

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
Parts I and II**

for  
**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**  
under the  
**ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT**  
As amended in 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**

**MARYLAND**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2011-12 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Maryland State Department of Education	
Address: 200 West Baltimore Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Mary L. Gable, Assistant State Superintendent Academic Policy	
Telephone: 410-767-0473	
Fax: 410-333-2275	
e-mail: <a href="mailto:mgable@msde.state.md.us">mgable@msde.state.md.us</a>	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Lillian M. Lowery	
_____ Signature	<u>Friday, March 8, 2013, 1:19:58 PM</u> Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>			
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
Academic Content Standards	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The changes to Common Core and PARCC assessments were reported last year and will be implemented in school year 2013-14 for Common Core Curriculum and 2014-15 for PARCC Assessments.

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The changes to Common Core and PARCC assessments were reported last year and will be implemented in school year 2013-14 for Common Core Curriculum and 2014-15 for PARCC Assessments.



**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The changes to Common Core and PARCC assessments were reported last year and will be implemented in school year 2013-14 for Common Core Curriculum and 2014-15 for PARCC Assessments.

### 1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

#### 1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

#### 1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	433,020	431,427	99.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,246	1,240	99.50
Asian	25,154	25,111	99.80
Black or African American	154,092	153,267	99.50
Hispanic or Latino	48,622	48,470	99.70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	452	452	100.00
White	187,265	186,739	99.70
Two or more races	16,187	16,146	99.70
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	52,398	51,883	99.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,528	18,475	99.70
Economically disadvantaged students	182,227	181,212	99.40
Migratory students	24	24	100.00
Male	222,231	221,288	99.60
Female	210,787	210,137	99.70
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,821	13.10
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,847	57.50
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	10,797	20.80
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,418	8.50
Total	51,883	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	434,582	433,167	99.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,247	1,242	99.60
Asian	25,309	25,252	99.80
Black or African American	154,323	153,608	99.50
Hispanic or Latino	48,735	48,564	99.60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	471	469	99.60
White	188,264	187,831	99.80
Two or more races	16,226	16,194	99.80
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	52,193	51,759	99.20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,438	18,292	99.20
Economically disadvantaged students	182,424	181,503	99.50
Migratory students	23	23	100.00
Male	222,777	221,974	99.60
Female	211,798	211,186	99.70

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	2,018
--	-------

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,113	13.70
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,514	57.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	10,714	20.70
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,418	8.50
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	17	0.00
Total	51,776	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The student participation count includes recently arrived students who are LEP, and who have attended schools in the U.S less than 12 months, including those students who took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment.		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	185,362	184,170	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	566	562	99.30
Asian	10,733	10,696	99.70
Black or African American	67,289	66,669	99.10
Hispanic or Latino	19,124	18,994	99.30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	192	189	98.40
White	81,366	80,992	99.50
Two or more races	6,074	6,050	99.60
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,023	21,614	98.10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,482	5,422	98.90
Economically disadvantaged students	71,790	71,064	99.00
Migratory students	8	8	100.00
Male	94,553	93,851	99.30
Female	90,792	90,302	99.50

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	5,420	25.10
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,981	55.40
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2,245	10.40
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,968	9.10
Total	21,614	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.



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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,224	55,495	87.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	149	86.60
Asian	3,877	3,735	96.30
Black or African American	21,136	16,552	78.30
Hispanic or Latino	8,284	7,063	85.30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	80	73	91.30
White	26,807	25,303	94.40
Two or more races	2,868	2,620	91.40
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,300	4,649	63.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,013	4,859	80.80
Economically disadvantaged students	28,884	23,095	80.00
Migratory students	8	7	87.50
Male	32,468	28,281	87.10
Female	30,756	27,214	88.50
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,228	53,796	85.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	138	80.20
Asian	3,855	3,628	94.10
Black or African American	21,159	15,813	74.70
Hispanic or Latino	8,275	6,835	82.60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	80	68	85.00
White	26,816	24,760	92.30
Two or more races	2,870	2,553	89.00
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,306	5,092	69.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,972	4,654	77.90
Economically disadvantaged students	28,896	22,031	76.20
Migratory students	8	5	62.50
Male	32,472	26,714	82.30
Female	30,755	27,081	88.10
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. The discrepancy between the male and female not adding to the total is because gender was not identified by one student.			

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Maryland does not test science in grade 3			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,062	56,675	89.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	156	91.20
Asian	3,822	3,717	97.30
Black or African American	21,531	17,681	82.10
Hispanic or Latino	7,968	6,928	86.90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	63	56	88.90
White	26,823	25,635	95.60
Two or more races	2,684	2,502	93.20
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,624	5,063	66.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,449	3,538	79.50
Economically disadvantaged students	28,531	23,854	83.60
Migratory students	3	2	66.70
Male	32,430	28,822	88.90
Female	30,632	27,853	90.90
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,049	56,652	89.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	159	93.00
Asian	3,800	3,661	96.30
Black or African American	21,541	17,694	82.10
Hispanic or Latino	7,957	6,941	87.20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	63	55	87.30
White	26,828	25,632	95.50
Two or more races	2,688	2,510	93.40
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,623	5,477	71.80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,393	3,488	79.40
Economically disadvantaged students	28,525	23,694	83.10
Migratory students	3	2	66.70
Male	32,413	28,455	87.80
Female	30,635	28,197	92.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. The discrepancy between the male and female not adding to the total is because gender was not identified by one student.			

