv. Pct*	CRT Prof/Adv. Pct*	CRT Prof/Adv. Pct*
A	All Public Schools	03	Reading	Non Special Ed	62.4	74.7	78.5
				Special Ed	25	42.9	51.3
			Math	Non Special Ed	68.8	76.2	80.0
				Special Ed	37.1	42.1	49.5
		04	Reading	Non Special Ed		79.0	83.8
				Special Ed		47.3	56.0
			Math	Non Special Ed		73.9	80.1
				Special Ed		38.5	47.3
		05	Reading	Non Special Ed	70.2	72.8	78.0
				Special Ed	35.1	37.7	44.2
			Math	Non Special Ed	59.8	68.0	73.5
				Special Ed	23.3	29.6	36.0
		06	Reading	Non Special Ed		74.0	74.8
				Special Ed		29.2	32.7
			Math	Non Special Ed		55.5	65.0
				Special Ed		14.1	21.6
		07	Reading	Non Special Ed		72.8	71.9
				Special Ed		26.2	28.2
			Math	Non Special Ed		54.8	60.0
				Special Ed		14.5	17.9
		08	Reading	Non Special Ed	65.7	69.8	71.2
				Special Ed	20.1	20.7	27.4
			Math	Non Special Ed	44.2	50.5	56.1
				Special Ed	8.3	10.8	16.9
		10	Reading	Non Special Ed	66.3	70.7	71.5
				Special Ed	21.6	27.1	28.6

Note: In 2003 the Alt-MSA was administered at 11th grade as MSDE transitioned to all test administrations at 10th grade. More information is available on the web at mdreportcard.org

III. Sound State Education Policies.

The May 10 publication from USDE calls for evidence and assurances that the following are in place as a demonstration that the state has implemented alternative assessments and is developing additional modified assessments for a limited group of students with disabilities. The following summarizes Maryland's evidence:

10. Document the technical quality of the alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if not previously completed.
Maryland's assessment system recently underwent the federally mandated peer review process, where the technical quality of all of the State's assessments, including the alternate assessments was reviewed. While we have not yet received the final report of the peer review, we believe we submitted adequate information to demonstrate the technical quality of our alternate assessments. ***See Enclosed Document: Alternate Maryland School Assessment 2003-2004 Technical Manual.***

11. Develop criteria and guidance for IEP teams regarding the identification of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and for setting appropriate proficiency expectations for those students.
The Alt-MSA assesses students with significant cognitive disabilities and their attainment of individually selected instructional-level reading and mathematics Mastery Objectives which are aligned with grade-level content Maryland Content Standards. These Mastery Objectives form the framework for the student's reading and mathematics instructional program.

Participation in the Alt-MSA is determined by the Individualized Education Program Team process. Students with disabilities in grades 3-8 and 10 must participate in either MSA or Alt-MSA. The decision as to which assessment is appropriate for an individual student is made by each student's IEP team. A student with a significant cognitive disability will participate in the Alt-MSA if he or she meets each of the following **Alt-MSA Participation Guidelines** criteria:

- The student is learning extended Maryland reading (at emerging, readiness, or functional literacy levels) and extended Maryland mathematics content standards objectives.

AND

- The student requires explicit and ongoing instruction in a functional life skills curriculum including personal management, community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational, communication/decision making/interpersonal.

AND

- The student requires extensive and substantial modification (reduced complexity of objectives and learning materials, and more time to learn) of general education curriculum. The curriculum differs significantly from that of their non-disabled peers. They learn different objectives, may use different materials, and may participate in different learning activities.

AND

- The student requires intensive instruction and may require extensive supports, including physical prompts, to learn, apply, and transfer or generalize knowledge and skills to multiple settings.

AND

- The student requires extensive support to perform and participate meaningfully and productively in daily activities in school, home, community, and work environments.

AND

- The student cannot participate in the MSA even with accommodations.

- Students not meeting the criteria above will participate in the Maryland School Assessment, with or without accommodations, as appropriate, based on their IEP.

- Specific additional guidance for Local Accountability Coordinators is provided in the Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook. The MSDE Technical Assistance Bulletin #5 provides information and guidance to local school systems on "Implementing the Alternate Maryland School Assessment, Alt-MSA." This is distributed to all local school systems and is on the MSDE website.

12. Demonstrate that policies are in place to ensure inclusion of all students in the assessment system, as required by IDEA and NCLB.

Specific guidance is provided to local school systems through the state regulations, COMAR 13A.05.01 and .02. In addition, local accountability coordinators and directors of special education are provided guidance through memos related to participation on a regular basis. Information Update #1 was distributed to local school systems on May 18, 2005 and to nonpublic special education facilities and private schools on May 20, 2005.

Accommodation information is updated annually in the *Requirements for Accommodating, Excusing, and Exempting Students in Maryland Assessment Programs*, Revised in August 20, 2004. This manual provides clarification on student participation and test administration in addition to the use of accommodations for all students, including students with disabilities.

13. Provide training to IEP teams on State assessment guidelines and policies, as required under IDEA and NCLB regulations.

