

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

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10

MARYLAND



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (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 *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
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: Bryan Zillig, Webmaster; Mary Gable, Assistant State Superintendent Academic Policy		
Telephone: 410-767-0487		
Fax: 410-333-2275		
e-mail: bzillig@msde.state.md.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick		
		Friday, March 11, 2011, 4:41:10 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
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

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

In June 2010, the Maryland State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English/Language Arts and Mathematics. These standards include grades K - 12. Curriculum revision teams are using the findings of the gap analysis report between the current Maryland State Curriculum and the CCSS to develop the Common Core State Curriculum. The draft document will be shared with the State Board in June 2011.

The Maryland Common Core State Curriculum will be fully implemented in the 2013-2014 school year.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There have been no changes in mathematics and reading/language arts assessments for grades 3-8.

An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards was administered March, 2009 to students in grades 6-8 whose IEP teams have determined the student requires an assessment based on modified academic achievement standards. The Alternate Assessment based on Modified Academic Achievement Standards (AAMAAS) for students in grades 3-5 was administered for the first time in March, 2010

The end of course assessments in algebra/data analysis and English which serve as the NCLB high school measure had the constructed response items eliminated from the May, 2009 and subsequent administrations.

An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for algebra/data analysis and English was administered in May, 2008. For students in grades 6, 7, 8, the assessment began in 2009, and grades 3, 4, 5 were added in 2010. These assessments are for students with disabilities who meet specific eligibility criteria.

There have been no changes to the science assessments grades 5 and 8 since it was first operationally administered in 2008. Standards were set for the MSA Science grades 5, 8, and 10 (biology) in 2008.

An alternative science assessment (Alt-MSA) based on modified achievement standards was first administered to students at a grade level equivalent of grades 5, 8, and 10 (The requirement for the NCLB high school measure) in 2008 -2009.

The end of course assessments in biology which serve as the NCLB high school measure also had the constructed response items eliminated from the May 2009 and subsequent administrations.

Maryland became a governing state in the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) consortium in 2010 and will fully implement the assessment system designed by this consortium to assess the Common Core Curriculum. Full implementation is expected by 2015.

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

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 2009-10, 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)	10.0
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	90.0
Comments:	

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

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 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 (IDEA) 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>
Comments:	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for 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	428,829	427,140	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,662	1,651	99.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	26,080	26,011	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	162,768	161,796	99.4
Hispanic	39,279	39,115	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	199,035	198,562	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,346	51,871	99.1
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	14,963	14,890	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	166,205	165,266	99.4
Migratory students	24	24	100.0
Male	219,711	218,717	99.5
Female	209,114	208,419	99.7
Comments:			

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	7,500	14.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,493	54.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	11,262	21.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,616	8.9
Total	51,871	
Comments:		

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	431,769	430,149	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,654	1,644	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	26,730	26,616	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	163,309	162,414	99.5
Hispanic	40,061	39,885	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	200,008	199,583	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,048	51,648	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,700	16,501	98.8
Economically disadvantaged students	167,345	166,477	99.5
Migratory students	20	20	100.0
Male	221,109	220,177	99.6
Female	210,656	209,968	99.7

Comments: 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.

1.2.4 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.

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	7,308	14.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,288	54.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	11,421	22.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,631	9.0
Total	51,648	

Comments: 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	186,063	184,039	98.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	650	645	99.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,128	11,054	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	70,289	69,245	98.5
Hispanic	16,006	15,805	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	87,954	87,254	99.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,229	21,312	95.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,579	4,479	97.8
Economically disadvantaged students	66,778	65,645	98.3
Migratory students	6	6	100.0
Male	95,071	93,861	98.7
Female	90,961	90,147	99.1
Comments:			