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Maryland does not test Science in Grade 4			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,021	52,104	85.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	148	84.60
Asian	3,624	3,500	96.60
Black or African American	21,505	16,100	74.90
Hispanic or Latino	7,162	5,845	81.60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	61	53	86.90
White	26,013	24,235	93.20
Two or more races	2,481	2,223	89.60
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,697	4,723	61.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,868	1,896	66.10
Economically disadvantaged students	27,158	20,703	76.20
Migratory students	1	0	0.00
Male	31,149	26,211	84.10
Female	29,872	25,893	86.70
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,033	54,915	90.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	160	91.40
Asian	3,608	3,475	96.30
Black or African American	21,519	17,736	82.40
Hispanic or Latino	7,159	6,342	88.60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	61	53	86.90
White	26,031	24,838	95.40
Two or more races	2,480	2,311	93.20
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,716	5,600	72.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,820	2,119	75.10
Economically disadvantaged students	27,158	22,571	83.10
Migratory students	1	0	0.00
Male	31,155	27,418	88.00
Female	29,878	27,497	92.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,278	42,069	68.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	173	115	66.50
Asian	3,694	3,148	85.20
Black or African American	21,581	10,640	49.30
Hispanic or Latino	7,273	4,324	59.50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	63	34	54.00
White	26,013	21,894	84.20
Two or more races	2,478	1,914	77.20
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,697	2,963	38.50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,179	949	29.90
Economically disadvantaged students	27,205	13,908	51.10
Migratory students	3	0	0.00
Male	31,283	21,318	68.10
Female	29,992	20,751	69.20

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. Due to gender missing for some students the sum of male and female counts may not equal the total number of students.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,669	51,261	83.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	143	80.30
Asian	3,648	3,464	95.00
Black or African American	21,981	15,849	72.10
Hispanic or Latino	6,941	5,391	77.70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	78	64	82.10
White	26,447	24,235	91.60
Two or more races	2,395	2,115	88.30
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,632	4,177	54.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,826	1,007	55.10
Economically disadvantaged students	26,913	19,508	72.50
Migratory students	3	1	33.30
Male	31,693	25,655	80.90
Female	29,975	25,606	85.40

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. The discrepancy between the male and female not adding to the total is because gender was not identified by one student.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,663	52,147	84.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	150	84.30
Asian	3,634	3,420	94.10
Black or African American	21,995	16,509	75.10
Hispanic or Latino	6,932	5,563	80.30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	78	59	75.60
White	26,451	24,309	91.90
Two or more races	2,395	2,137	89.20
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,644	4,463	58.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,784	907	50.80
Economically disadvantaged students	26,926	20,004	74.30
Migratory students	2	1	50.00
Male	31,704	25,960	81.90
Female	29,959	26,187	87.40

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Maryland does not test Science in Grade 6			



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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,664	46,395	76.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	118	76.60
Asian	3,366	3,158	93.80
Black or African American	21,991	13,296	60.50
Hispanic or Latino	6,558	4,551	69.40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	42	72.40
White	26,373	23,434	88.90
Two or more races	2,164	1,796	83.00
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,447	3,755	50.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,325	584	44.10
Economically disadvantaged students	25,733	15,892	61.80
Migratory students	4	0	0.00
Male	31,285	23,281	74.40
Female	29,379	23,114	78.70
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,693	49,337	81.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	122	78.70
Asian	3,350	3,119	93.10
Black or African American	22,031	15,464	70.20
Hispanic or Latino	6,545	5,056	77.20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	44	75.90
White	26,387	23,671	89.70
Two or more races	2,166	1,861	85.90
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,480	3,933	52.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,272	562	44.20
Economically disadvantaged students	25,755	17,957	69.70
Migratory students	4	0	0.00
Male	31,320	24,007	76.70
Female	29,372	25,330	86.20
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. The discrepancy between the male and female not adding to the total is because gender was not identified by one student.			

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Maryland does not test Science in Grade 7			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,652	42,846	69.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	190	127	66.80
Asian	3,496	3,213	91.90
Black or African American	22,368	11,379	50.90
Hispanic or Latino	6,389	3,843	60.20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75	49	65.30
White	27,043	22,591	83.50
Two or more races	2,090	1,643	78.60
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,400	2,864	38.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,104	385	34.90
Economically disadvantaged students	25,180	12,988	51.60
Migratory students	2	0	0.00
Male	31,561	21,342	67.60
Female	30,091	21,504	71.50
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,698	49,921	80.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	190	144	75.80
Asian	3,477	3,227	92.80
Black or African American	22,403	15,626	69.70
Hispanic or Latino	6,382	4,806	75.30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	73	52	71.20
White	27,076	24,234	89.50
Two or more races	2,096	1,832	87.40
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,433	3,944	53.10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,057	345	32.60
Economically disadvantaged students	25,209	17,228	68.30
Migratory students	2	0	0.00
Male	31,596	24,412	77.30
Female	30,101	25,509	84.70
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. The discrepancy between the male and female not adding to the total is because gender was not identified by one student.			

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,781	43,769	70.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	131	68.60
Asian	3,557	3,160	88.80
Black or African American	22,302	11,456	51.40
Hispanic or Latino	6,509	3,940	60.50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	78	50	64.10
White	27,039	23,338	86.30
Two or more races	2,092	1,694	81.00
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,380	2,707	36.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,381	321	23.20
Economically disadvantaged students	25,000	13,017	52.10
Migratory students	2	0	0.00
Male	31,605	22,320	70.60
Female	30,163	21,449	71.10

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. Due to gender missing for some students the sum of male and female counts may not equal the total number of students.