Local school systems are provided training and information through a wide range of opportunities, including:

✓October Special Education/Early Intervention Leadership Conference

✓Statewide Trainings on Reauthorization of IDEA '04- held on May 18, 20, June 2, and June 6, 2005

Specific training has been provided according to the following schedule:

ALTERNATE MARYLAND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT (Alt-MSA)

MSDE Training and Support provided to the Baltimore City Public School System from January 2004 to May 2005

DATE	LOCATION	TOPIC	PARTICIPANTS
January 13, 2004	Paquin School	The Revision of Alt-MSA Mastery Objectives	Teachers/Test Examiners and Support Staff
February 10, 2004	Paquin School	Alt-MSA Work Session	Teachers/Test Examiners and Support Staff
October 1, 2004	BCPSS	Alt-MSA Training	Teachers/Test Examiners and Support Staff
January 18, 2005	Lois T. Murray	Alt-MSA Support	Teachers/Test Examiners
February 7, 2005	Lois T. Murray	Alt-MSA Support	Teachers/Test Examiners

From January 2004 to May 2005	Phone call and e-mail support with the writing of mastery objectives, the administration of the Alt-MSA, and the instructional connection to the content standards from the Reading and Mathematics Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC).	Teachers/Test Examiners and Administrators

Statewide Training and Support provided to all Maryland school systems from January 2004 to May 2005

DATE	LOCATION	TOPIC	PARTICIPANTS
May 26, 2004	Faulkner Ridge	Alt-MSA Facilitator Meeting	Alt-MSA Facilitators
August 26, 2004	Towson State University	Special School Consortium	Teachers, Administrators and Paraprofessional staff from center based programs.
September 1, 2004	JHU Downtown Center	Initial 2004 – 2005 Alt-MSA Administration and Handbook Training	Local Accountability Coordinators and Alt-MSA Facilitators
September 8, 2004	Faulkner Ridge Center	Alt-MSA Training Follow-up session	Alt-MSA Facilitators
October 20, 2004	JHU/CTE	Alt-MSA Facilitator Meeting	Alt-MSA Facilitators
February 9, 2005	Faulkner Ridge Center	Alt-MSA Facilitator Meeting	Alt-MSA Facilitators

Additional specific site visits include:

January 10 Baltimore City, Lois T. Murray
11 Howard County
12 MSB, Kennedy Krieger
13 Stedwick ES-Montgomery Co., Margaret Brent, PG
18 Lois T. Murray
24 Caroline Co
25 Wicomico
26 Anne Arundel
27 Dorchester, Talbot
28 Harford, Ridge Ruxton-Baltimore Co

February 1 Maryland State Board of Education
2 Howard Co; Goucher College-graduate course presentations
3 Baltimore Co
8 Wicomico
22 Dorchester

June 6, 8 LACs and Alt-MSA Facilitators, LEA 24 Schools

A Statewide Summer Institute will be convened June 28, 29, 30 targeting Special Schools, Local Accountability Coordinators, and Local Directors of Special Education.

14. Train teachers on instructional interventions, including special education teachers and general education teachers with subject matter expertise, on how to work together, provide access to the general curriculum, and use data to improve student achievement. **The Maryland State Department of Education continues to offer trainings, workshops, online opportunities and ongoing professional development to Maryland general and special education teachers, principals, and other school system leadership to increase both the knowledge and skills needed to accelerate the academic performance of students with disabilities. The focus is on the development of content knowledge, use of effective instructional practices, and use of data to monitor progress.**

    Summarized in *Attachment B: 2005 Workshops, Trainings and Documents re Training on Instructional Interventions for General and Special Education Teachers* are 10 major initiatives that were conducted and/or disseminated during the 2004-2005 school year. These include:
    1) Training on the Alternative Maryland School Assessment;
    2) Training for State Technical Assistants Assigned to Schools in State Improvement;
    3) Workshops for 27 Low Performing Middle School Teams;
    4) Governor's Academies in Mathematics, English, Government and Biology;
    5) Online Content Modules;

6) Professional Development Modules in English/Language Arts for Year 2 Improvement Schools (in development);
7) Collaborative Leadership Training for Reading, Special Education and Mathematics Supervisors;
8) Dissemination of Statewide Surveys on Reading and Mathematics Interventions in Use in Maryland Schools;
9) *Passport to Success Demonstration Middle School Project* Outreach to 100 Participants as well as Certified Coach Training; and
10) Teacher Recruitment and Training.

15. Conduct outreach to parents of students with disabilities to explain State testing policies. This outreach may take several forms, such as website documents; brochures for parent centers, schools, and districts; or training for parent liaisons.
The Maryland State Department of Education maintains an ongoing program of outreach to parents in Maryland on our assessment program. Three websites provide a significant amount of information to parents:

1) http://marylandpublicschools.org/ **is our main Departmental website with links to other content and downloadable copies of print publications;**

2) http://mdreportcard.org/ **is the site displaying our school, school system, and state assessment and accountability data. This website is especially designed to provide data in graphical format so that parents and professionals alike can access and understand school performance;**

3) http://mdk12.org/ **is commonly referred to as our "School Improvement" website. It contains sample test items, content standards, and the Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum.**

Links to some of the specific web content available for parents are as follows:

- Testing. **A page providing a menu of information on testing**
http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/testing/

- Alt-MSA. **A specific page giving detailed information on Alt-MSA**
http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/testing/alt_msa/

- Alt-MSA Handbook
http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/testing/alt_msa/2004_2005_ALT_Handbook

- English Language Arts standards and assessments
http://mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/reading/index.html

- Mathematics standards and assessments
http://mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/mathematics/index.html

- Maryland School Assessments information
  http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/testing/msa/

- Parent publications that are available on the web. Most have been distributed widely to parents and school system staffs.
  http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/newsroom/publications/pubsother/
  Examples of some of the publications posted are as follows:
  i. **Sample MSA Home Reports**
  ii. **A Parent's Guide to Achievement Matters Most**
  iii. **Testing in Maryland: A parent's guide to the Maryland School Assessment for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10**
  iv. **Information Sheet: MSA Reading**
  v. **Information Sheet: MSA Mathematics**
  vi. **Maryland School Assessment Questions and Answers**
  vii. **MSDE Bulletin, various editions**

