

**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 2007-08

MARYLAND



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

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) 2007-08 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 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
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: Dr. Ronald A. Peiffer, Deputy State Superintendent for Academic Policy		
Telephone: 410-767-0473		
Fax: 410-333-2275		
e-mail: rpeiffer@msde.state.md.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick		
		<u>Wednesday, March 11, 2009, 12:56:23 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. 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 taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Currently the mathematics standards for pre-kindergarten through grade 8 are undergoing external review by Achieve, Inc. Maryland educators will be asked to review the feedback received as a result of the expert review and make the necessary changes or revisions, prior to the end of the 2008-2009 school year.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts 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 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.

1. The NRT items were removed from the April 2008 administration of the grades 3-8 reading and mathematics assessments and replaced with Maryland CRT items
2. An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards will be administered in March 2009 to students in grades 6-8 whose IEP teams have determined the student requires an assessment based on modified academic achievement standards. Permission was granted by the United State Education Department to defer the development of an AA-MAAS for students in grades 3-5.
3. Standard setting for the alternative assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards in reading,/language arts and mathematics occurred in the summer of 2008 and the standards were approved by the State Board of Education in August 2008.
4. The end of course assessments in algebra/data analysis and English which serve as the NCLB high school measure will have the constructed response items eliminated from the May 2009 and subsequent administrations.
5. Standard setting for the alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for those end of course assessments occurred during the summer of 2008 and the standards were approved by the State Board in August 2008.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below 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 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 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*.

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."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. There have been no changes to the science assessment administered to students in grades 5 and 8.
2. Standard setting for the science component of the alternative assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards occurred during the summer of 2008 and the standards were accepted by the State Board in August 2008.
3. The end of course assessment in biology also serves as the NCLB high school measure. The constructed response items will be eliminated in the May 2009 administration and all subsequent administrations.
4. Standard setting for the alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards occurred in the summer of 2008 and the standards were accepted by the State Board in August 2008.
5. Maryland's assessments and academic achievement standards in science have not yet been approved. Final peer review documentation is currently being submitted.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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	427,041	424,560	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,581	1,576	99.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	23,811	23,757	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	161,341	159,800	99.0
Hispanic	35,679	35,493	99.5
White, non-Hispanic	204,622	203,927	99.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,167	51,492	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,146	13,080	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	143,925	142,615	99.1
Migratory students	12	12	100.0
Male	218,430	216,926	99.3
Female	208,610	207,633	99.5
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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. Do not include results from students 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	9,156	17.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,526	72.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	316	0.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,494	8.7
Total	51,492	
Comments:		

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	427,641	425,063	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,589	1,584	99.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	23,808	23,693	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	161,525	160,014	99.1
Hispanic	35,413	35,153	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	205,295	204,608	99.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,059	51,403	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,460	12,234	98.2
Economically disadvantaged students	143,703	142,357	99.1
Migratory students	12	12	100.0
Male	218,668	217,136	99.3
Female	208,966	207,920	99.5
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,428	18.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,120	72.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	362	0.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,493	8.7
Total	51,403	
Comments:		

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

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 *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	181,020	180,953	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	645	645	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,278	10,276	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	66,725	66,688	99.9
Hispanic	14,112	14,109	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	89,227	89,202	100.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,827	20,760	99.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,642	4,640	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	54,701	54,664	99.9
Migratory students	8	8	100.0
Male	91,855	91,813	100.0
Female	89,133	89,108	100.0
Comments:			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 *NCLB* science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,312	20.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,743	66.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	449	2.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,256	10.9
Total	20,760	
Comments:		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,734	48,534	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	202	81.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,417	3,197	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22,339	16,081	72.0
Hispanic	5,429	4,154	76.5
White, non-Hispanic	27,302	24,900	91.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,005	4,259	60.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,308	2,328	70.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22,207	15,901	71.6
Migratory students	3	3	100.0
Male	30,291	24,810	81.9
Female	28,443	23,724	83.4