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,135	50,482	83.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	169	84.50
Asian	3,278	3,154	96.20
Black or African American	22,755	16,043	70.50
Hispanic or Latino	5,168	4,260	82.40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	30	81.10
White	27,233	25,470	93.50
Two or more races	1,464	1,356	92.60
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,783	3,306	48.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	890	531	59.70
Economically disadvantaged students	18,813	13,926	74.00
Migratory students	3	2	66.70
Male	30,702	25,458	82.90
Female	29,432	25,024	85.00

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. The discrepancy between the male and female not adding to the total is because gender was not identified by one student.

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,803	51,409	83.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	168	83.60
Asian	3,528	3,235	91.70
Black or African American	22,960	16,653	72.50
Hispanic or Latino	5,314	4,220	79.40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	39	69.60
White	28,242	25,737	91.10
Two or more races	1,499	1,357	90.50
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,557	3,411	52.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	994	397	39.90
Economically disadvantaged students	19,034	13,720	72.10
Migratory students	3	1	33.30
Male	31,314	24,905	79.50
Female	30,486	26,504	86.90

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. Due to gender missing for some students the sum of male and female counts may not equal the total number of students.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,111	49,913	81.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	163	82.30
Asian	3,445	3,244	94.20
Black or African American	22,786	15,349	67.40
Hispanic or Latino	5,212	4,077	78.20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	48	41	85.40
White	27,940	25,687	91.90
Two or more races	1,480	1,352	91.40
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,537	3,357	51.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	862	478	55.50
Economically disadvantaged students	18,859	13,125	69.60
Migratory students	3	1	33.30
Male	30,963	25,410	82.10
Female	30,147	24,503	81.30

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data has been checked and is accurate. The discrepancy between the male and female not adding to the total is because gender was not identified by one student.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,454		
Districts	25		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A Based on ESEA Flexibility			

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	369		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	312		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	57		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A Based on ESEA Flexibility			

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

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
24		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A Based on ESEA Flexibility		

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	4
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	22
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	9
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland only allowed three alternative governance options for schools entering restructuring implementation in the 2011-2012 school year. 1) Replace all or most of the school staff, which may include the principals, who are relevant to the school's inability to make adequate progress, 2) Contract with a private management company, and 3) reopen the school as a public charter school.

In past years, MSDE allowed schools to select "other major restructuring options". Schools implementing those "other" options were grandfathered and allowed to continue to employ them.

2012 "other" options included:

- 1) Appoint a turnaround specialist.
- 2) Use an external-based reform model



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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on the 2011 AYP data, Maryland has identified the following local school systems as school systems in improvement or corrective action.

System Improvement Year 1:

- Dorchester County
- Montgomery County
- Baltimore City

System Improvement Year 2:

- Wicomico County

Corrective Action:

- Prince George's County

Under the Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act, each local school system was required to develop and implement a comprehensive Master Plan containing goals and strategies for improving student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps. Each year, an update to this plan is submitted to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) and reviewed to determine if sufficient progress is being made by individual school systems.

School systems identified as being in improvement and/or corrective action must, as part of the development of the Master Plan Update, provide a summary of how the school system has revised the applicable components of the Update demonstrate how the school system plans to exit improvement or corrective action status or to execute the corrective actions taken by the State Board of Education.

In 2010, MSDE was awarded one of the Race to the Top (RTTT) education grants. As required in the RTTT application, school systems with persistently low-performing Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools must, as part of the Master Plan Update, provide a plan describing district-level support for improving student performance at the identified schools. This plan must also describe the corresponding resource allocations dedicated to improved performance, aligned with the State's RTTT goals.

In 2011 Prince George's County Public Schools remains in corrective action; however, since the system's comprehensive master plan was cited as having all of the elements that the Board would have included in a corrective action plan, no corrective actions have been adopted by the State Board of Education. Subsequent Master Plan update documents have been approved by the State Board. The update for 2011 is currently under review by the Department and final recommendations on approval will be presented to the State Board in early December.

As part of the master plan review process, Prince George's County was required to present its plan for exiting corrective action status.

Prince George's County attended a meeting with the review panel on November 16th to discuss their status. At this meeting, Prince George's County presented a comprehensive plan for exiting Corrective Action. Highlights are below:

- School Improvement Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring: 1) Inclusion of Special Education and ELL teachers in the school-based collaborative process; and 2) Continued use of quarterly performance management reviews to hold schools and departments accountable for performance.
- Systemic supports: 1) Broad implementation of the Universal Design for Learning and differentiated instruction; and 2) Expansion of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.
- Support for Alternative Governance (AG) schools, including an Alternative Governance Oversight Board, which will continue to monitor the implementation of AG plans and provide support - particularly human resources support - as needed. The county will also use the Harvard University Graduate School of Education's Data Wise Improvement Process to facilitate effective data-driven collaborative planning. Implementation of Data Wise will begin as a pilot in 10 AG schools

- Support for middle schools includes continued implementation of the turnaround model in 6 schools, revised curricula in math and language arts, expanded collaborative planning, extra weight for middle schools in student-based budgeting, full implementation of PBIS, and implementation of special programs such as Middle Years Program, Chesapeake Math and Science, urban debate, STEM program with NOAA, and the NSF minority pipeline grant.
- Strategies and activities for Special Education Reform include establishing a Discipline Reform Charter to increase staff capacity to provide behavioral supports and decrease disciplinary removals of students with disabilities; expanding efforts to provide Least Restrictive Environment reform with a shift in emphasis to college and career readiness; and establishing best practices for Response to Intervention (RTI) routines and procedures including implementation of Leveled Literacy and Number Worlds for struggling K-3 students, expanding professional development on differentiated instruction, and integration of the principles of Universal Design for Learning into daily instructional planning.
- Strategies to address English language learners include implementing ELO programs for high need students, implementing collaborative planning between the Reading/English Language Arts and ESOL Departments at the middle and high school levels and central office departments.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	1
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A Based on ESEA Flexibility		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	
---	--

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

#### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has reserved funds to support the salaries of Title I school support specialists who are part of the School Support Team and provide direct assistance and oversight to the identified Tier I, Tier II and Tier II schools. The specialists are assigned as teams to LEAs with schools served by the school improvement grant. They are charged with working directly with the Central Support Teams in each LEA as models and strategies are being developed, implemented and monitored; they oversee the spending down of funds, budgets, and program implementation. The school improvement specialists are the first line between the SEA and the LEA.