- High School Assessment testing information
  http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/testing/has/
  i. **Maryland High School Assessments and Your Child**
  ii. **A Letter to Parents of Middle School Students, February 2005**
  iii. **How Will the HSA Affect Me?**
  iv. **Summary of requirements for the graduating classes of 2005-2008**
  v. **Summary of requirements for the graduating classes of 2009 and beyond**
  vi. **Frequently asked questions about high school graduation requirements**
  vii. **Encouraging Achievement in Your Child**
  viii. **State Board of Education Resolution (charging a State task force to investigate comparable methods of measuring student achievement in HSA-tested subjects).**
  ix. **HSA Questions and Answers**
  x. **For Administrators: What to Look for in High School Classroom Instruction**
  xi. **High School Assessments: A Conversation with Maryland 2003 Teacher of the Year Darren Hornbeck (A video on High School Assessments that is available on our website.)**

Meetings and focus groups addressing Statewide Assessment have been convened throughout the State. The State Special Education Advisory Committee includes parents, advocates, and persons with disabilities. In addition, the MSDE convened focus groups to address the impact of statewide assessments and the impact on students with disabilities.

MSDE implements a concerted outreach to parents of students with disabilities to involve them in the development of support materials and to inform parents and advocates about

the Statewide assessment system. Parents are represented on the Alt-MSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee. MSDE has developed and made available several resources that parents/guardians may access, including: a brochure that describes the Alt-MSA, a newly released videotape describing Alt-MSA that will be sent to every school, and the Alt-MSA Handbook and content standards that are posted on the MSDE Home Page.

Parents are included in focus groups at the local level to address issues raised through questions to local directors, phone calls to the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, and through parent letters. Representatives of the MSDE also meet regularly with members of the PTA. A Parent-Professional Partnership Course is available to parents through a local University to provide training and college credit for parents and professionals from the local level in a trainer of trainer model. An important aspect of this program is an overview of the statewide assessment system.

16. Incorporate appropriately the scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities into the State reporting and accountability system.
Maryland has fully incorporated the results of Alt-MSA administration in both the reporting and accountability systems. This information is displayed at http://mdreportcard.org/**. AYP calculations for school year 2004-2005 will be available on June 20, 2005. Specific guidance is provided to local school systems through the state regulations, COMAR 13A.05.01 and .02.**

17. Submit all alternate assessments for the Department's peer review process for standards and assessments.
Maryland submitted its Alt-MSA assessment to the United States Department of Education for peer review earlier this year as required by law. The formal report on the review has not yet been received by the Maryland State Department of Education. Maryland will submit its Mod-MSA for review when developed as per federal guidelines.

Additional Steps

Maryland additionally commits to the following steps as part of our overall strategy to improve assessments for students with disabilities, in particular for the development of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards:

- Develop and formally approve or adopt modified academic achievement descriptors.
  June 2005
  - Meet with MSDE reading, mathematics and special education staff to produce first draft of modified grade level content standards.
  - Assemble and meet with Modified Assessment Test Specifications Committee to review overall plan and draft of modified content standards.

  July 2005
  - **Stakeholder groups review draft modified content standards.**
  - **Complete identification of modified content standards and present to State Board of Education.**

- Build a framework, including purpose and scope of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, that addresses key questions and issues (e.g., portfolio or multiple choice) and is informed by stakeholder and technical advisory input.

  June 2005
  - MSDE staff met on June 10 with Maryland's Psychometric Council to review psychometric issues associated with a modified assessment, including expanded accommodations and modifications to testing.
  - Meet with MSDE reading, mathematics and special education staff to produce first draft of modified grade level content standards.
  - Assemble and meet with Modified Assessment Test Specifications Committee to review overall plan and draft of modified content standards.

  July 2005
  - Complete identification of modified content standards and present to State Board of Education.
  - Review with testing vendor and special education/content staff the grade level assessments in reading or math against modified content standards to determine those assessment questions that are aligned with the modified content standards.
  - Complete and publish MSA Test Modifications document along with updated Accommodations document. Particular focus will be on modifications related to reading/accessing grade level content passages.

  August 2005
  - Complete work with MSA test vendors and Mod-MSA test specifications team on reading and mathematics modified assessments.

- Contract for the development of valid alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards for students with disabilities who need to take a modified assessment (as well as students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if applicable).

  June 2005
  - Begin meeting with MSA testing vendors to begin discussions on implementation of Mod-MSA including design and out-of-scope contract issues.

  July 2005
  - Review with testing vendor and special education/content staff the grade level assessments in reading or math against modified content standards to determine those assessment questions that are aligned with the modified content standards.

  August 2005
  - Complete work with MSA test vendors and Mod-MSA test specifications team on reading and mathematics modified assessments.

- Establish (with diverse stakeholder involvement) and formally approve or adopt modified achievement standards with "cut scores" that differentiate among achievement levels and are aligned with State content standards.

  July 2005

  - Stakeholder groups review draft of modified content standards. *(See Attachment C: Assessment Stakeholder Outreach.)*
  - Complete identification of modified content standards and present to State Board of Education.
  - Document the technical quality of the alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards.

  Fall 2006

  - **Complete Mod-MSA technical report.**

- Demonstrate that policies are in place to ensure inclusion of all students in the assessment system, as required by IDEA and NCLB.

Specific guidance is provided to local school systems through the state regulations, COMAR 13A.05.01 and .02. In addition, local accountability coordinators and directors of special education are provided guidance through memos related to participation on a regular basis. Information Update #1 was distributed to local school systems on May 18, 2005 and to nonpublic special education facilities and private schools on May 20, 2005.

Accommodation information is updated annually in the *Requirements for Accommodating, Excusing, and Exempting Students in Maryland Assessment Programs*, Revised in August 20, 2004. This manual provides clarification on student participation and test administration in addition to the use of accommodations for all students, including students with disabilities.