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,702	48,745	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	212	85.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,404	3,135	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	22,344	16,599	74.3
Hispanic	5,405	3,968	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	27,301	24,831	91.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,004	4,472	63.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,257	2,087	64.1
Economically disadvantaged students	22,193	16,024	72.2
Migratory students	3	3	100.0
Male	30,280	24,157	79.8
Female	28,422	24,588	86.5

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP C*SPR* data to the 2008 Performance C*SPR* data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Maryland currently does not administer a science assessment to grade 3 students.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,263	53,363	88.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	234	218	93.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,474	3,356	96.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22,825	18,509	81.1
Hispanic	5,401	4,520	83.7
White, non-Hispanic	28,329	26,760	94.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,718	5,195	67.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,566	1,943	75.7
Economically disadvantaged students	22,294	17,995	80.7
Migratory students	2	1	50.0
Male	30,797	26,971	87.6
Female	29,466	26,392	89.6

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,204	53,269	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	235	216	91.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,440	3,282	95.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22,820	18,652	81.7
Hispanic	5,392	4,507	83.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,317	26,612	94.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,719	5,610	72.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,505	1,893	75.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,275	17,899	80.4
Migratory students	2	2	100.0
Male	30,758	26,469	86.1
Female	29,446	26,800	91.0

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP C*SPR* data to the 2008 Performance C*SPR* data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Maryland currently does not administer a science assessment to grade 4 students.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,115	49,253	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	182	79.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,545	3,343	94.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,058	16,004	69.4
Hispanic	5,523	4,115	74.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,761	25,609	89.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,871	4,171	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,154	1,317	61.1
Economically disadvantaged students	22,150	15,135	68.3
Migratory students	2	1	50.0
Male	31,519	25,084	79.6
Female	29,596	24,169	81.7

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,094	52,978	86.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	196	85.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,527	3,335	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,066	18,109	78.5
Hispanic	5,507	4,556	82.7
White, non-Hispanic	28,763	26,781	93.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,878	5,362	68.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,109	1,460	69.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,147	17,164	77.5
Migratory students	2	1	50.0
Male	31,517	26,561	84.3
Female	29,574	26,416	89.3

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,422	39,380	64.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	223	143	64.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,637	2,903	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23,092	10,617	46.0
Hispanic	5,671	2,744	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,786	22,972	79.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,800	2,990	38.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,455	665	27.1
Economically disadvantaged students	22,307	9,739	43.7
Migratory students	5	1	20.0
Male	31,677	20,571	64.9
Female	29,733	18,808	63.3
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,626	46,791	75.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	143	74.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,444	3,206	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,148	14,214	61.4
Hispanic	5,456	3,719	68.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,385	25,509	86.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,559	3,406	45.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,614	810	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,439	12,820	59.8
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	31,474	23,256	73.9
Female	30,152	23,535	78.1

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,602	50,420	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	155	81.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,420	3,170	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,148	16,792	72.5
Hispanic	5,442	4,012	73.7
White, non-Hispanic	29,400	26,291	89.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,555	3,917	51.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,562	747	47.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21,432	14,837	69.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	31,468	24,691	78.5
Female	30,133	25,729	85.4

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP C*SPR* data to the 2008 Performance C*SPR* data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Maryland currently does not administer a science assessment to grade 6 students.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,179	43,219	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	259	172	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,414	3,111	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	24,131	12,009	49.8
Hispanic	5,245	3,159	60.2
White, non-Hispanic	30,129	24,767	82.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,888	2,832	35.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,349	531	39.4
Economically disadvantaged students	21,598	10,414	48.2
Migratory students	3	2	66.7
Male	32,500	21,417	65.9
Female	30,679	21,802	71.1