Maryland used administrative funds from the school improvement grant to support LEAs through the Breakthrough Center and Title I Office. The SEA participates in an ongoing consultation process (with identified LEA staff) to determine the alignment of resources in the impacted schools in order to make decisions which will improve teaching and learning for all children as they achieve proficient and advanced levels of student achievement.

Based on the final decisions by the LEA, the SEA has offered to broker and/or provide services at the school level to meet the specific needs of the school community in the following areas:

- Curriculum;
- Instruction;
- Assessment;
- School Culture and Climate;
- Students, Family and Community Support;
- Professional Development with Accountability;
- Effective Leadership;
- organizational Structure and Resources; and
- Comprehensive and Effective Planning

Funds have been reserved to partially support an Executive Director position for the Breakthrough Center and for materials associated with providing technical assistance to Tier I and Tier II schools. Technical assistance from the Breakthrough Center includes activities such as offering services to LEAs which will assist the LEAs in developing district capacity or measure its capacity to support its identified schools.

The SEA also utilized the Restructuring Implementation Technical Assistance (RITA) Initiative, developed in January 2007 as a response to the Title I A requirement for the SEA to provide technical assistance to low performing schools. The RITA process is designed to assist Restructuring Implementation schools in identifying programs and systems that are effective and those that need to be eliminated or improved to advance student achievement. RITA establishes teams of highly skilled educators to work in concert with school districts and schools, using a thoughtful, systematic, evidence-based process in order to provide constructive recommendations for the district and the school that will improve teaching and learning.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All Title I schools in improvement receive technical assistance from the Maryland State Department of Education. Technical assistance intensifies as a school progresses along the continuum of non-performance. In accordance with the State Differentiated Accountability Pilot, schools in year 1 and 2 complete and submit to MSDE a School Inventory rating their performance on eight key indicators of school success including curriculum; instruction; assessment; school culture and climate; student, family and community support; professional development with accountability; organization structures and resources; and comprehensive and effective planning.

Once schools enter their third year of school improvement, MSDE staff guide the school through 1) a comprehensive needs assessment, 2) the Teacher Capacity Needs Assessment, involving all school staff, to discover root causes underlying non-performance, 3) a revisit of a recent climate survey, and 4) the adoption of one of NCLB's Corrective Actions. MSDE guides the schools throughout this process through professional training, developing specific guidelines and rubrics, documenting all activities through Websurveyor, and sharing results statewide.

Additionally, select schools in Baltimore City, Dorchester and Prince George's Counties received support from the Breakthrough Center, Maryland's Statewide System of Support. The Breakthrough Center is an internal MSDE operation dedicated to coordinating, brokering and delivering support to districts and schools across the state.

## 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

#### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	57,036
Applied to transfer	3,214
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,226
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	



**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 3,695,036

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	1

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. School Choice was not offered at the four middle schools in one system because there were no system middle schools that met requirements to be identified as a receiving school.

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	28,404
Applied for supplemental educational services	11,413
Received supplemental educational services	8,216
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,733,359
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	200,923	187,007	93.10	13,916	6.90
All elementary classes	89,836	85,640	95.30	4,196	4.70
All secondary classes	111,087	101,367	91.30	9,720	8.70

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes are weighted (multiplied by four) to account for all CAS instruction.
--

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

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	50.40
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	17.60
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	3.80
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" includes elementary school classes taught by teachers that are not certified in the grade they are teaching.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	38.90
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	23.30
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	30.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	6.90
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" includes secondary school classes taught by teachers that are not certified in the grade they are teaching.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

**NOTE:** No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	21,816	19,184	87.90
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	25,695	25,108	97.70
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	20,005	16,782	83.90
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	27,368	25,878	94.60

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	75.60	25.40
Poverty metric used	Poverty metric used Eligible for free/reduced meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
Secondary schools	59.60	19.00
Poverty metric used	Poverty metric used Eligible for free/reduced meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	

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

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Dual language	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Two-way immersion	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Transitional bilingual programs	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Developmental bilingual	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Heritage language	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Structured English immersion	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Content-based ESL	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Pull-out ESL	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other:

Push-in; Newcomer program; ESOL tutoring support (ESL services provided by tutors under the supervision of ESL certified teacher).

A heritage language program in Spanish was not submitted by any of our LEAs as an LIEP during this year's data collection cycle.