The complete timeline of activities related to the development of the Modified Maryland School Assessment (Mod-MSA) based on modified achievement standards follows.

Timeline for Development of Modified Maryland School Assessment Mod-MSA

May 2005

- Met with MSDE staff and LEA special education directors to discuss options
- State Board of Education approves request to design modified assessment.

June 2005

- MSDE staff met on June 10 with Maryland's Psychometric Council to review psychometric issues associated with a modified assessment, including expanded accommodations and modifications to testing.
- Meet with MSDE reading, mathematics and special education staff to produce first draft of modified grade level content standards.
- Assemble and meet with Modified Assessment Test Specifications Committee to review overall plan and draft of modified content standards.
- Begin meeting with MSA testing vendors to begin discussions on implementation of Mod-MSA including design and out-of-scope contract issues.

July 2005

- Stakeholder groups review draft of modified content standards.
- Complete identification of modified content standards and present to State Board of Education.
- Finalize and distribute rubric for identifying students eligible for modified test and begin LEA training.
- Review with testing vendor and special education/content staff the grade level assessments in reading or math against modified content standards to determine those assessment questions that are aligned with the modified content standards.
- Complete and publish MSA Test Modifications document along with updated Accommodations document. Particular focus will be on modifications related to reading/accessing grade level content passages.

August 2005

- LEAs begin to identify "2%" students as per state guidelines.
- Complete work with MSA test vendors and Mod-MSA test specifications team on reading and mathematics modified assessments.

September 2005

- Meet with Local Accountability Coordinators to review Mod-MSA design (LACs manage assessments in each of Maryland 24 school system).
- Begin meetings with school system staff, stakeholder groups, and special education community to ensure familiarity with Mod-MSA.

October 2005

- Vendor reprograms scoring applications for the modified assessments.

- Complete design work on Mod-MSA Examiners Manual and Testing and Coordinating Manual (TACM).

March 2006
- Administer MSA, Alt-MSA and new Modified assessments: begin scoring.

May 2006
- Distribute Mod-MSA data to standard setting vendor for development of book marking materials.

June 2006
- Calculate AYP as per normal timeline with all but 2% students. Recalculate AYP with 2% students when State Board approves achievement standards.

July 2006
- Complete booking marking for Mod-MSA achievement standards.
- Request State Board of Education approval of standard setting cut scores.
- Complete AYP recalculations; add modified assessment scores to online report card.
- Produce Mod-MSA home reports for distribution to LEA and parents.
- Begin research studies addressing reliability and validity and continue through fall and winter.

Fall 2006
- Complete Mod-MSA technical report.

Attachment A

Identification of Students with Disabilities for the Modified-Maryland School Assessment and Interim Plan

In Maryland, consistent with IDEA and the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind Act), all students with disabilities are included in all general state and district wide assessments. IDEA emphasizes providing students with disabilities access to the general curriculum and to educational reforms as an effective means of ensuring better results. All students, including students with disabilities, are expected to receive instruction consistent with Maryland's Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC), based on the Maryland Content Standards and Core Learning Goals, and must be assessed on their attainment of grade level reading and math content. To determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) under NCLB, all students, including students with disabilities, are assessed in reading and math in grades 3 through 8, and during the high school grade.

Alternate assessments must be available for those students who cannot participate in the MSA with accommodations as indicated in their IEPs. Any alternate assessments must be available for students with disabilities consistent with the State's academic content standards. The alternate assessments include the following:

- **Alt-MSA for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are participating on alternate academic achievement standards (limited to reporting 1% of those scoring proficient); or**
- **Mod-MSA (Modified MSA) for students with academic disabilities who with access to the general education curriculum will participate in modified academic content and achievement standards (limited to reporting 2% of those scoring proficient).**

Summary of Revised Federal Policy Alternate Assessments for Students with Disabilities (Based in U. S. Department of Education documents released 4/7/05 and 5/10/02)

> **Policy** "State may develop modified academic achievement standards and use alternate assessments based on those modified achievement standards for students with persistent academic disabilities and served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. States may include proficient scores from such assessments in making adequate yearly progress (AYP) decisions but those scores will be capped at 2.0% of the total tested population. This provision does not limit how many students may be assessed against modified achievement standards."

Maryland's Implementation Procedures:
Students with disabilities are to participate and progress in the general education curriculum. It is the responsibility of each student's IEP team to consider accommodations, supplementary aids, services, and supports to enable the student to participate and progress in the general curriculum with non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.

The Maryland State Department of Education has met with local directors of special education as well as parents and advocates to develop and review the process for identification of students with disabilities who may be eligible to participate in the Mod-MSA. Consistent with the requirements of the individualized education program (IEP) process, the IEP Team would apply the proposed policy (*C.1*) and the attached rubric (*C.2*) to a review of the IEPs to determine that

the students identified as eligible would be identified based on their individual evaluation information and the instructional and service information on their IEPs. To ensure that the students eligible to participate in the Mod-MSA have received access to the general curriculum and content standards, a rigorous process has been developed, reviewed, and revised to reflect the federal guidance.

Specific types of interventions are to be documented by the IEP Team to ensure direct instruction in reading and mathematics on the Maryland Content Standards, as well as individualized instruction using scientifically based models. In addition, other models of instruction and professional development for staff are to include:

- Response to interventions models which are research-based and focus on individual instruction for students with disabilities in reading and math;
- Professional development with an emphasis on coaching and mentoring;
- Availability of co-teaching models with general and special education teachers providing access to the general curriculum and core content.