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	6,372	29.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10,396	48.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2,377	11.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,167	10.2
Total	21,312	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,996	51,597	86.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	234	89.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,854	3,684	95.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22,496	17,354	77.1
Hispanic	6,218	5,104	82.1
White, non-Hispanic	27,164	25,221	92.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,974	4,453	63.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,404	3,401	77.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,856	20,095	77.7
Migratory students	6	5	83.3
Male	30,645	26,086	85.1
Female	29,350	25,511	86.9
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,950	50,367	84.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	261	220	84.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,833	3,585	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	22,489	16,878	75.1
Hispanic	6,213	4,929	79.3
White, non-Hispanic	27,154	24,755	91.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,979	4,686	67.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,358	3,198	73.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,831	19,279	74.6
Migratory students	4	3	75.0
Male	30,615	24,763	80.9
Female	29,335	25,604	87.3
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 are not assessed for Science.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,203	55,182	90.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	268	244	91.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,955	3,818	96.5
Black, non-Hispanic	22,969	19,276	83.9
Hispanic	6,029	5,261	87.3
White, non-Hispanic	27,982	26,583	95.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,581	5,231	69.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,616	2,924	80.9
Economically disadvantaged students	25,780	21,679	84.1
Migratory students	2	2	100.0
Male	31,455	28,078	89.3
Female	29,748	27,104	91.1
Comments:			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,179	53,493	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	238	89.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,929	3,734	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	22,973	18,307	79.7
Hispanic	6,021	5,026	83.5
White, non-Hispanic	27,990	26,188	93.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,588	5,197	68.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,567	2,698	75.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,763	20,419	79.3
Migratory students	2	2	100.0
Male	31,453	26,890	85.5
Female	29,726	26,603	89.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 are not assessed for Science.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,231	50,091	83.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	233	200	85.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,651	3,471	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,001	16,895	73.5
Hispanic	5,639	4,346	77.1
White, non-Hispanic	27,706	25,179	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,702	4,486	58.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,192	1,421	64.8
Economically disadvantaged students	25,073	18,386	73.3
Migratory students	6	6	100.0
Male	31,052	25,464	82.0
Female	29,178	24,627	84.4
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,217	53,841	89.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	234	214	91.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,635	3,470	95.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23,011	19,201	83.4
Hispanic	5,628	4,753	84.5
White, non-Hispanic	27,709	26,203	94.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,712	5,510	71.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,149	1,528	71.1
Economically disadvantaged students	25,066	20,642	82.4
Migratory students	4	3	75.0
Male	31,050	27,063	87.2
Female	29,167	26,778	91.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,421	39,862	66.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	152	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,725	3,072	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23,003	11,109	48.3
Hispanic	5,727	2,900	50.6
White, non-Hispanic	27,724	22,623	81.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,607	2,918	38.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,433	621	25.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,491	12,008	47.1
Migratory students	4	2	50.0
Male	31,160	20,533	65.9
Female	29,250	19,323	66.1
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,183	48,859	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	183	76.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,715	3,498	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,472	16,097	68.6
Hispanic	5,589	4,108	73.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,167	24,973	88.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,721	3,953	51.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,547	869	56.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,654	16,704	67.8
Migratory students	3	1	33.3
Male	31,331	24,340	77.7
Female	29,851	24,519	82.1
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,194	52,701	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	205	85.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,699	3,485	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,501	18,533	78.9
Hispanic	5,579	4,492	80.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,174	25,985	92.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,747	4,783	61.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,500	843	56.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,660	18,903	76.7
Migratory students	2	1	50.0
Male	31,348	26,174	83.5
Female	29,845	26,526	88.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 are not assessed for Science.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,470	44,666	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	231	174	75.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,740	3,443	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,380	13,178	56.4
Hispanic	5,683	3,610	63.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,436	24,261	85.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,541	3,486	46.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,321	544	41.2
Economically disadvantaged students	23,937	13,623	56.9
Migratory students	4	2	50.0
Male	31,672	22,502	71.0
Female	29,798	22,164	74.4
Comments:			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,464	50,325	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	232	193	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,721	3,455	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,390	16,848	72.0
Hispanic	5,679	4,256	74.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,441	25,572	89.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,552	4,038	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,276	550	43.1
Economically disadvantaged students	23,944	16,772	70.0
Migratory students	3	2	66.7
Male	31,681	24,686	77.9
Female	29,782	25,638	86.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 are not assessed for Science.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,486	40,996	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	142	70.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,711	3,310	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,450	10,842	46.2
Hispanic	5,725	3,180	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,396	23,522	80.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,206	2,554	35.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,071	330	30.8
Economically disadvantaged students	23,335	10,856	46.5
Migratory students	2	0	0.0
Male	31,909	20,267	63.5
Female	30,576	20,729	67.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,517	50,301	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	168	82.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,694	3,431	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,494	16,370	69.7
Hispanic	5,720	4,225	73.9
White, non-Hispanic	29,405	26,107	88.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,214	3,943	54.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,034	417	40.3
Economically disadvantaged students	23,372	15,787	67.5
Migratory students	2	0	0.0
Male	31,909	24,274	76.1
Female	30,607	26,027	85.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,353	42,247	67.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	148	73.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,775	3,289	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,270	11,225	48.2
Hispanic	5,810	3,078	53.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,276	24,503	83.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,915	2,391	34.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,341	266	19.8
Economically disadvantaged students	23,582	11,135	47.2
Migratory students	1	0	0.0
Male	31,812	21,377	67.2
Female	30,522	20,866	68.4
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,571	50,593	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	166	77.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,385	3,223	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,028	16,189	70.3
Hispanic	4,232	3,416	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	29,711	27,599	92.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,146	3,295	46.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	739	453	61.3
Economically disadvantaged students	16,631	12,112	72.8
Migratory students	1	0	0.0
Male	30,653	25,365	82.7
Female	29,918	25,228	84.3
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,826	49,595	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	153	75.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,643	3,257	89.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,105	16,073	69.6
Hispanic	4,347	3,146	72.4
White, non-Hispanic	30,524	26,965	88.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,841	3,223	47.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	815	301	36.9
Economically disadvantaged students	16,701	11,425	68.4
Migratory students	1	0	0.0
Male	31,152	23,495	75.4
Female	30,673	26,100	85.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,265	49,504	80.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	160	74.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,554	3,311	93.16
Black, non-Hispanic	22,972	15,037	65.46
Hispanic	4,268	3,252	76.19
White, non-Hispanic	30,254	27,743	91.70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,790	3,383	49.82
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	705	366	51.91
Economically disadvantaged students	16,572	11,111	67.05
Migratory students	1	0	0.0
Male	30,889	25,001	80.94
Female	30,375	24,502	80.67
Comments:			