**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	55,618
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	55,597
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	35,376
French	1,998
Chinese	1,863
Vietnamese	1,296
Amharic	1,025

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121 (a)(2).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	52,831
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	439
Total	53,270
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Section 1.6.3.1.1 - The source file for the total number of LEP students in Maryland represents the unduplicated number of LEP students enrolled in an elementary or secondary school at any time during the school year. This number will be larger than the number of students who participated in the English proficiency assessment since this number represents the number of LEP students who were attending school in Maryland during the testing window which lasted approximately 5 weeks. Teacher-school error/109; truant/104; special needs/64; transferred/47; entered during testing window/47; parent refusal/30; LEA error/17; suspended/5; hospitalized/9; enrolled in evening high school/5; out of country/1; student anxiety/1.</p>	

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	8,257
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15.50
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.</p>	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	52,812
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	439
Total	53,251
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Section 1.6.3.2.1 - The source file for the number of Title III served LEP students represents the unduplicated number of LEP students enrolled in an elementary or secondary school at any time during the school year. This number will be larger than the number Title III served students who were attending school in Maryland during the testing window which lasted approximately 5 weeks. In years past, a screening instrument's results were assigned proficiency level raw scores that were then used as the first data point and compared to the raw scores attained on the summative ELP assessment. Feedback from psychometricians indicated that these two data points were not comparable. The following was included in our 2/3/2012 letter to the SASA Programs Office: For the AMAO 1 calculation of ELL students new to the state of MD in the 2011-2012 school year, data point one becomes the first administration of ACCESS for ELLs. This accounts for the larger number of students with only 1 data point than MSDE has reported in the past. Our K population has the largest number of ELLs than any other grade and accounts for a large portion of the total number. Teacher-school error/109; truant/104; special needs/64; transferred/47; entered during testing window/47; parent refusal/30; LEA error/17; suspended/5; hospitalized/9; enrolled in evening high school/5; out of country/1; student anxiety/1.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	15,393

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	18,978	50.70	19,458	52.00
Attained proficiency	8,253	15.60	5,281	10.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Spring 2012 was the first administration of ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency assessment (ELPA). Results were available in June of 2012. These results have been compared to the last three administrations of LAS Links, MD's former ELPA in a study that was completed in October of 2012. We will be working with the WIDA Consortium assessment and research specialists in early January to set the AMAO 1 and 2 targets for 2012. We will be able to submit the resulting data files to include with MD's CSPR during the correction				

period and populate the following tables: 1.6.3.2.2: Title III English Language Proficiency Results; 1.6.4.1: Title III Subgrantee Performance; 1.6.4.2: State Accountability.

The lack of data for AMAO 1 is a result of our waiting for approval from the ED of our criteria and targets.

As of 3/8/12- AMAO data has been entered

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No assessments given in native languages

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No assessments given in native languages

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No assessments given in native languages

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
4,827	5,369	10,196

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,130	8,758	86.50	1,372

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,196	9,080	89.10	1,116
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,242	2,210	68.20	1,032
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			



**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	22
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	5
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	11
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	16
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	17
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	3
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	5

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Spring 2012 was the first administration of ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency assessment (ELPA). Results were available in June of 2012. These results have been compared to the last three administrations of LAS Links, MD's former ELPA in a study that was completed in October of 2012. We will working with the WIDA Consortium assessment and research specialists in early January to set the AMAO 1 and 2 targets for 2012. We will be able to submit the resulting data files to include with MD's CSPR during the correction period and populate the following tables: 1.6.3.2.2: Title III English Language Proficiency Results; 1.6.4.1: Title III Subgrantee Performance; 1.6.4.2: State Accountability.  
 The number 17 was entered in # of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)- This number was incorrectly entered and has been removed.  
 As of 3/8/12- AMAO data has been entered

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Spring 2012 was the first administration of ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency assessment (ELPA). Results were available in June of 2012. These results have been compared to the last three administrations of LAS Links, MD's former ELPA in a study that was completed in October of 2012. We will working with the WIDA Consortium assessment and research specialists in early January to set the AMAO 1 and 2 targets for 2012. We will be able to submit the resulting data files to include with MD's CSPR during the correction period and populate the following tables: 1.6.3.2.2: Title III English Language Proficiency Results; 1.6.4.1: Title III Subgrantee Performance; 1.6.4.2: State Accountability.	

### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
17,673	1,154	7

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,272
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	337

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	21	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	19	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	17	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	13	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	16	
Other (Explain in comment box)	10	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	21	2,036
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	21	5,990
PD provided to principals	17	642
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	17	702
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	19	950
PD provided to community based organization personnel	14	429
Total	109	10,749

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/01/11	7/13/11	13
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The notices of grant awards are completed after the notification has been received from the Department of Education of the amount of the Title III allocation. These in turn are sent out to LEAs; assurances must be signed and returned to MSDE. This process usually takes about 2 weeks.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	3
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	10	10
LEAs with subgrants	14	14
Total	24	24
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		



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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	91	685
K	173	1,185
1	154	1,192
2	142	1,159
3	124	1,141
4	112	1,035
5	100	1,043
6	85	878
7	85	870
8	84	885
9	83	1,045
10	51	768
11	44	620
12	71	786
Ungraded		
Total	1,399	13,292

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students are reported with an actual grade and that ungraded is N/A

The grade option for Ungraded was removed from the Maryland Student Records Manual. All students are reported with an actual grade so ungraded is N/A.

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

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	218	1,329
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,046	10,643
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	21	214
Hotels/Motels	114	1,106
Total	1,399	13,292

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

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

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	168
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	635
K	1,090
1	1,087
2	1,083
3	1,057
4	957
5	976
6	820
7	801
8	817
9	958
10	699
11	564
12	728
Ungraded	
Total	12,440

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The grade option for Ungraded was removed from the Maryland Student Records Manual. All students are reported with an actual grade so ungraded is N/A.