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,145	51,296	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	261	206	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,388	3,129	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	24,146	16,896	70.0
Hispanic	5,228	3,796	72.6
White, non-Hispanic	30,118	27,268	90.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,881	3,975	50.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,299	535	41.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,598	14,504	67.2
Migratory students	3	2	66.7
Male	32,485	25,084	77.2
Female	30,659	26,212	85.5

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Maryland currently does not administer a science assessment to grade 7 students.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,607	40,167	62.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	161	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,404	3,019	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	25,317	10,498	41.5
Hispanic	5,102	2,636	51.7
White, non-Hispanic	30,524	23,853	78.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,788	2,362	30.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,214	408	33.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,059	8,503	40.4
Migratory students	2	0	0.0
Male	33,375	20,111	60.3
Female	31,232	20,056	64.2

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,633	47,195	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	193	76.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,383	3,012	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	25,364	14,915	58.8
Hispanic	5,094	3,154	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	30,537	25,921	84.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,788	3,103	39.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,176	317	27.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,076	11,521	54.7
Migratory students	2	0	0.0
Male	33,405	22,941	68.7
Female	31,226	24,254	77.7

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP C*SPR* data to the 2008 Performance C*SPR* data would result in large discrepancies.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,331	39,590	61.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	258	154	59.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,473	2,859	82.3
Black, non-Hispanic	24,933	9,757	39.1
Hispanic	5,216	2,318	44.4
White, non-Hispanic	30,431	24,500	80.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,517	2,240	29.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,465	214	14.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20,850	7,714	37.0
Migratory students	3	0	0.0
Male	33,149	20,428	61.6
Female	31,162	19,160	61.5
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	55,036	46,470	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	135	84.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,059	2,916	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	18,982	13,248	69.8
Hispanic	3,337	2,655	79.6
White, non-Hispanic	29,497	27,515	93.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,663	2,844	50.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	875	513	58.6
Economically disadvantaged students	11,868	8,443	71.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	26,970	22,659	84.0
Female	28,065	23,810	84.8

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

The trend for our high school achievement data changed in the 2007-08 school year. Maryland moved to High School Status model reporting of the cumulative result of our end of course assessments by reporting the "best" score for the 11th graders as of the end of year enrollment. Beginning in the 2008-09 school year we are using the 12th grade4rs as of the end of year enrollment. This change was approved and is reflected in our accountability workbook.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	55,683	45,682	82.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	169	139	82.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,131	2,830	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	19,126	13,351	69.8
Hispanic	3,085	2,318	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	30,172	27,044	89.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,578	2,575	46.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	326	146	44.8
Economically disadvantaged students	11,636	7,845	67.4
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	27,223	21,223	78.0
Female	28,460	24,459	85.9

Comments: In 2007 MSDE reported AYP data instead of performance data as required. These data were corrected in November 2008 through EdFacts file submissions for the 2006-2007 assessment performance data. Comparing the 2007 AYP CSPR data to the 2008 Performance CSPR data would result in large discrepancies.

The trend for our high school achievement data changed in the 2007-08 school year. Maryland moved to High School Status model reporting of the cumulative result of our end of course assessments by reporting the "best" score for the 11th graders as of the end of year enrollment. Beginning in the 2008-09 school year we are using the 12th grade4rs as of the end of year enrollment. This change was approved and is reflected in our accountability workbook.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	55,200	45,165	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	134	81.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,166	2,945	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	18,663	12,172	65.2
Hispanic	3,222	2,443	75.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,985	27,471	91.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,443	2,723	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	720	378	52.5
Economically disadvantaged students	11,507	7,570	65.8
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	26,987	22,094	81.9
Female	28,213	23,071	81.8
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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 schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,365	1,138	83.4
Districts	24	8	33.3
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 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 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	366	275	75.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	313	230	73.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	53	45	84.9
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

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 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
24	8	33.3
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

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 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and 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 2008-09 (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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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 *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	3
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	3
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	4
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 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)	5
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	1
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	34
Comments:	

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

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.