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 the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,375	936	68.1
Districts	25	5	20.0
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	406	239	58.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	303	171	56.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	103	68	66.0
Comments:			

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
24	5	20.8
Comments:		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

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

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

1.4.4.3 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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments:	

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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)	14
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	21
Comments:	

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 school entering restructuring implement in the 2009-2010 school year: 1) Replace all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, 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.

Other options included:

- 1) Appoint a turnaround specialist.
- 2) Replicate the governance of a charter school
- 3) Appoint a distinguished principal
- 4) Blueprint for High School Reform and Derivative High Schools in Baltimore City. Towson University Partnership Schools.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

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

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

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds 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 2010 AYP data, Maryland has one district identified for improvement and another that remains in corrective action. One LEA, Baltimore City Public Schools, exited corrective action status based on 2009 AYP data.

Wicomico County Public Schools--

Wicomico County entered system improvement based on the 2010 AYP results from the Maryland School Assessment (MSA). Per Maryland regulations governing school system improvement, Wicomico County was required to revise the applicable components of their comprehensive master plan to address achievement problems. In addition, Wicomico was required to attend a meeting held at the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) to present its plan to exit improvement status. Wicomico was required to present before the panel that reviewed their master plan, not before the State Board. This meeting was moderated by the master plan office at MSDE.