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	842
Migratory children/youth	19
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,131
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	483

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,154	793
4	1,040	812
5	1,045	791
6	871	594
7	860	520
8	883	554
High School	736	541

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,151	830
4	1,040	792
5	1,045	709
6	873	569
7	855	452
8	884	405
High School	729	547

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	1,043	440
6		
7		
8	870	441
High School	728	502

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65
K	41
1	19
2	27
3	17
4	11
5	10
6	6
7	10
8	8
9	16
10	3
11	10
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	85
Total	334
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease (14.6%) this season to Category 1 count was the result of:

- Smaller number of 16-21 OSY workers in the state
- Increase Immigration Raids including while on the road
- High gas prices (limits mobility as well as agri-business production)

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42
K	29
1	10
2	20
3	12
4	8
5	5
6	4
7	8
8	4
9	4
10	1
11	3
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.



**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Collected and maintained the same as Category 1 count.

Child count data is collected at the SEA level (only one data specialist) All Certification of Eligibility (COEs) are electronic (the electronic COE has all the required National COE components and was approved by OME). COEs must be done with a face to face interview and only a trained recruiter can complete the electronic COE. Tablet PCs are only assigned to trained staff and cannot be used or shared by others.

All student program data is collected from the LEA projects on input forms - these are all entered by the SEA data specialist. Training is provided annually for student data collection. Program data is collected at the end of a program or when the child leaves the State. All students that are counted must have an enrollment line during the funding period to be counted.

When the count is run there is a freeze to the data base to generate a copy maintaining a point in time count that reflect the eligibility period for funding (September 1 to August 31)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland operates one central data base (MIS2000). All COEs are processed at the State Migrant Education Service Center. All data (enrollments, withdrawals, supplemental programs, needs assessments) submitted to the Center are entered and maintained in one system (MIS 2000). (Trained migrant recruiters can only complete COEs.)

Certification of Eligibility records are sent to the state data specialist and reviewed for eligibility and completeness. A review of the information is done to be sure that the family qualifies and the information in the comments section meets the requirements for eligibility. If the COE does not meet the eligibility requirements for any reason then it is sent back to the recruiter with a brief explanation. The recruiter would need to interview the family to clarify the information and resubmit the COE. If the COE meets the eligibility requirements then a search of the State data base is made to see if the student has been in the State on a previous move. If the student has been in the State before then they are selected from the list and approved to the COE. This is done on each child on the form. If the student does not have a previous move to The State then they are approved as a new student.

Students enrolled in summer program are reviewed (in early August) to make sure the eligibility of the student has not ended before the regular school term (late August). Students enrolled in the regular school year are reviewed (in early June) to make sure the eligibility of the student has not ended before the summer program starts (late June).

The State Data Specialist is responsible for getting the list of currently enrolled students to the recruiters so they can verify if the students are still residing in the area. The recruiter visits the families and reports the information back to the State data specialist. The data specialist will then enter a new student history line into the data base with the updated information. If the student has left the area, then no new entry is made for that student.

Student's enrollment is evaluated annually. Students are not counted automatically from one year to the next the recruiter/advocate and local summer recruiters are required to visit the family at least once a year to determine eligibility.

Training is provided for LEA summer program staff so that accurate student data is collected and submitted (attendance, priority for service, needs assessments, LEP status, and Special Education status). Program checklists are sent to administrators to remind them of submission requirements.

Maryland operates one central data base (MIS2000). All electronic COEs are uploaded to the State Migrant Education Service Center for validation and acceptance. All data (enrollments, withdrawals, supplemental programs, needs assessments, secondary credits, and OSY services) submitted to the Center on input forms are entered and maintained in one system (MIS 2000). (Trained migrant recruiters can only complete COEs and administrators and key staff in projects receive training related to student program data)

COEs are uploaded to the State Data Specialist and reviewed for eligibility and completeness. A review of the information is done to be sure that the family qualifies and the information in the comments section meets the requirements for eligibility. If the COE does not meet the eligibility requirements for any reason then it is uploaded to the recruiter with a brief explanation. The recruiter may need to re-interview the family to clarify the information and resubmit (electronically) the COE. If the COE meets the eligibility requirements then a search of the State data base is made to see if the student has been in the State on a previous move. If the student has been in the State before then they are selected from the list and approved to the COE. This is done on each child on the form. If the student does not have a previous move to The State then they are approved as a new student. All COEs are maintained electronically in the SEA data base. If the COE is rejected because they are deemed ineligible they are deleted at the verifier and will be deleted from the recruiter's tablet they are never part of the data base count.

Students enrolled in summer program are reviewed (in early August) to make sure the eligibility of the student has not ended before the regular school term (late August). Students enrolled in the regular school year are reviewed (in early June) to make sure the eligibility of the student has not ended before the summer program starts (late June).

The State Data Specialist is responsible for getting the list of currently enrolled students to the recruiters so they can verify if the students are still residing in the area. The recruiter visits the families and reports the information back to the State data specialist. The data specialist will then enter a new student history line into the data base with the updated information. If the student has left the area, then no new entry is made for that student. Each fall the Data Specialist sends a verification form to local school systems to determine if eligible school aged students are still in the area as well as verifying the grade and school they are attending at this point the MD student id is provided.

Student's enrollment is evaluated annually. Students are not counted automatically from one year to the next the recruiter/advocate and local summer recruiters are required to visit the family at least once a year to determine eligibility.

Training is provided for LEA summer program staff so that accurate student data is collected and submitted (attendance, priority for service, needs assessments, LEP status, and Special Education status). Program checklists are sent to administrators to remind them of submission requirements. Student information is always tied to a school history line. Students must have an enrollment line between September 1 and August 31 to be counted.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data is collected and maintained the same as Category 1.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MIS 2000 logic used to produce Maryland's Count:

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

For a given student you can, and most likely will, have multiple school enrollments. In many cases, several of a student's enrollments will fall within the twelve-month reporting period.