Three schools entered a partnership with Towson University.
One School selected a distinguished principal.
Two schools chose to suspend the office of the principal.
Twenty-eight schools hired a Turn-around Specialist.

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 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and 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 2008-09 (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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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.

Prince George's County -- no corrective actions have been adopted by the State Board of Education. The 2006 Master Plan update was cited as having all of the elements that the board would have included in a Corrective Action Plan, so the board chose not to issue a separate document.

Baltimore City Public Schools -- Corrective actions have been adopted by the State Board of Education and the State Board of Education required that a new Master Plan be submitted by the school system three years ago. The Master Plan and its annual updates are the administrative vehicle for insuring strategic planning based in student performance, accountability for finances associated with the strategic plan, and submission of federal and state grant funding documentation. Corrective actions adopted concern the curriculum, delivery of instruction, instructional materials, professional development, leadership, and an independent evaluation of curriculum implementation. The school system has submitted required reports, participated in joint planning and reviews, and has been recommended for approval of existing plans. Further, the system has demonstrated improved student performance and better management as of the current submissions.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 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 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	2
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 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

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 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	125	76
Comments: In answer the the question below regarding the date that processing appeals based on the SY 2007-08 data was completed: The elementary and middle school appeal process was completed on 08/08/08. The high school appeal process was completed on 10/29/08.		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	10/29/08
---	----------

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

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 2007-08.

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 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	17,116	18,501
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	7,424	6,765
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	43.4	36.6
Total number 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 2007-08	9,358	8,338
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 2007-08	54.7	45.1
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	61	
Comments: This data only includes students in assessed grades. The data in the SY 2006-07 column only reflect schools that received funding in SY 2007-08.		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 2007-08 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 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	26
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	11
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	35
Comments:	

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1		41	4	11		Not Collected
5	Supplemental Education Services	18	5	4		Not Collected
1		1	1	0		Not Collected
7 = Combo 2	Summer School for PreK	1	1	0		Not Collected

Comments: 6= Combo 1: Strategies 1 and 2
 7= Combo 2: Strategies 1 and 5
 MSDE does have data for Column 6, Response OptionA; however, we do not collect data for Column 6, Options B through D. Therefore, we are unable to determine the most common outcome for Column 6.

Column 1 Response Options Box
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.
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.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
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.
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

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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.

Maryland shares effective strategies with the LEAs during Title I Briefings (held twice a year). Briefings usually address only one or two Title I topics where helpful strategies could be discussed, based on the need of the LEAs. Title I Administrative Meetings (held three times a year), have provided the opportunity for Title I Coordinators to share the strategies they use with their colleagues during open table talk sessions and panel discussions. Technical assistance meetings are held by each State point of contact with their assigned LEAs. The point of contact may refer an LEA to communicate with another LEA to get more insight on the implementation of a strategy. Strategies are shared during those meetings to help meet the need of the LEA. The various meeting venues described allow LEAs the opportunity to hear about other strategies and lessons learned from their colleagues.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) 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:

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable. No 1003(g) grant funds were used during SY 2007-08. MSDE did not begin to issue grants until the 2008-09 school year.

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 2007-08 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.

Maryland implemented the following actions to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA:

1. State School Improvement Grants issued to all schools in Year 1-Restructuring. Maryland's General Assembly authorized \$11,379,601 for schools in improvement in the 2007-2008 school year.
2. Maryland provided technical support by training schools in restructuring planning in the use of the Teacher Capacity Needs Assessment.
3. Maryland provided technical support and training to individual schools and districts in the content areas of reading and mathematics.
4. Maryland provided special education grants to schools and systems where students failed to make AYP due to the specials needs populations.
5. Maryland began to plan the consolidation of its statewide system of support to better coordinate its efforts in service delivery and technical assistance. Pilot programs began in two school districts with schools in improvement in August 2008.

