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 2008-09

MARYLAND

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

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) 2008-09 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 EDFacts 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 18, 2009**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 12, 2010**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2008-09 ___Part II, 2008-09

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: Sandra K. Toomey, CSPR Coordinator

Telephone: 410-767-0439

Fax: 410-333-2275

e-mail: stoomey@msde.state.md.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick

_____ Wednesday, March 10, 2010, 4:30:01 PM
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2008-09

PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

An expert review of the Maryland State Curriculum for pre-k-8 mathematics was conducted during spring 2009. Recommendations made during that review will be incorporated during the transition to Common Core standards. Maryland is planning to conduct an alignment and transition study to estimate the scale of curricular movements and redesign that will be needed for adoption of the Common Core Standards for mathematics and reading/English language arts.

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.

• There have been no changes to the mathematics and reading/language arts assessments for grades 3-8.
• An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards was 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. The development of an AAMAAS for students in grades 3-5 was deferred until March 2010 and will be administered for the first time in the 2009-10 school year to students in grades 3-5 whose IEP teams have determined the student requires an assessment based on modified academic achievement standards.
• The end of course assessments in algebra/data analysis and English which serve as the NCLB high school measure had the constructed response items eliminated from the May 2009 and subsequent administrations.
• An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for algebra/data analysis and English was administered beginning in May 2008 to students with disabilities who meet specific eligibility criteria.

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 4,000 characters.

• The end of course assessment in biology also serves as the NCLB high school measure. The constructed response items were eliminated in the May 2009 administration and all subsequent administrations.
• An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for biology was administered beginning in May 2008 to students with disabilities who meet specific eligibility criteria.
• Maryland's assessment and academic achievement standards in science have not yet been approved. Documentation was provided for the November 2009 Peer Review. We are awaiting the final determination from the US Department of Education.

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 assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	425,822	424,198	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,554	1,549	99.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	24,799	24,760	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	161,208	160,128	99.3
Hispanic	37,164	37,055	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	201,093	200,702	99.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	50,777	50,283	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,611	13,562	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	152,401	151,473	99.4
Migratory students	20	20	100.0
Male	217,710	216,740	99.6
Female	208,108	207,454	99.7
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, 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(*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,713	19.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,956	59.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,977	11.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,637	9.2
Total	50,283	
Comments: Regarding the error message for section 1.2.3 - 'The total number 50,188 doesn't match the number of students with disabilities tested in 1.2.4 (50,215)'. This cross edit check between 1.2.3 (EDFacts File N093) and 1.2.4 (EDFacts File N081) does not take into account that the N093 has been updated with a new grouping 'ENGPROFTEST' for Assessment Administered; and that the N081 EDFacts file has been updated to include recently arrived students who are LEP, and who have attended schools in the U.S. less than 12 months, including those students who took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment. Thus, in section 1.2.3 the		

actual total is 50,215 and then the report backs out the 27 students in the grouping 'ENGPROFTEST' for a total of 50,188 and then compares it to section 1.2.4, which has a total of 50,215; however, there is not a provision provided to exclude the same 27 students in the grouping for Students with Disabilities based on the N081 EDFacts file specifications.
Partner Support was contacted and stated that the program would be corrected in the 2010 application.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	428,986	427,431	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,562	1,553	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,517	25,442	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	161,833	160,904	99.4
Hispanic	37,999	37,845	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	202,071	201,683	99.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	50,624	50,209	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,421	15,259	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	153,515	152,653	99.4
Migratory students	21	21	100.0
Male	219,248	218,318	99.6
Female	209,734	209,109	99.7
Comments: Regarding the error message for section 1.2.3 - 'The total number 50,188 doesn't match the number of students with disabilities tested in 1.2.4 (50,215)'. This cross edit check between 1.2.3 (EDFacts File N093) and 1.2.4 (EDFacts File N081) does not take into account that the N093 has been updated with a new grouping 'ENGPROFTEST' for Assessment Administered; and that the N081 EDFacts file has been updated to include recently arrived students who are LEP, and who have attended schools in the U.S. less than 12 months, including those students who took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment. Thus, in section 1.2.3 the actual total is 50,215 and then the report backs out the 27 students in the grouping 'ENGPROFTEST' for a total of 50,188 and then compares it to section 1.2.4, which has a total of 50,215; however, there is not a provision provided to exclude the same 27 students in the grouping for Students with Disabilities based on the N081 EDFacts file specifications. Partner Support was contacted and stated that the program would be corrected in the 2010 application.			