Attachment A.1
[Proposed Guidelines for Local School Systems]

Identification of Students with Disabilities for Participation in Mod-MSA

The Modified Maryland School Assessment (Mod-MSA) is based on modified academic content standards for students with disabilities. These are students who are not proficient, even with full access to the general education curriculum. These students will be able to be assessed using modified assessments based on those modified academic content standards. Students who participate in the Mod-MSA in grades 3-8 and score proficient will be capped at 2%.

Mod-MSA results are to be reported at three proficiency levels (Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) as part of the State accountability program. Results from the Mod-MSA will be aggregated with those from the MSA and Alt-MSA for accountability purposes.

MOD-MSA PARTICIPATION GUIDELINES

Students with disabilities in grades 3-8 must participate in either MSA, Mod-MSA, or Alt-MSA. Each student's IEP team will make the decision as to which assessment is appropriate for an individual student. A student who will be instructed and assessed using modified academic content standards must meet each of the following criteria:

- The student is learning using modified academic content standards in reading and mathematics.
  AND

- The student requires modifications during assessments and instruction, in addition to accommodations. These testing/assessment and instructional modifications may include: reduced complexity of language, reduced number of test items, reduced amount of content to learn, paraphrasing of reading passages, embedded scaffolding for a written response such as sentence stems, guided response outline, guided questioning to generate response, software such as Co-Writer and Write Outloud, use of calculator, and spell check.
  AND

- The student requires the use of a modified general curriculum. The curriculum for the student is aligned with the Maryland Content Standards for the student's grade level but is modified (reduced amount to learn, reduced complexity, reduced output) so the student can access the content and demonstrate what he/she has learned.
  AND

- The student must have had at least three consecutive years of individualized intensive instruction in reading and mathematics consistent with his/her IEP (beginning with the most recent), and although progress toward grade level standards was made, he/she is not making progress at grade level.
  AND

- The student must demonstrate that his/her cannot attain proficiency in actual grade level MSA, even with accommodations.

Attachment A.2
[For use by school-based IEP Teams]

IEP Team Decision-Making Model

This decision-making model should be utilized by IEP Teams in schools that did not meet AYP (during the 2004-2005 administration of the MSA) based solely on special education as a subgroup, if the local school system determines it will appeal AYP for individual schools. For students with IEPs enrolled in these schools, IEP Team meetings must be convened prior to the end of this current school year. The purpose of this IEP Team meeting is to utilize the IEP Team Decision-Making Model to consider the student's eligibility and participation in Mod-MSA. Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, students who meet the criteria below may be eligible to participate in the Mod-MSA program.

The IEP Team must determine if:

✓ The student is learning using modified academic content standards in reading and mathematics.

✓ The student requires modifications during assessments and instruction, in addition to accommodations. These testing/assessment and instructional modifications may include: reduced complexity of language, reduced number of test items, reduced amount of content to learn, paraphrasing of reading passages, embedded scaffolding for a written response such as sentence stems, guided response outline, guided questioning to generate response, software such as Co-Writer and Write Outloud, use of calculator, and spell check.

✓ The student requires the use of a modified general curriculum. The curriculum for the student is aligned with the Maryland Content Standards for the student's grade level, but is modified (reduced amount to learn, reduced complexity, reduced output) so the student can access the content and demonstrate what he/she has learned.

✓ The student must have had at least three consecutive years of individualized intensive instruction in reading and mathematics consistent with his/her IEP, and although progress toward grade level standards was made, he/she is not making progress at grade level.

✓ The student must demonstrate that he/she cannot attain proficiency in their actual grade level MSA, even with accommodations.

In addition the IEP Team is required to respond to the following in detail:

- **Alt-MSA**: This student is <u>not</u> eligible to participate in the Alt-MSA.
  - ❑ Yes
  - ❑ No

- **General Curriculum**: How the student's disability affects involvement and progress in the general curriculum.

- ❑ List page of IEP that reflects this consideration _____

- **Modified General Curriculum**: The goals and objectives on the student's IEP require a modified general curriculum in:
  - ❑ Reading List pages of IEP that reflect modifications_____
  - ❑ Math List pages of IEP that reflect modifications_____

- **Grade Level Proficiency**: The instructional performance grade levels identified on the IEP, as measured by formalized assessment instruments or district-wide assessments that are designed for standardized assessment of achievement, are substantially below grade level.
  - ❑ Yes
  - ❑ No

- **Content Standards**: The goals on the student's IEP are aligned with the Maryland Content Standards.
  - ❑ Reading List IEP pages that reflect these goals_____
  - ❑ Math List IEP pages that reflect these goals_____

- **General Education Interventions**: The following instruction, general education interventions, and special education and related services have been provided to the student:
  - ❑ Instruction in the general education curriculum for _____ number of years.
  - ❑ Intensive reading interventions have been provided for _____years.
    List school-based intervention

    _____
    _____
    _____

  - ❑ Intensive mathematics interventions have been provided for ____ years
    List school-based intervention

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

  - ❑ List related services provided:

    Service_____ Years_____Frequency_____
    Service_____ Years_____Frequency_____
    Service_____ Years_____Frequency_____

  - ❑ Student has received special education instruction provided by qualified special education personnel outside the regular classroom for _____number of years and _____ hours per day.
  - ❑ One to one special education instruction with qualified special education personnel for _____ number of years and _____ hours per day.

- ❑ Resource room instruction by qualified special education personnel for _____ number of years and _____hours per day.