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	39,042
Applied to transfer	1,485
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,208

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

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

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 3,053,185
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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	20,739
Applied for supplemental educational services	9,602
Received supplemental educational services	7,276
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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	\$ 7,217,701
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	115,692	97,833	84.6	17,859	15.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	6,524	4,177	64.0	2,347	36.0
Low-poverty schools	5,812	5,476	94.2	336	5.8
All elementary schools	23,524	19,729	83.9	3,795	16.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	14,625	10,082	68.9	4,543	31.1
Low-poverty schools	23,686	21,367	90.2	2,319	9.8
All secondary schools	92,168	78,104	84.7	14,064	15.3
Comments:					

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.

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

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

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 were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	31.6
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	7.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	60.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	1.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes certified teachers who are teaching in a grade that is not included in their certification.

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

	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)	21.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	66.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	2.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes certified teachers who are teaching in a grade that is not included in their certification.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	63.8	18.3
Poverty metric used	Eligible for free/reduced meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
Secondary schools	48.0	12.4
Poverty metric used	Eligible for free/reduced meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
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	
<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.

Sixteen LEAs offer push-in or co-teaching programs. Seven LEAs offer newcomer programs.

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

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. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in 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 in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	41,593
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	41,570
Comments:	

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

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	26,239
French	1,655
Chinese	1,588
Korean	1,287
Vietnamese	1,118

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	37,511
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	902
Total	38,413
Comments: The total number of LEP students reported in 1.6.2.2 reflects an unduplicated count (41,570) of all students who were present at some point during the school year and were served under Title III. This includes students who may have withdrawn or transferred before or after the testing window. The number of Title III served LEP students assessed on State annual English Language Proficiency assessments reported in 1.6.3.2.1 reflects an unduplicated count (37,511) of LEP students who were present only during the testing window and were assessed on the state ELP test.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	17,793
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	46.3
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	37,511
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	902
Total	38,413
Comments: The total number of LEP students reported in 1.6.2.2 reflects an unduplicated count (41,570) of all students who were present at some point during the school year and were served under Title III. This includes students who may have withdrawn or transferred before or after the testing window. The number of Title III served LEP students assessed on State annual English Language Proficiency assessments reported in 1.6.3.2.1 reflects an unduplicated count (37,511) of LEP students who were present only during the testing window and were assessed on the state ELP test.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, 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.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	10,273	31.0
ELP attainment	17,793	47.0
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- 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
9,039	4,458	13,497
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,930	6,206	69.5	2,724
Comments:			

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

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

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 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
8,788	6,165	70.2	2,623
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,452	1,532	44.4	1,920
Comments:			

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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	23
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	23
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	23
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	23
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	23
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 2006-07 and 2007-08)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

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>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

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:	

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

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 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 in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III 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 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
16,617	6,460	9

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.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	897
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	266

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.

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

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets 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 (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	23	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	20	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	15	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	17	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	17	
Other (Explain in comment box)	5	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	19	2,840
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	19	2,257
PD provided to principals	15	543
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	11	312
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	9	1,079
PD provided to community based organization personnel	6	138
Total	23	7,169

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One LEA provided an ESOL course offering for guidance counselors. Two LEAs provided training to interpreters to translated for ESOL parents. Two LEAs offered Spanish language classes for teachers.

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

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 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

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

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

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.

Not applicable.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	5
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). 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	82.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	78.6
Hispanic	79.7
White, non-Hispanic	89.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	75.6
Limited English proficient	87.9
Economically disadvantaged	80.1
Migratory students	25.0
Male	82.2
Female	88.3
Comments: the 25% migratory student graduation rate has been reviewed and is correct.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

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 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5.0
Hispanic	5.1
White, non-Hispanic	2.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.0
Limited English proficient	1.5
Economically disadvantaged	2.8
Migratory students	7.7
Male	2.8
Female	4.2
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	13	13
LEAs with subgrants	11	11
Total	24	24
Comments:		