Highlights from the Wicomico plan are as follows:

- Support for schools in improvement, including hiring a consultant to diagnose skill areas that need to be strengthened and focus on instructional strategies to address identified areas of need, comprehensive needs assessment of the school and use of results to guide improvement action, and sheltered English classes for
- Creation of a contractual position to work alongside administrators and teachers in the area of school climate and student behavior.
- Redeployment of supervisors and coordinators to instructional leadership teams based on AYP results for each school.
- Meetings among supervisors, principals, executives and coordinators (SPEC) to provide professional development on topics, including examination of student work, asking probing questions, providing effective feedback to students, etc.
- Professional development on building relationships and cultural proficiency.

Reading

- Literacy coaches have been assigned to elementary schools based on AYP results. If a school did not make AYP and is a paired school with another school (primary/intermediate), then coaching support was provided at the partner school. Additional schools received coach support based on levels of subgroup performance.
- Provided support to analyze class level MSA and Benchmark Assessment data and provided professional development targeted to demonstrated skill needs.
- Provided professional development in the area of daily formative assessment and differentiation linked to the assessment results.
- The reading coordinator provided regular professional development for elementary principals and assistant principals focusing on areas of identified need with regard to instruction, curriculum, resources, etc.
- The Wicomico County Reading Committee was formed with the mission of promoting a love of reading through collaboration among schools, families and the community in order to create lifelong readers. Community support was enlisted by asking businesses to place posters in their establishments and wear "20-20" pins. The message was that students will read independently for 20 minutes during the reading period and 20 minutes outside of school every day.
- Reading intervention programs were now positioned in the unified arts block at the middle school level. Struggling students received reading intervention every other day for a 45-minute block. It is the aim for these programs to be taught by certified reading teachers.

Mathematics

- Math professional development coaches have been assigned to elementary schools based on AYP results.
- The math supervisor, math coordinator and math professional development coaches provided professional development for teachers and administrators on the components of effective mathematics instruction. This is providing teachers with a consistent set of expectations in regards to the "non-negotiable" components of effective mathematics instruction and was a focal point of discussion during post-observation conferences with teachers.
- School-based interventions were used to supplement instruction and target specific needs of students using resources such as Mobius, Connected Math, Navigator, and McGraw Hill supplements.
- The order that standards are taught in 8th grade Algebra I Part 1 has been modified. Instructional focus was on state, grade-level standards assessed on the MSA prior to the assessment with algebra being the primary focus following the MSA.
- Middle and high school math teachers met with math coaches to analyze their individual data on benchmarks. Remediation plans were created to target specific standards that do not meet expectation. Within each standard, individual students not meeting expectation were identified and individual accommodations planned.

Prince George's County Public Schools—

In 2010 Prince George's County 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 2010 is currently under review by the Department and final recommendations on approval will be presented to the State Board in mid-December.

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

Some highlights of the Prince George's Plan are as follows:

- In SY2009-10, the system closed six schools because of declining enrollment and turned this into an opportunity to create six K-8 model schools to increase opportunities for specialty choice schools for students. In addition, four middle schools were designated for turnaround schools, replacing the administration and most of the staff. Finally, 5 schools (3 middle and 2 elementary schools) moved into alternative governance, which required some staff replacement.
- For SY2010-11, the district instituted short range initiatives and a comprehensive 7 year plan. The system has adopted a rigorous set of goals focused on high student achievement for the next seven years. The basis of the goals is that all students will graduate college and

career ready. The district has developed and adopted the Profile of a Graduate, with emphasis on student problem solving, flexibility, reflection and collaboration. This requires a renewed emphasis on Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, world languages, advanced mathematics, and additional science courses. The key performance indicators for Goal 1 are listed below.

- The district is using two systems to monitor progress:

- o As a part of the performance management process, all schools must report benchmark assessment results disaggregated by student group. School principals must present their data to an audience of their peers and the Assistant Superintendent and offer explanations and action plans based on the data. In addition, each division must present quarterly data in a PMAPP session. Each division disaggregates data by student group. The second monitoring system is the data warehouse, which, when implemented, will provide an automatic electronic platform for the data processing which is now done by hand in the testing office. Data disaggregated by student group will be readily available for decision makers at the classroom, school, area office, central office, and executive levels.