- ❑ Other research-based interventions provided to the student, including:
  _____
  _____

- **Grade Level Progress**: The student made progress toward grade level standards in the following areas and is not performing at grade level in the following areas:
  - ❑ Reading
  - ❑ Math

- **Instruction**: The student has had at least three years of individualized intensive instruction consistent with the IEP in the following areas:
  - ❑ Reading List years that reading goals are included in IEP _____
  - ❑ Math List years that math goals are included in IEP _____

- **Accommodations**: During instruction /assessment the student receives accommodations as indicated on the IEP in the area of:
  - ❑ Reading List pages of IEP that reflect accommodations_____
  - ❑ Math List pages of IEP that reflect accommodations_____

- **Supplementary Aids and Services**: The student has been provided with supplementary aids and services as indicated on the IEP in the areas of:
  - ❑ Reading List pages of IEP that reflect supplementary aids and services_____
  - ❑ Math List pages of IEP that reflect supplementary aids and services_____

Students meeting each of the above criteria with supporting documentation and not participating in the Alt-MSA will participate in the Mod-MSA.

Date: _____

Jurisdiction: _____

School: _____ Grade: _____

Student Name: _____ ID #: _____

D.O.B. _____

IEP Team Chair: _____

Team Members:

General Education Teacher: _____

Special Education Teacher: _____

Individual to Interpret Assessment Results: _____

Parent/Guardian: _____

Others: _____

Attachment B

2005 Workshops, Trainings and Documents re Training on Instructional Interventions for General and Special Education Teachers

Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Maryland State Department of Education, June 2005

1. 27 Intensive Trainings for Teachers in Student and Teacher Preparation to Administer the Alt-MSA

Sept 1 Alt-MSA rollout to Local Accountability Coordinators and Alt-MSA Facilitators
Sept 2 Alt-MSA rollout to Non-Public schools
Sept 8 Alt-MSA Facilitator meeting
Sept 9 Baltimore County presentation to staff
Sept 15 Frederick Co presentation to staff
Sept 16 Benedictine School presentation to staff
Sept 17 LEA 24 presentation
Sept 21 Dorchester Co planning with staff
Sept 22 Prince George's Co presentation to staff
Sept 23 Southern MD School Psych presentation
Sept 24 LEA 24 presentation
Sept 30 Anne Arundel Co presentation to staff

Oct. 1 Baltimore City presentation to staff
Oct 21 Non-Public Schools presentation to staff
Oct 22 Montgomery County presentation to Placement Unit Staff
Oct 22 Kennedy Krieger meeting with staff
Oct 26 Presentation to Anne Arundel County advisory committee
Oct 27 Children's Guild-presentation to staff
Oct 27 Caroline County presentation to staff

Nov. 4 Howard County teachers presentation
Nov. 9 Montgomery County Education Association (MCEA)
Nov 18 Presentation at Maryland Assessment Group Conference (MAG)

Dec. 1 Somerset-Betsy Reich-Technical Assistance
Dec. 2 Local Directors presentation
Dec 13 Non-Public Schools presentation to Ed Directors
Dec 15 Talbot County presentation to staff
Dec 22 Montgomery County-2 associate superintendents, 3 directors, various supervisors, teacher's union president--planning and technical assistance

2. Training On How To Improve Performance Of Students With Disabilities To The State Technical Assistants Assigned To Work With Schools In State Improvement

Staff from the Student Achievement and Results Branch provided professional development to 44 Maryland State Department of Education Technical Assistants and LEA School Improvement contact personnel on September 23, 2004. The MSDE Technical Assistants provide direct professional development to teachers and other staff at MSDE identified schools in improvement.

The professional development focused on Maryland School Assessment data and the need to analyze and use data for decision making to improve the academic performance of students with disabilities. Best practices were shared from a school that has successfully identified and implemented strategies to provide differentiated learning experiences for diverse learners. Background information of diversifying instruction and resources for teaching strategies and techniques were shared.

3. Training To 27 Low Performing Middle Schools That Are Participating In A State-Funded Program, Known As I-PAS. Improving Proficiency Of All Students

In April 2005**,** we provided professional development to more than 75 middle school teachers and administrators from schools participating in the 2004-2005 I-PAS/Challenge program. The outreach focused on using the Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC) to help students with disabilities meet state standards. Participants engaged in guided practice using the VSC to "backmap" to identify pre-requisite skills that need to be taught before students can access the grade-level VSC indicators and objectives. Examples of sample products for assessment limits were provided. School teams engaged in activities evaluated the collaborative practices in place at their school and brainstormed to determine next steps for improving reading. In addition, participants received resource packets detailing specific strategies for accommodations and modifications. A packet of information provided, including resource materials and the curriculum training packet are included. All materials were also sent electronically to all participants.

In addition to providing new knowledge and skills to the participants, the professional development was a trainer-of-trainers activity for some of the schools or local school systems that identified scaffolding and knowledge of prerequisite skills as a need for staff.

5. Governor's Academies Are Available Statewide And Held Regionally.

Governor's Academies in the content areas of Mathematics, English, Social Studies (Government), and Science (Biology) are under development and currently accepting registrations from general and special educators to attend two-week academies.

The purposes of the Academies are:

- to improve participants knowledge of content subject matter and pedagogy to assist students in improving achievement and performance on the HSA.

- develop a network of teachers who can share instructional strategies and effective lessons
- provide ongoing professional development during the school year with coaching and mentoring provided to participants.

6. Online Modules Are Available For Statewide Use

There are currently two, online web-enhanced "trainer of trainer" modules, one in social studies (American Government), and one in mathematics (Algebra/Data Analysis). Eight districts have been trained and have incorporated the web-enhanced into their instructional delivery process. Social studies is currently identifying their "trainer of trainers" which are to include an instructional technology specialist, a special education teacher, a central office content specialist and other (ELL suggested), as was previously done in math. These modules serve as additional curriculum resources.

7. Professional Development Modules Will Be Available For Statewide Use Beginning With Schools In Year Two Of Improvement

Currently under development are English/language arts instructional modules that engage participants in using the voluntary state curriculum in planning for instruction, making the instruction more accessible to students with disabilities, and strategizing for embedding scaffolded instruction into the planning/instructional delivery process to address diverse learning needs.