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 reading/language arts assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,852	19.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,705	59.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,994	11.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,637	9.2
Total	50,188	
Comments: Regarding the error message for section 1.2.3 - 'The total number 50,188 doesn't match the number of students with disabilities tested in 1.2.4 (50,215)'. This cross edit check between 1.2.3 (EDFacts File N093) and 1.2.4 (EDFacts File N081) does not take into account that the N093 has been updated with a new grouping 'ENGPROFTEST' for Assessment Administered; and that the N081 EDFacts file has been updated to include recently arrived students who are LEP, and who have attended schools in the U.S. less than 12 months, including those students who took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment. Thus, in section 1.2.3 the actual total is 50,215 and then the report backs out the 27 students in the grouping 'ENGPROFTEST' for a total of 50,188 and then compares it to section 1.2.4, which has a total of 50,215; however, there is not a provision provided to exclude the same 27 students in the grouping for Students with Disabilities based on the N081 EDFacts file specifications. Partner Support was contacted and stated that the program would be corrected in the 2010 application.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	184,160	181,762	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	655	645	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,569	10,496	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	69,028	67,661	98.0
Hispanic	14,772	14,579	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	89,098	88,343	99.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	21,411	20,329	95.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,165	4,069	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	59,743	58,354	97.7
Migratory students	9	9	100.0
Male	93,311	91,899	98.5
Female	90,812	89,826	98.9
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,069	20.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,822	63.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,179	5.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,259	11.1
Total	20,329	
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,447	50,927	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	250	212	84.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,812	3,580	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22,695	17,064	75.2
Hispanic	5,967	4,691	78.6
White, non-Hispanic	27,723	25,380	91.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,034	4,113	58.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,098	2,995	73.1
Economically disadvantaged students	24,252	18,256	75.3
Migratory students	5	4	80.0
Male	31,098	25,885	83.2
Female	29,349	25,042	85.3
Comments: Statewide, there was a 15% increase in 3rd grade LEP enrollment in SY 2008-09. Third grade increases were most notable in larger LEAs such as Price George's County with a 22% increase and Anne Arundel County with a 20% increase.			

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.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,417	51,303	84.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	249	223	89.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,794	3,544	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22,709	17,414	76.7
Hispanic	5,947	4,691	78.9
White, non-Hispanic	27,718	25,431	91.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,043	4,857	69.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,049	2,963	73.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,251	18,319	75.5
Migratory students	5	5	100.0
Male	31,080	25,648	82.5
Female	29,337	25,655	87.4
Comments: Statewide, there was a 15% increase in 3rd grade LEP enrollment in SY 2008-09. Third grade increases were most notable in larger LEAs such as Price George's County with a 22% increase and Anne Arundel County with a 20% increase.			