- o Data is now presented weekly at Executive Cabinet meetings and quarterly at Board of Education meetings. Specific data that is monitored includes the Key Performance Indicators. Actions plans are developed in response to data that do not reflect progress. Examples include enhancements to professional development around the suspension of disabled students and interventions in mathematics at the middle school level.

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10
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 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: Modified assessment was available in 2010 for all students grades 3-8 and high school. No appeal process was needed for 2010.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	
---	--

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	18,146	19,350
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	10,396	10,282
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	57.3	53.1
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	18,150	19,372
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	11,780	12,418
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	64.9	64.1
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	12
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	1

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	54
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<p>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
6 = Combo 1	Combination of strategies 1, 2, and 4	1	1	0	D	1 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected.)
7 = Combo 2	Combination of 1, 2 and 5. 5= Supplemental Educational Services	27	1	3	D	19 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected.)
5	Supplemental Educational Services	18	1	2	D	12 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected.)
8 = Combo 3	Combination of strategies 1, 2, 3, and 5. 5= Supplemental Educational Services	8	2	0	D	4 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected.)
6 = Combo 1	Combination of strategies 1 and 2	9	1	1	D	6 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected.)
7 = Combo 2	Combination of strategies 1, 2, and 3	3	0	1	D	3 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected.)

Comments:

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p>

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state has shared information during the Administrative Meetings with all LEAs. The state has also provided networking opportunities during these meetings and encouraged the LEAs to call each other to share best practices. The MSDE website is currently under expansion. Information from the Administrative meetings is now being posted.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.

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 also part of the School Support Team and provide direct assistance and oversight to the identified Tier I, Tier II and Tier III 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 include 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 requirements 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 2009-10 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. This technical assistance intensifies as a school progresses along the continuum of non-performance. In accordance with the State Differentiated Accountability Pilot, schools in years 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 shepherds 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, Kent 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.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	31,683
Applied to transfer	1,213
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	799
Comments:	

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.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,119,473

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.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

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:

³ 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*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	24,382
Applied for supplemental educational services	10,256
Received supplemental educational services	8,208
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,611,486
Comments:	

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.

	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	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	196,095	179,792	91.7	16,303	8.3
All elementary classes	83,411	79,141	94.9	4,270	5.1
All secondary classes	112,684	100,651	89.3	12,033	10.7

The increase in elementary classes was due to a change in the way classes were counted. In order for the number of elementary classes to be proportional to the number of secondary classes, MSDE changed the collection of elementary classes from a single-class approach to a departmentalized individual subject approach. In addition, we are reporting year round classes, including summer, where in prior years we reported a single day snapshot.

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	46.4
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	7.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	43.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	2.8
Total	100.0

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)	38.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	12.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	43.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	5.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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 different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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).

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
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	19,355	16,827	86.9
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	24,389	23,840	97.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	18,659	14,861	79.6
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	27,359	25,399	92.8
1.5.3.1 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.			

1.5.3.1 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	69.9	22.0
Poverty metric used	Eligible for free/reduced meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
Secondary schools	55.6	15.8
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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Push-in ESL, newcomer programs, ESL services provided by tutor under supervision of certified ESOL teacher.

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	49,574
Comments:	

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.	49,575
Comments:	

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	29,751
French	1,702
Chinese	1,690
Vietnamese	1,157
Korean	1,017

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 student 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 assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	45,217
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	728
Total	45,945
<p>Comments: The difference between this number (45,945) and the number of LEP students in the state (1.6.2.1 - 49,557) is 3,629. The smaller number can primarily be attributed to the mobility of the ELL population into and out of Maryland. The number of students reported in 1.6.3.1.1 represents students enrolled in Maryland during a point in time - the ELP assessment testing window. The larger number signifies the number of students who were enrolled in the state of Maryland at some point during the school year but were not enrolled during the testing window.</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	8,425
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18.1
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) 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	45,212
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	728
Total	45,940