8. Collaborative Leadership Training

Collaborative briefings for English/Language Supervisors and Directors/Supervisors of Special Education, and Mathematics Supervisors/ Directors/Supervisors of Special Education were held to provide strategies for; improving accessibility to the general education curriculum for students with disabilities, differentiating instruction to address diverse learning needs, and collaborating for more effective instructional planning and delivery.

Conferences held jointly with Assistant Superintendents of Instruction and Special Education Directors have focused on researched based interventions that are effective with students with disabilities and the evaluation of the impact of professional development provided for staff.

9. Survey Of Reading And Math Curriculum Materials In Use For Students With Disabilities

At the request of local special education directors and our Reading First Office, STAR conducted a web-based survey of which reading interventions were being used by local school systems at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Reports were disseminated to all school systems with additional information about web contacts for the most frequently used reading intervention programs. The report was also distributed to assistant superintendents of instruction at our annual joint retreat with instruction and special education leadership from all 24 local school systems. Reading survey is included in this package of information. We are currently completing a similar survey of math programs being used at both the core text level and for interventions. This survey also included information about the settings where students with disabilities are receiving math instruction.

Attachment C

Assessment Stakeholder Outreach

Representatives of the Maryland State Department of Education

1. Carol Ann Baglin, Assistant State Superintendent, Div. Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS), Chair
2. Tom Barkley, Transition Specialist, DSE/EIS
3. Sharon Hall, Section Chief, Alternate Maryland School Assessment Program, DSE/EIS
4. Donna R. Riley, Policy & Resource Specialist, DSE/EIS
5. Susan Schaffer, Director, Work Force Technology Center, Division of Rehabilitative Services (DORS)

Representatives of Local School Systems, including General and Special Educators, Administrators, Board Members, Student Services, Guidance Counselors, and Transition Specialists

6. Ellen Schaefer, Supervisor, Department of Special Education, Montgomery County Public Schools
7. Dr. Karen Salmon, Superintendent Talbot County Public Schools,
8. Mr. James Lupis, Executive Director, Public School Superintendent Association of Maryland (PSSAM)
9. Mr. Allan Gorsuch, Director, Eastern Shore of Maryland Education Consortium
10. Jim Dryden, Executive Director, Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)
11. Clara Floyd, President, Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)
12. Michael Galassi, Special Services Vice President, Baltimore Teachers Union (BTU)
13. Sue Ann Tabler, Executive Director, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)
14. Carl Smith, Executive Director, Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)
15. Stacey Kopnitsky, Executive Director, Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)
16. Roberta Strosnider, President, Maryland Chapter of Council of Exceptional Children (MD-CEC)
17. Helena Davis, Local School System Transition Specialist, Baltimore City Public Schools
18. Dr. Jodi French, Director, Special Education Services, Cecil County Public Schools
19. Pamela Pencola, Director, Special Education, Frederick County Public Schools
20. Bonnie Walston, Supervisor, Special Education, Wicomico County
21. Diane Black, Director, Special Education, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
22. Bobbie Pedrick, Special Education, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
23. Patty Daley, Coordinator, Special Education, Howard County Public Schools
24. Judy Glass, Director, Special Education, Baltimore County Public Schools
25. Mr. Wade Blair, Guidance Counselor, Mary Moss Academy, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
26. Cydney Wentsel, Supervisor of Guidance and Counseling, Harford County Public Schools

Representatives of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities

27. Dorie Flynn, MANSEF
28. Revanette Gilmore, Villa Maria
29. Dr. Addys Karunaratne, Foundation School
30. Dr. Robin Church, Kennedy Krieger School
31. Gabrielle Miller, Kennedy Krieger School

Representatives of Advocacy Communities

32. Dr. Karen Rigamonti, Chairperson, Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)
33. Catriona Johnson, Director, Public Policy Initiatives, Developmental Disabilities Council (DDC) Dr. Carol Quirk, Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)
34. Diane Sakwa, Families Involved Together, Inc.
35. Leslie Seid-Margolis, Maryland Disability Law Center
36. Jane Walker, Maryland Children's Mental Health Coalition
37. Jim McComb, Maryland Association of Resources for Families and Youth (MARFY)
38. Theresa LeMaster, Parent, U of MD Clinical Law Program – 1/20 only
39. Diane Cheslea, Learning Disabilities Association
40. Linda Spencer, Children and Adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (CHADD) - 1/20 only

Representatives of Other State Agencies

41. Jade Gingerich, Maryland Department of Disabilities (MDOD)
42. Elliott Schoen, Office of the Attorney General

Attachment IV

To: Local Superintendents
Assistant Superintendents for Instruction, Local Directors of Special Education
Local Accountability Coordinators, Public Information Officers

From: Nancy S. Grasmick
State Superintendent of Schools

Date: June 2008

Re: *2008 Maryland AYP Appeals Manual for Elementary, Middle, and High Schools*
AYP Designations, Appeals Procedures, and File Submission

MATERIALS ENCLOSED

Enclosed is the *2008 Maryland AYP Appeals Manual for Elementary, Middle, and High Schools*, which will guide you through the steps necessary to research, document, and file appeals. The *2008 Maryland AYP Appeals Manual* comprises the following sections: Background Information on AYP and School Improvement, Directions for Appeals Based on Data and Coding Problems, and Directions for Appeals Based on Medical Emergencies and Special Education (modified assessment appeal), and a special section Procedures for Submitting Student-Level Data Files.