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.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	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 (*IDEA*)	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 does not administer the Maryland State Assessment in Science to third grade 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.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,502	53,026	89.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	230	208	90.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,530	3,426	97.0
Black, non-Hispanic	22,765	18,715	82.2
Hispanic	5,556	4,729	85.1
White, non-Hispanic	27,419	25,948	94.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,388	4,962	67.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,815	2,213	78.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,564	19,390	82.3
Migratory students	5	4	80.0
Male	30,646	27,040	88.2
Female	28,854	25,986	90.1
Comments:			

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.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,456	51,525	86.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	207	90.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,511	3,326	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22,758	17,954	78.9
Hispanic	5,543	4,474	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	27,415	25,564	93.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,395	5,151	69.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,756	1,960	71.1
Economically disadvantaged students	23,542	18,358	78.0
Migratory students	5	4	80.0
Male	30,621	25,836	84.4
Female	28,835	25,689	89.1
Comments:			

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.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	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 (*IDEA*)	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 does not administer the Maryland State Assessment in Science to fourth grade 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.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,999	49,530	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	185	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,648	3,452	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,287	16,467	70.7
Hispanic	5,510	4,131	75.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,325	25,295	89.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,802	4,184	53.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,073	1,297	62.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,439	16,505	70.4
Migratory students	2	1	50.0
Male	31,211	25,008	80.1
Female	29,788	24,522	82.3
Comments:			

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.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,959	54,558	89.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	215	93.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,621	3,442	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,289	19,425	83.4
Hispanic	5,496	4,644	84.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,324	26,832	94.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,806	5,752	73.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,009	1,441	71.7
Economically disadvantaged students	23,424	19,316	82.5
Migratory students	3	2	66.7
Male	31,188	27,317	87.6
Female	29,771	27,241	91.5
Comments:			

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.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,138	38,954	63.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	159	69.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,710	3,017	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,259	10,429	44.8
Hispanic	5,621	2,760	49.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,306	22,586	79.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,736	2,832	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,227	635	28.5
Economically disadvantaged students	23,562	10,104	42.9
Migratory students	3	1	33.3
Male	31,277	20,191	64.6
Female	29,847	18,760	62.8
Comments: The warnings related to increase or decrease in percentage of Migratory students is directly related to the fact that they are a migrant population that is in different schools each year as well as different numbers within grade levels.			

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.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,058	46,428	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	173	75.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,619	3,358	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23,328	14,718	63.1
Hispanic	5,619	3,865	68.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,263	24,314	86.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,625	3,568	46.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,590	869	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,966	14,243	62.0
Migratory students	3	1	33.3
Male	31,519	23,383	74.2
Female	29,538	23,045	78.0
Comments:			

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.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,041	50,929	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	190	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,597	3,330	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,350	17,511	75.0
Hispanic	5,600	4,238	75.7
White, non-Hispanic	28,264	25,660	90.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,635	4,391	57.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,540	773	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,960	16,572	72.2
Migratory students	3	1	33.3
Male	31,527	25,526	81.0
Female	29,512	25,403	86.1
Comments:			

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.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	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 (*IDEA*)	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 does not test sixth grade students in science.			

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.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,137	44,765	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	139	70.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,575	3,277	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,438	12,854	54.8
Hispanic	5,591	3,466	62.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,336	25,029	85.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,340	3,206	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,307	563	43.1
Economically disadvantaged students	22,391	12,072	53.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	31,757	22,035	69.4
Female	30,380	22,730	74.8
Comments:			

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.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,131	50,798	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	153	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,559	3,301	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23,477	16,872	71.9
Hispanic	5,576	4,125	74.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,325	26,347	89.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,355	3,925	53.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,259	579	46.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,386	15,429	68.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	31,745	24,683	77.8
Female	30,386	26,115	85.9
Comments:			

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.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	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 (*IDEA*)	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 does not administer the Maryland State Assessment in Science to seventh grade 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.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,619	41,932	65.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	151	61.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,531	3,171	89.8
Black, non-Hispanic	24,268	11,341	46.7
Hispanic	5,403	3,048	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	30,170	24,221	80.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,496	2,686	35.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,268	463	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,395	10,471	46.8
Migratory students	5	3	60.0
Male	32,753	20,894	63.8
Female	30,866	21,038	68.2
Comments:			