Comments: The difference between the two numbers in sections 1.6.2.2 and 1.6.3.2.1 (4363) can primarily be attributed to the mobility of the ELL population into and out of Maryland. Actually, 728 students remained in the state but were non test-takers. The number of students reported in 1.6.2.2 (49,575) is based on enrollment throughout the school year; students reported in 1.6.3.2.1 represent students enrolled in Maryland during a point in time - the ELP assessment testing window. Therefore the difference between the numbers indicates the number of students who were enrolled in the state of Maryland at some point during the school year but were not enrolled during the testing window.

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 AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ 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.	1,876

1.6.3.2.2**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 State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated 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 percentage of States 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	30,556	70.5	25,138	58.00
Attained proficiency	8,425	18.6	7,247	16.00
Comments:				

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).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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)
N/A
Comments:

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)
N/A
Comments:

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)
N/A
Comments:

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 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
5,286	6,435	11,721
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,157	5,189	84.3	968
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results 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.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,157	5,514	89.6	643
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 monitored former LEP 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.
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
1,903	1,086	57.1	817
Comments:			

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	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	18
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	11
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	20
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	4
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

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:

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	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in 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 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
17,952	4,959	6

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 education 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) ð The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course ð (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.	1,188
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	496

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 activities for 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 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	20	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	18	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	19	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	18	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	17	
Other (Explain in comment box)	16	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	18	6,279
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	18	1,735
PD provided to principals	17	1,052
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	16	873
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	14	1,415
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	444
Total	22	11,798

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Professional Development activities include:
 Teach Like a Champion (improving instructional delivery)
 Strategies and state and federal policies pertaining to ELLs and RELLs were shared with the aspiring leadership cohort .
 ESOL programmatic development, legal background and requirements, demographic data and projections.
 Differentiation between whether ELL students might have a learning issue as contrasted to a language development issue.
 Professional development provided on the Maryland State English Language Proficiency Standards highlighting the alignment with the State English Language Arts Standards.
 All ESOL staff received training in the use of the iPod touch, which students and teachers use regularly in secondary classrooms
 ESOL instructional staff worked collaboratively on Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum project teams and at the kindergarten level to align the ESOL curriculum to the state curriculum.
 Reading Together training: After-school coordinator training in how to implement a cross-aged peer reading tutoring program and how to develop English Language Learner leaders.
 Policies pertaining to working with ELLs were presented to principals and assistant principals at county-wide Administrator & Supervisor meetings.
 ELL Parent Involvement sessions.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/10	07/01/10	0
Comments: In Maryland there is a "0 day delay" because the LEA grants are made available on the day grants are awarded: July 1.		

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.

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
Comments:	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	85.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	78.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	79.0
Hispanic	78.6
White, non-Hispanic	90.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	70.0
Limited English proficient	82.3
Economically disadvantaged	85.5
Migratory students	0.0
Male	82.2
Female	88.3
Comments: The number of migratory students in Maryland is low. In the 2008-2009 school year no migrant students were eligible to graduate.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3.6
Hispanic	2.2
White, non-Hispanic	3.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.1
Limited English proficient	4.0
Economically disadvantaged	2.6
Migratory students	0.0
Male	3.3
Female	2.3
Comments: There were no migratory dropouts in the 2008-2009 school year. High school migrant numbers are generally low which is the reason for fluctuation in the dropout rate.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	8	8
LEAs with subgrants	16	16
Total	24	24
Comments:		

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)	35	619
K	68	1,084
1	74	1,131
2	72	1,072
3	62	1,049
4	55	951
5	55	974
6	44	850
7	40	821
8	39	809
9	50	1,089
10	39	797
11	26	593
12	23	637
Ungraded	0	0
Total	682	12,476
Comments:		

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	73	1,410
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	500	10,105
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	54	186
Hotels/Motels	55	775
Total	682	12,476
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	546
K	960
1	1,012
2	943
3	935
4	830
5	854
6	758
7	723
8	695
9	955
10	700
11	492
12	567
Ungraded	
Total	10,970
Comments:	