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

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

,":MIS2000:schlhist" schlhist0

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

Where student0.StudentSeq=schlhist0.StudentSeq

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

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

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

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

Determines if Funding Date is within the period

or

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

Determines if Withdraw Date is within the period

or

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

Determines if LQM Date is within the period

or

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

Determines if Residence Date is within the period

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

And (schlhist0.LQM3Date>=!StartDate)

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

And (student0.ThirdBDay<=!EndDate)

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

And (student0.TwentySecondBDay>=!StartDate)

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

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

Note: MIS2000 logic assures that a student is only counted one time even if they have multiple enrollments (different schools, summer, fall and spring etc). Duplicate enrollment (same child different last name i.e. Juan Garcia vs Juan Garcia-Alvarez is checked at the time of enrollment as described in 1.10.3.2)

#### Definitions

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

Start Date and End Date allow the user to enter variable dates at runtime. Maryland used a start date of September 1st and an end date of August 31st of funding year on this Category 1 count report.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Use of the same system (MIS2000)

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State in-service training is provided for all recruiters, preseason and during the season. Staff development is critical to ensure that all recruiters understand the process for identification and recruitment, all eligibility requirements, and the State's validation process.

The electronic COE is submitted to the Service Center and is reviewed, by the Data Specialist (Maryland's Data Specialist is the State Director's Administrative Specialist III) and the State Director if necessary. The electronic COE form has date and time stamps build into the program.

Validation Review Steps:

1. Certification of Eligibility (COE) is uploaded to the Data Specialist.
2. Data Specialist reviews the forms for eligibility and completeness.
3. If the COE is incomplete, it is rejected and sent to the recruiter with a brief explanation of why it was rejected.
4. Recruiter interviews the family again and makes corrections, then submits the COE back to the Data Specialist and the process starts at the beginning.
5. If the COE is eligible and complete then the Data Specialist does a search of the state data base to see if the student has been in the State prior to the current move.
6. If the student has been in the State prior to the current move then the student is selected from the list for approval to the COE form.
7. If the student has not been in the State before then, a new student record is started for that student and approved to the COE form.
8. If the Data Specialist deems the COE not eligible then it is given to the State Migrant Director for evaluation. The State Director will make the final determination for validation interview or make the determination of eligibility.
9. Validation of eligibility can be done by data collection or re-interview validation. The Data Specialist will prepare the forms needed.
10. The State Recruiter is given a copy of the COE with the eligibility section blank and a MEP Re-Interview Outcome Summary Form.
11. A Regional Recruiter will re-interview the family. Once completed the Data Specialist will provide the original forms and the recruiter will compare the results. A Regional Recruiter will make the determination if the family is eligible or not. (If necessary, the information is given to the Migrant State Director for a final determination.)
12. If the COE is determined to be eligible the Data Specialist will entered the COE into the database.
13. If the COE is determined to be not eligible, the local recruiter is advised to mark their copy of the COE as not eligible and file the form. The LEA project is notified that this family is not eligible for services and cannot be part of their eligible count.

Invalid COEs are not entered into the State Data Base.

Random Sampling of new COEs are used to monitor the quality of work as well as determine training needs.

State in-service training is provided by the State Director and Data Specialist for all recruiters, preseason and during the season. Staff development is critical to ensure that all recruiters understand the process for identification and recruitment, all eligibility requirements as defined in the law and NRG, and understand the requirements outlined in the MSDE Guide for

Identification & Recruitment ( which include the detailed directions for completing the National COE), and the State's validation process. Recruiters must attend the annual training to continue in the position of recruiter. Only trained recruiters are assigned a Tablet PC and they are the only authorized user.

The State Data Specialist attends national conferences as well as OME trainings related to COEs and MSIX data requirements. This Specialist is highly experienced. The Specialist is the only individual that inputs data into the State Data Base.

The electronic COE is uploaded to the Service Center and is reviewed, by the Data Specialist (Maryland's Data Specialist is the State Director's Administrative Specialist III) and the State Director if necessary. The electronic COE form has date and time stamps built into the program.

The State Director and Data Specialist review recruitment work quality and frequency of error to determine training needs. At the Site level documentation is monitored, once a COE is approved, then the recruiter prints a copy for the project. Random Sampling of new COEs are used annually to monitor the quality of work as well as determine training needs.

Training is provided for LEA program staff so that accurate student data is collected and submitted (attendance, priority for service, needs assessments, LEP status, and Special Education status). Program checklists are sent to administrators to remind them of submission requirements. Student information is always tied to a school history line. Students must have an enrollment line between September 1 and August 31 to be counted.

Validation Review Steps:

1. Electronic Certification of Eligibility (COE) are uploaded to the State Migrant Data Specialist on the verifying computer (not directly into the SEA data base). Only COE's that are approved by the verifying computer can be uploaded to the SEA data base.
2. State Migrant Data Specialist reviews all COEs for eligibility and completeness of comments that relate to the eligibility section of the COE.
3. If the COE is not clearly eligible then the COE is rejected and sent to the recruiter with a brief explanation of why it was rejected. Once a COE has been rejected the signatures are deleted from the COE.
4. The recruiter returns to the family/individual to either correct an error in their reporting or to request additional information. They then are required to obtain a new signature and upload the COE back to the State Migrant Data Specialist for review.
5. If the COE is determined to be not eligible, the State Migrant Data Specialist has the State Migrant Director review the COE for a final determination. If the COE is determined to be not eligible the COE is deleted from the verifying computer and also from the recruiter tablet. This is never entered into the Data Base.
6. If the COE is eligible and complete then the State Migrant Data Specialist does a search of the state data base to see if the student has been in the state prior to the current move.
7. If the student has been in the State prior to the current move then the student is selected and the student is approved on the COE.
8. If the student has not been in the State before then a new student record is selected and a new student number is generated and the student is approved on the COE.
9. Once the COE has been verified as eligible the SEA signs and approves the COE. The COE is uploaded to the SEA data base.
10. Student data is submitted by the LEA Migrant Projects to the SEA. Attendance documentation is required for summer programs. Only if a student has been in attendance in a program can they be counted as served during the summer. Regular school attendance is collected and services as outlined in the Service Delivery Plan are reported by the projects showing frequency of service.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Prospective Re-Interview was conducted in Maryland.