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.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,698	51,069	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	244	194	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,518	3,240	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	24,348	17,007	69.8
Hispanic	5,402	3,881	71.8
White, non-Hispanic	30,186	26,747	88.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,521	3,847	51.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,238	486	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,474	14,979	66.6
Migratory students	5	2	40.0
Male	32,786	24,893	75.9
Female	30,912	26,176	84.7
Comments:			

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.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,411	41,408	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	241	149	61.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,583	3,068	85.6
Black, non-Hispanic	24,041	10,698	44.5
Hispanic	5,485	2,752	50.2
White, non-Hispanic	30,038	24,738	82.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,292	2,418	33.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,416	291	20.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,315	9,577	42.9
Migratory students	6	2	33.3
Male	32,594	21,223	65.1
Female	30,794	20,183	65.5
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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	56,436	47,935	84.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	168	149	88.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,045	2,932	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,347	14,557	71.5
Hispanic	3,409	2,821	82.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,466	27,476	93.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,598	2,691	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	411	256	62.3
Economically disadvantaged students	12,466	9,166	73.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	27,756	23,367	84.2
Female	28,679	24,568	85.7

Comments: Statewide, high school LEP student enrollment decreased by 10% in SY 2008-09.
SY 2008-09 was the first year students were required to pass High School Assessments (HSA) as part of high school graduation requirements. LEAs made decisions regarding course placement readiness and appropriate interventions.
LEAs reviewed their ESOL course sequence and data indicates that additional interventions increased RLA LEP participation rate.
Late high school placement, limited English language proficiency, insufficient credits, and interrupted and/or limited schooling were contributing factors in the decreases of LEP participation in math and science assessments.

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,776	48,229	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	150	84.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,267	2,964	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,594	15,090	73.3
Hispanic	3,512	2,744	78.1
White, non-Hispanic	30,223	27,281	90.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,433	2,650	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	455	221	48.6
Economically disadvantaged students	12,568	9,015	71.7
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	28,348	22,473	79.3
Female	29,426	25,756	87.5

Comments: Statewide, high school LEP student enrollment decreased by 10% in SY 2008-09.
SY 2008-09 was the first year students were required to pass High School Assessments (HSA) as part of high school graduation requirements. LEAs made decisions regarding course placement readiness and appropriate interventions.
LEAs reviewed their ESOL course sequence and data indicates that additional interventions increased RLA LEP participation rate.
Late high school placement, limited English language proficiency, insufficient credits, and interrupted and/or limited schooling were contributing factors in the decreases of LEP participation in math and science assessments.

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,213	46,996	82.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	144	81.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,203	2,998	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,361	13,527	66.4
Hispanic	3,473	2,726	78.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,999	27,601	92.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,301	2,680	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	426	244	57.3
Economically disadvantaged students	12,477	8,425	67.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	28,028	23,065	82.3
Female	29,185	23,931	82.0
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.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,372	1,057	77.0
Districts	25	4	16.0
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. 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 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	358	254	71.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	314	215	68.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	44	39	88.6
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. 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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
24	3	12.5
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. *See* Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* 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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û 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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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)	9
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	31
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland only allows three alternative governance options: 1) Replace all or most of the school staff which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make adequate progress, and 2) contract with a private management company 3) reopen the school as a public charter school.

There were no other major restructuring of the school governances" available to new schools entering restructuring during the 2008-2009 school year. However, in past years MSDE allowed schools to select "Turnaround Specialist" as an option. To date, 27 schools are still implementing this option.

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State'ts 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 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- 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.

Baltimore City Public Schools -- Corrective actions have been adopted by the State Board of Education and the State Board required that a new Master Plan be submitted by the school system in 2006. The Master Plan and its annual updates are the administrative vehicle for ensuring strategic planning based on student performance, accountability for finances associated with the Master 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, has undergone an intensive Master Plan update review process by the Maryland State Department of Education, and has been recommended for approval of existing plans. Further, the system has demonstrated improved student performance and better management through 2008. The Master Plan update for 2009 is currently under review by the Department and final recommendations on approval will be presented to the State Board in mid-December.