OVERVIEW

As you know, the Maryland School Assessment window was later this year to accommodate the fact that school systems scheduled their spring breaks during the usual March testing window. Therefore, elementary and middle school AYP will be available later than usual, and schools needing to offer choice options to parents will need to process their appeals (if appropriate) and required choice materials in tight timeframe.

This is the last year that school systems will be allowed to appeal the AYP results for schools that did not make AYP solely due to the subgroup of special education. Only students who were previously identified as eligible to participate in the modified assessments and took the regular assessment in the summer of 2007, October 2007, or January 2008 (and not May 2008) are eligible to be appealed. Next year, all eligible students will participate in the modified assessment and their obtained score will be included in AYP results.

You will have 10 business days to process appeals. Given that the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services has worked with all school systems and conducted numerous trainings on the procedures to identify students eligible for participation in the modified assessments (see attached listing of trainings from fall and winter). They also completed reviews of the records of identified students, therefore, we are confident that once you know the schools eligible for these appeals, materials can be processed expeditiously for those students. Since school systems should be verifying their data before initial submission to MSDE, coding errors should be rare.

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL AYP APPEALS PROCEDURES

You will receive *preliminary* AYP and Schools in Improvement information directly from MSDE's Division of Accountability and Assessment. The information will include an embargoed list of the elementary and middle schools in your system that, based on 2008 Maryland School Assessment and Alternate Maryland School Assessment performance and attendance rates, have been identified for School Improvement for the 2008-2009 school year, are exiting School Improvement, or require Local Attention. Schools included in this list are elementary and middle schools only**.** Please note that the Title I designations are for the 2007-2008 school year. The list will be updated with the 2008-2009 Title I designations as soon as these are available. The list of high schools identified for School Improvement for the 2008-2009 school year will be released to you when the data becomes available.

Submitting Appeals

Please submit appeals related to the list of elementary and middle schools so they are **received and signed for by the Office of Academic Policy by the announced deadline**, using the process outlined in the manual. The deadline for appeals for high schools will be announced later when the high school data is available. Please note that local school systems are required to submit an electronic file of students who are being appealed on the basis of the modified assessment. Keep in mind, also, that if you are successful in appealing for data coding and/or medical emergencies, you may then want to submit appeals for modified assessments. For this reason, coding errors should be submitted in advance of the final deadline.

All appeals should be accompanied by a cover letter signed by the superintendent that lists the schools whose AYP status you are appealing and the students being appealed. Along with the letter, you must include the completed *Elementary/Middle/High School Appeals Form SY 2007-08* for each school for each type of appeal (see C.6 in the manual).

HIGH SCHOOL AYP APPEALS PROCEDURES

The procedures for filing AYP appeals for high schools are included in this 2008 manual. High school appeals related to the modified assessment will be accepted only for students who last took the HSA prior to the May 2008 administration. The scores for any student participating in the May administration **cannot** be appealed. The timetable for filing appeals for high schools will be announced prior to the release of the high school data.

If you have questions on the appeals process, please contact Dr. Ron Peiffer at 410-767-0473 or at rpeiffer@msde.state.md.us. If you have technical questions on AYP results or data file submissions, please contact Dr. Leslie Wilson at 410-767-0073 or at lewilson@msde.state.md.us. If you have specific questions about Part C of the manual regarding students with disabilities, please contact Dr. Carol Ann Baglin at 410-767-0238 or at cbaglin@msde.state.md.us. We hope this information is helpful to you as you prepare appeals.

. If you have any follow-up questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

NSG:rap:sks
Attachment

MOD-HSA PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FACT SHEET

STATE TRAINING

DATE	PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER ATTENDED
December 14, 2007	All Local School Systems – Asst. Superintendents of Instruction, Directors of Special Education, LACs, Central Office Special Education Personnel	170

REGIONAL TRAININGS

DATE	PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER ATTENDED
December 17, 2007	Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, Cecil, and St. Mary's – Directors of Special Education, LAC's, High School Principals, Special Education Staff	33
December 18, 2007	Caroline, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester – Directors of Special Education, LAC's, High School Principals, Special Education Staff	74
December 19, 2007	Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Harford – Directors of Special Education, LAC's, High School Principals, Special Education Staff	101
DATE	**PARTICIPANTS**	**NUMBER ATTENDED**
January 8, 2008	Howard, Montgomery, and Prince George's – Directors of Special Education, LAC's, High School Principals, Special Education Staff	112

January 10, 2008	Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, and Washington – Directors of Special Education, LAC's, High School Principals, Special Education Staff	48
January 22, 2008	LEA 24 (Non-public) – Testing Coordinators, Principals, Special Education Staff	109
Beginning January 2008	Ongoing technical support as requested	
February 8, 2008	Technical support to local school system Executive Officers	35
February 19, 2008	Technical support to local school system –Central Career Center at Briscoe High School - Baltimore City Public Schools	6

Topics covered in trainings included:

- Mod eligibility requirements
- Guidelines for IEP teams
- Summary of Maryland's Assessments
- Sample of modified test items
- Creating standard based IEPs
- Writing IEP goals based on content standards

Technical Support

DATE	PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER ATTENDED
Beginning January 2008 Ongoing technical support as requested		
February 8, 2008	Technical support to local school system Executive Officers	35
February 19, 2008	Technical support to local school system –Central Career Center at Briscoe High School - Baltimore City Public Schools	6

March 10, 11, 12, 2008	Technical support for High School Principals – Baltimore City Public Schools	50 (attended each session)
March 26, 2008	Technical support to local school system –Kent County Public Schools	16
April 10, 2008	Technical support conference call- Baltimore City Public School s	50 (from ten high schools)
April 23, 2008	Technical support to local school system- Talbot County Public Schools	20
May 5, 2008	Mod-assessment presentation at the Social Studies Briefing- Maryland Historical Society	40

05-06-08