The intent of the re-interview is for someone who is familiar with the regulations of the MEP other than the original interviewer of an approved COE to verify all information and confirm Section III/Eligibility Data listed on that COE. There must be three attempts to contact the family, either by driving to the current street address listed in the Section I of the COE or by phone; if the family cannot be contacted after three attempts, this also must be noted on the Re-interview Outcome Summary Form and return to MSDE MEP Office. The procedures outline the preparing for the re-interview, conducting the re-interview at the home, conducting the re-interview by phone and the MEP Re-Interview Outcome Summary Form.

Training is provided before the re-interview is conducted.

Maryland further refined the process to increase the sample size to be 50 COEs and a random sample of 90 COE's (which was 75% from each recruiter) was pulled to assure re-interviews of 50. Each COE was sequentially numbered prior to the sampling. Every 10th COE was pulled from each recruiter until the sample size was met.

Re-interviewers were scheduled by MSDE MEP Office (coordinated with Kansas and New York) to conduct re-interviews of approved COEs (those that have been reviewed and processed by the Data Specialist and or the State Director)

Re-interview forms contain the information on the COE except Section III - Qualifying Move and Work. This section has been left blank and is to be completed when re-interviewing the family.

The re-interviewer conducts the re-interview or notes that after three attempts, the family could not be reached, or that information was provided from another individual that the family left the area. This information is recorded on the Outcome Summary Form.

Completed forms were returned on August 1, 2012 to the MSDE MEP Office and no copy is kept by the re-interviewer. The outside re-interviewers compare the original COE with the re-interview Section III and made determinations of eligibility based on the re-interview forms and the original COE.

Re-interviews were conducted July 27, 2012 thru August 1, 2012 by two experienced recruiters from other states (one from Kansas and one from New York)

The results were:

- 60 of 90 re-interviews were able to be conducted. Resulting in 67% of the new COEs during the sample range completed. Of the 60 re-interviewed 59 resulted in being eligible.
- 30 of the 90 COEs were families/individuals that had either left the area or after three attempts the recruiter was unable to reach the individual.
- 3 COE's were questioned all three were sent to the LEA in which the challenge of the results were conducted with the following results:
  1. One workers job did not qualify him this season but his previous move qualified him - this was also noted by the re-interviewers. A new COE was generated and the previous COE was removed.
  2. One worker's statement of testing water in the cans was taken as second stage, however, with clarification with the worker and the employer the "very large can" in question is in the first stage of processing. This COE was deemed eligible
  3. One COE the worker was in the second stage but had not clearly described the work during the original interview. We deemed the student not eligible and was removed the COE and the student was not served with MEP funds, and not part of the student count.
- Based on the final results the error rate was .016

The following are key factors contributing to the accuracy of the COE's

1. Training focus on a National COE requiring all steps to be followed and refocusing on the interview process to assure 100% accuracy.
2. Using electronic COE
3. Detailed review process conducted by MEP Data Specialist. No COE is accepted if any of the required fields are incorrect, or comments are not clear and meet the requirements under the law.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Enrollment information is validated on a regular basis. Child count data is monitored using Snap Reports. (Reports that have been prewritten for use in MIS 2000 that runs temporary table of all data elements) Snap reports are done using all students, sampling is never used. Reports are run at different times during the year and using different criteria depending on what information the report requires. The majority of reports are run at the end of the year.

Snap reports are run to validate the numbers reported in the EDEN files. Supporting documentation is generated (example: Snap reports generate list of students reported that correlates to the numbers reported, for eligible children, priority service, eligible child, LEP, Special Education, Mobility Status by age/grade).

List of Snap Reports

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

Table I Population Data

? Chart and list by age/grade of all Eligible, Priority for Service, Limited English Proficient, Special Education, and Mobility.

Table III MEP Participation - Summer Served



? Chart and list by age/grade of all Served, Priority for Service, Continuation of Service, Any Instructional Service, Reading Instruction, Mathematics Instruction, Any Support Service, Counseling Service, and Any Referred Service.

Table III MEP Participation - Regular School Served

? Chart and list by age/grade of all Served, Priority for Service, Continuation of Service, Any Instructional Service, Reading Instruction, Mathematics Instruction, Any Support Service, Counseling Service, and Any Referred Service.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

The state data specialist sends LEAs a list of all school age migrant children identified in the district prior to opening of regular term. The LEA reports back the school and grade each migrant student is enrolled in the district. If a student is not enrolled in school then the regional recruiter follows up to see if the family is still in the area. If the family has left the area no new enrollment is entered. If the student is still in the area the LEA is notified that the student is still in the area and not attending. All residency enrolled (under age 4 and out of school youth) are entered into the data base only if they have been identified as still residing in the State. Maryland does not count children automatically from year to year or make the assumption that they are still in the state because they have three years of eligibility once identified.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No corrective actions were identified for eligibility determinations.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility

determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None

Students are never entered into MIS2000 data base prior to validation of COE.