Prince George's County Public Schools -- 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 require a separate document. Subsequent Master Plan update documents have been approved by the State Board. The update for 2009 is currently under review by the Department and final recommendations on approval will be presented to the State Board in mid-December.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
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 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	111	67
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	09/18/09

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 2008-09.

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 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA that were administered* in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the **mathematics** assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	18,300	20,402
Total number of students who were proficient or above in **mathematics** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	9,983	9,218
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in **mathematics** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	54.6	45.2
Total number of students who completed the **reading/language arts** assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	18,346	20,450
Total number of students who were proficient or above in **reading/language arts** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	11,806	12,044
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 2008-09	64.4	58.9
Comments:		

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

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 2008-09 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 2008-09 that **made adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2008-09	22
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2008-09	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2008-09	49
Comments:	

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

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 based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, 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	Combination of strategies 1, 2, and 4.	1	0	1	D	1 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected)
7 = Combo 2	Comgination of strategies 1, 2, 4, and 5. 5 = Supplemental Educational Services	17	4	2	D	11 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected)
5	Supplemental Educational Services	13	0	1	D	10 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected)
8 = Combo 3	Combination of strategies 1,2,3, and 5. 5 = Supplemental Educational Services	17	4	2	D	11 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected)
6 = Combo 1	Combination of strategies 1 and 2.	11	1	4	D	6 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected)
7 = Combo 2	Combination of strategies 1,2, and 5. 5 = Supplemental Educational Services	28	3	5	D	23 (Outcome A, outcomes B and C were not collected)
Comments: In addition to Supplemental Educational Services, Maryland schools utilized 5 different combination of strategies.						

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
D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Maryland State Department of Education compiled the strategies each school used into a booklet. The booklet was distributed during the first Title I Administrative meeting in which all 24 LEAs and the SEED School Maryland attended. During the Title I Administrative Meeting, the grant recipient LEAs discussed and highlighted how the 1003(a) and 1003(g) grants were being used in their LEAs. Networking time was provided for LEAs to discuss the strategies being used, which are funded through the grants. LEAs have called the recipient coordinator of the grants requesting suggestions as to how other systems have used their funds that may be helpful in their schools. The booklet was also distributed to principals in the Prince George's County Public School System who attended their annual Title I Principal's conference in fall 2008. The booklet has been posted on the SEA Title I website.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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.

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2007-2008, an extensive school assessment (Restructuring Implementation Technical Assistance or RITA) was administered to 17 low-performing Tile I schools in Baltimore City that were in "restructuring implementation." Recommendations for improvement were identified by the review team and communicated to school and district administrators. School improvement funds (1003g) were allocated to support improvement efforts at the school level. Administrative funds allowed Maryland to monitor these schools this year via onsite and desk review of mid-cycle grant reports. MSDE continues to monitor these schools as they implement their school improvement initiatives funded with 1003(g) funds. Six of the 17 RITA schools made adequate yearly progress on the 2009 Maryland School Assessment. Three of the six schools exited school improvement.

The Maryland State Department of Education is in the process of revising the RITA protocol in consultation with Brown University to include District recommendations in order to help LEAs recognize areas where they can improve their support to chronically low performing schools.

In 2008-09 MSDE created the Breakthrough Center, Maryland's Statewide System of Support (SSOS), as the way to differentiate the level of support to low-performing Title I schools by providing more uniquely tailored strategies for improvement and by building sustainability in local school districts.

During 2008-09, an Executive Director was hired (50 % Title I funds) to pilot the SSOS in two Maryland districts in the form of technical assistance: one is a small, rural district with limited central office capacity to develop a strategic approach for supporting the persistent and emerging needs of its Title I schools in improvement; the second in one of Maryland's largest districts, with a mix of successful schools and a cluster of underperforming Title I schools. All targeted Title I schools met AYP in 2008-09. Through the Breakthrough Center, teacher and administrator professional development were also provided to Title I schools in improvement in other districts in across the state.