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 youth	482
Migratory children/youth	8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,874
Limited English proficient students	522
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	12
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	14
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	10
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	4
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One LEA indicated: notebook computers and after school tutoring.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	0
Transportation	4
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	9

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Nine local school systems identified the following other barriers:

1. Helping the family to locate affordable housing.
2. Obtaining proof of residency for enrollment of students experiencing homelessness, identifying unaccompanied youth.
3. Parents not having telephone services, problems in contacting homeless parents.
4. Continuing to try to educate staff and teachers to eliminate the barrier of those not being aware of student's rights/services available to them.
5. Many school-based staff that still do not understand the requirements of the McKinney Vento Act. This often creates challenges in providing services to students and families in a prompt and supportive manner.
6. The Department of Student Services staff constantly strives to educate schools about the requirements of the law and the need to eliminate barriers. Significant progress has been made in understanding and identification.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *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	845	594
4	778	594
5	790	604
6	689	498
7	641	419
8	636	383
High School	473	324
Comments:		

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *ESEA* 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	843	605
4	778	635
5	792	516
6	689	402
7	637	301
8	633	226
High School	467	340
Comments:		

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	86
K	23
1	18
2	15
3	19
4	9
5	15
6	9
7	12
8	7
9	12
10	8
11	12
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	199
Total	446

Comments:

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 small upward trend (14.9%) this season to Category 1 count was the result of:

- Workers reporting lack of work in their homebase states, especially more movement north from Florida.
- Regional recruiters who have developed working relationships in the community and are native Spanish speakers.

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	49
K	16
1	16
2	10
3	8
4	6
5	9
6	5
7	3
8	1
9	6
10	1
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	7
Total	139
Comments:	

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.

The program served 12% more students ages 3-21, with an increase of services for children age 3. Again this is a migrant population that changes from year to year and this season there was an increase in school age students as well as 3 year olds. The MEP also served 17 children ages 0-2. This was critical, without these services school age students would have stayed in the camps to babysit.

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.

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 Certificate of Eligibility (COE) records 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.

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 schlhst.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" schlhst0

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 ((schlhst0.FundingDate>=!StartDate and schlhst0.Funding Date <=!EndDate)

Determines if Funding Date is within the period

or

(schlhst0.WithdrawDate>=!StartDate and schlhst0.WithdrawDate<=!EndDate)

Determines if Withdraw Date is within the period

or

(schlhst0.LQMDate>=!StartDate and schlhst0.LQMDate <=!EndDate)

Determines if LQM Date is within the period

or

(schlhst0.ResDate>=!StartDate and schlhst0.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 (schlhst0.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)

Maryland's COEs are only completed in person. For students that remain in the State a recruiter is required to make a home visit and verify the student(s) is still in the State (re-enrollment forms in the summer and monthly status reports are submitted to the Migrant Education Service Center to determine if the eligible migrant students, ages 0-21, are still in the State). School age students are also verified by school district's pupil services (Student Verification Reports sent to the districts and reviewed by the State MEP). This process is used to assure that students counted are only students residing during the September 1 through August 31 timeframe. All residency enrollments must be validated on a minimum yearly basis.

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.

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.

The State had a subcommittee revise Maryland's Migrant Education Program Re-interview Procedure with Random Sample in February 2009. 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 62 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 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 all 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 immediately to the MSDE MEP Office and no copy is kept by the re-interviewer. The Data Specialist and State Director compare the original COE with the re-interview Section III.

Re-interviews were conducted July 26 thru August 12, 2010 by Regional Recruiters in the area they are not assigned.

The results were:

- 55 of 62 re-interviews were able to be conducted and all the COEs were eligible. Resulting in 68% of the new COEs during the sample range were completed.
- 7 COEs were families/individuals that had either left the area or after three attempts the recruiter was unable to reach the individual.

The following are two 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. Implemented electronic COE (first season)
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.