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

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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	104	315
K	241	569
1	265	620
2	223	540
3	188	567
4	184	529
5	151	529
6	120	467
7	124	536
8	88	479
9	107	635
10	57	416
11	27	354
12	32	346
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1,911	6,902
Comments:		

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

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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	198	1,027
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,501	5,152
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	25	116
Hotels/Motels	187	607
Total	1,911	6,902
Comments:		

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

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)	289
K	511
1	566
2	493
3	517
4	494
5	485
6	427
7	482
8	420
9	564
10	363
11	305
12	312
Ungraded	0
Total	6,228
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	427
Migratory children/youth	9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,019
Limited English proficient students	161
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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	9
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	10
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	9
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	9
Referral to other programs and services	5
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Food, Storage Rental, Hygiene products including toiletries, diapers, wipes, oral hygiene, deodorant, body wash, etc.

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

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	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	2
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	4

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1) Funds for dedicated buses to return all students to school of origin.
 2) Custody issues.
 3) During the 2007-08 school year, one LEA spent in excess of \$89,000 transporting homeless students to their school of origin. A very small amount was paid for from the grant. Lack of affordable housing in this district is responsible for many children's homeless status. Children frequently move from shelters to a relative and then to another relative which results in the continuation of the homeless status. When students don't have a quiet place to study, it poses a barrier to their academic success. A large majority of the homeless children in the LEA are living with a single parent (mother) often a victim of domestic violence or abuse. Additionally, affordable day care continues to pose a problem for these women as they try to obtain employment to support their families.
 4) High mobility rates among this population causes some students to have poor attendance making it difficult to maintain academic progress.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	429	280
4	427	314
5	423	279
6	338	204
7	369	234
8	352	168
High School	343	162
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	431	290
4	428	316
5	426	233
6	337	171
7	365	140
8	357	117
High School	461	221
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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)	60
K	10
1	17
2	21
3	10
4	9
5	12
6	8
7	15
8	11
9	14
10	7
11	6
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	142
Total	346

Comments:

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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.

Key reasons for the 36 percent decrease in Category 1 count:

1. Immigration Issues (families afraid to move and worker reluctant to talk to any agencies)
2. Reduction of crop acreage requiring the use of farm workers
3. Drought conditions limited available work
4. Limited housing for families
5. Large migrant camps continue to limit families
6. Cost of fuel has made travel difficult for farm workers and has impacted farm production.

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

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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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)	41
K	9
1	13
2	12
3	8
4	5
5	11
6	5
7	9
8	7
9	9
10	3
11	4
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	138
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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.

Key reasons for the 72.5 percent increase in Category 2 count:

1. More aggressive outreach for attendance
2. Services coordinated with Migrant Head Start for infants and toddlers, allowing siblings to attend MEP instead of having to stay home and baby sit.
3. Provided evening tutoring at the camp and or home for middle and high school students that were working in the fields during the day.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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.

Data is collected and maintained the same as category 1.

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

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

The original hard copy COEs are sent to the MSDE Migrant Education Service Center and reviewed by the State Data Specialist. The state data specialist searches MIS2000 to see if the child has an existing record. When the data base is searched to identify children, the state data specialist looks at names, birth date, parents names, siblings (if there are any), and home base addresses to compare to determine if there is a possible duplicate child, before entering the student into the data base (i.e. Juan Garcia vs Juan Garcia Alvarez). If a duplicate record is identified the records are merged based on documentation. If a record of the child is on the data base then the state data specialist uses the existing identifier (student number). If a record of the child does not exist then the state data base will assign the child an identifier (student number).

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 state 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.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MIS 2000 logic used to produce Maryland's Count:

Select distinct count (distinct 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 (schlhist0.LQM3Date>=!StartDate)

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

And (student0.ThirdBDay<=!EndDate)

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

And (student0.TwentySecondBDay>=!StartDate)

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

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

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

Definitions

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Use of the same system (MIS2000)

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

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 COE arrives at the Service Center and is reviewed, by the Data Specialist (Maryland's Data Specialist is the State Director's Administrative Specialist III) and the State Director if necessary.