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

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 2008-09 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.

During the 2008-2009 school year, Title I schools in seven jurisdictions received an additional $2,724,179 in State School Improvement Grants funded by the Maryland General Assembly. Most of these funds supported extended day programs (43%) followed by staff development (17%), high school assessments (12%), consultants (7%), staffing (6%), interventions (6%), technology (6%), instructional materials (2%), and administrative expenses (2%). State school improvement funds were distributed to both Title I and non-Title I schools improvement across the State. Percentages above have been rounded.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	31,585
Applied to transfer	933
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	587

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 1,543,235

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

[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	19,796
Applied for supplemental educational services	10,277
Received supplemental educational services	7,959
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. *See* Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* 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	$ 15,058,281
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	110,182	97,459	88.4	12,723	11.6
All elementary classes	19,920	18,420	92.5	1,500	7.5
All secondary classes	90,262	79,039	87.6	11,223	12.4

Highly Qualified Teachers HQT are not reported for schools where Core Academic Subjects are not taught, and HQT are not reported for schools that did not have enrollment at the time of reporting. These type of schools are Alternative Centers and Special Education Centers, and these schools are temporary placement centers for students.

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.	Yes

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.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	32.4
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	7.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	57.5
Other (please explain in comment box below)	2.2
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.

	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)	25.6
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	58.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	4.1
Total	99.9

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The total calculates to 99.9% because the numbers are rounded off to one decimal point.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	6,858	5,419	79.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	5,833	5,593	95.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,681	11,047	80.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	21,767	20,060	92.2

1.5.4 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	65.1	19.4
Poverty metric used	Eligible for free/reduced meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	
Secondary schools	50.0	13.6
Poverty metric used	Eligible for free/reduced meals divided by the September 30 enrollment count for all schools.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.

d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs =** Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

22 Push-in ESL, 6 Newcomer programs, 12 ESL Tutoring Support

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	41,529
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	41,525
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; Castilian	25,734
French	1,493
Chinese	1,441
Vietnamese	1,056
Korean	1,018

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	39,554
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,784
Total	41,338
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	6,036
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	14.5
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	39,532
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,783
Total	41,315
Comments:	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).

	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	1,413

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of ôMaking Progressö as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of ôMaking Progressö and the number and percent that met the State definition of ôAttainmentö of English language proficiency.

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	24,213	52.7	23,166	56.00
ELP attainment	6,026	13.1	6,204	15.00

Comments: Maryland results % for Making progress should be calculated by dividing the number of LEP students Making progress (24,213) by the number Total N size which in Maryland's case is Progress (24,213)+ No Progress(15,723) = 39,996. Thus the % of students making progress is 60.6%. AND NOT 52.7% using a total N size of Progress(24,213) + No Progress(15,723) + Proficient(6,026) = 45,962 as Maryland students who are proficient (6,026) are a subset of the Progress + No Progress (39,996) students. When the Proficient student count is included again in the Total N size, students are counted twice and hence increase the total N size and lower the AMAO %.