Validation Review Steps:

1. Certification of Eligibility (COE) is sent to the Data Specialist.
2. The Data Specialist stamps the date received on all COE's.
3. All COE forms are reviewed for completeness.
4. Complete COEs moves to step number 8 in the process.
5. If the COE is incomplete, a COE Correction Form is sent with the COE to the recruiter to correct (If the COE is missing a box checked, the Data Specialist will call the Recruiter and verify the box needing to be checked. The action is recorded on the COE and initialed)
6. Recruiter makes corrections and sends COE back to the Data Specialist.
7. Data Specialist stamps the date received and again checks the forms for completeness.
8. The Data Specialist reviews COEs for eligibility. (Does the COE meet eligibility requirements as outlined in the guidance? Does it have enough information to stand on its own? Is more information needed to verify eligibility? Does it need a COE Attachment Sheet to give more supporting evidence of eligibility?)
9. If the Data Specialist needs additional clarification on any part of eligibility section, the recruiter completing the form is called for clarification and the COE is sent back, if additional information is needed (using the COE correction form). This process may result in the need for another interview and completion of another COE with an attachment sheet. The State Director requires re-interviews for validation of any COE that appears in question, or the recruiter could not give sufficient information.
10. If the COE is deemed eligible, a search is made on the State Data Base to see if the children have a prior COE or school history.
11. Children meeting the qualifications and having no prior COE or school enrollment in Maryland are entered in to the database (MIS2000).
12. Any student that has been in Maryland's system (MIS2000) is checked against the local system enrollment information to assure that there in fact was a break in residency from the district or state. If a large number of absentee days are reported more information is collected from the LEA to determine if there were true gaps that could be a result of a move. The following data elements are searched to ensure that duplicate entries do not exist on an individual child. Student Name, Birth Date, Parent/Guardian, and Place of Birth.
13. 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.
14. Validation of eligibility can be done by data collection or re-interview validation. The Data Specialist will prepare the forms needed.
15. The State Recruiter is given a copy of the COE with the eligibility section blank and a MEP Re-Interview Outcome Summary Form.
16. The State Recruiter will re-interview the family. Once completed the Data Specialist will provide the original forms and the recruiter will compare the results. The State 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.)
17. If the COE is determined to be eligible the Data Specialist will entered the COE into the database.
18. 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 COE forms are not entered into the State Data Base. This season two COE's were deemed not eligible during the review process and did not get entered into the MIS2000 data base and the students were not served in a MEP funded program.

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

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

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.

All COEs were reviewed for accuracy - documentation is maintained for each action. Two families were deemed not eligible but were not part of the child count. Additionally two families were re-interviewed during the summer and both were found eligible.

Maryland is in the process of developing new procedures for prospective re-interviewing based on the Federal Regulations effective August 28, 2008. The s

State has done a sampling of COE forms that cuts across all recruiters during the program year. The MEP Director will work with State statistician to select a sampling procedure. Both Regional Recruiters will test forms and methods on a random sample of new COE's. This sample will allow the State to finalize the forms and procedure.

Families and workers have become more reluctant to even speak to recruiters for eligibility and are more reluctant to discuss this information the second time with an individual they do not know. This is the reason the Regional Recruiters will test protocols to determine an effective method to do random re-interviews in Maryland.

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

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 Table III MEP Participation Table IV School Data

Count Regular Count

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

B-1 List Regular G-2 List

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

D-1 List Regular G-4 List

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

E-2 List Regular G-6 List

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

E-4 List Regular G-10 List

Ethnicity

Homebase Summer Count

Summer H-1 List

Table II Academic Status Summer H-2 List

Grade/age Summer H-3 List

Summer H-4 List

Summer H-5 List

Summer H-6 List

Summer H-8 List

Summer H-10 List

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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.

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

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.

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