Rationale for decreases in LEP students tested on the ELP assessment from SY 2007-08 to SY 2008-09
• The criteria for AMAO 1 for SY 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 were essentially the same. AMAO 1 was calculated by using a composite score obtained from the LAS Links assessment. Students were considered to have made progress if their overall test score on the LAS Links composite was 15 scale score points higher than the composite score from the previous year's test administration.
• The AMAO 1 target in SY 2008-2009 increased from 48% (SY 2007-2008) to 56% of students making progress.
• The criterion for AMAO 2 (accountability) in SY 2007-08 was attained from a composite cut score of 4 on the ELP assessment with a minimum cut score of 4 in each domain to determine proficiency.
• The AMAO 2 target for SY 2007-2008 was 30% of students attaining proficiency.
• Cohorts were used for AMAO 2 determination in SY 2007-08. Only students who were enrolled in ESOL services for more than two years and had a proficiency level of 3 or higher were included in the AMAO 2 count.
• The criterion for AMAO 2 (accountability) in SY 2008-09 was attained from a composite cut score of 5 on the ELP assessment with a minimum cut score of 4 in each domain to determine proficiency.
• Cohorts were not used in SY 2008-2009 to determine AMAO 2 proficiency. All LEP students, K-12 participated in the ELP assessment and were included in AMAO 2 calculations.
• The AMAO 2 target for SY 2008-2009 was changed to 15% of students attaining proficiency.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Maryland assessments are administered in English, they are not offered in native languages.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Maryland assessments are administered in English, they are not offered in native languages.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Maryland assessments are administered in English, they are not offered in native languages.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP 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
7,127	3,461	10,588
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,062	4,641	76.6	1,421
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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
6,066	4,936	81.4	1,130
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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 total 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
1,687	840	49.8	847
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	23
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	10
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	19
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	12
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	21
# - 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 2007-08 and 2008-09)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
12,509	257	6

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. *See* Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* 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 under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) û The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course û (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.	1,129
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	400

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	24	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	24	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	23	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	23	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	23	
Other (Explain in comment box)	10	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	24	3,619
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	23	1,394
PD provided to principals	18	599
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	20	594
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	19	793
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	181
Total	116	7,180

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Strategies and government policies pertaining to ELLS.
Cultural diversity course and cross-cultural communication.
Student data driven instruction training.
Spanish for Educators
Kindergarten curriculum writing staff development.
Interpreter Training

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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/08	07/01/08	0
Comments: In Maryland there is "0 day delay" because the LEA grants are made available on the day grants are awarded, July 1.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	4
Comments:	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	79.0
Hispanic	77.5
White, non-Hispanic	89.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	72.8
Limited English proficient	88.3
Economically disadvantaged	82.1
Migratory students	0.0
Male	81.8
Female	88.4
Comments:	

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 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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4.5
Hispanic	4.6
White, non-Hispanic	2.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5.8
Limited English proficient	3.3
Economically disadvantaged	2.8
Migratory students	10.0
Male	4.1
Female	2.7
Comments:	

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	12	12
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	24	24
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	36	483
K	120	916
1	81	949
2	82	863
3	69	817
4	62	823
5	62	772
6	61	668
7	62	633
8	62	660
9	52	839
10	40	557
11	43	417
12	26	421
Ungraded	0	0
Total	858	9,818
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	142	1,281
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	564	7,609
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	59	219
Hotels/Motels	93	709
Total	858	9,818
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	459
K	859
1	889
2	819
3	770
4	771
5	734
6	619
7	587
8	616
9	760
10	512
11	384
12	396
Ungraded	
Total	9,175
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	364
Migratory children/youth	6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,481
Limited English proficient students	344
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. *See* Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* 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	0
Staff professional development and awareness	11
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
Transportation	11
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	9
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	9
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	1
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Two local school systems indicated that they provide other forms of educational support to homeless students. One school system uses McKinney-Vento funds for a summer pool program. Another uses these funds to provide hygiene supplies as well as costs for rental of storage facility at the onset of homelessness.

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	2
School Selection	1
Transportation	3
School records	0
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	5

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Five local school systems identified other barriers:
1) Parents being under the impression that they can attend any school because they are homeless; which results in a denial and then having to move the student from one school to another.
2) Immunizations (from above): Please note that the student was asked to return to school as soon as it was known that the she was homeless. Homeless status WAS documented in our system's database.
3) There was a need to have school-based administration understand what services are provided for homeless children. Student Services are educating more of the staff by utilizing the PPW's.
4) We consider it a barrier when we know a family is homeless but they will not declare themselves as such.
5) Not enrolling immediately.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	717	510
4	712	537
5	682	539
6	571	409
7	532	324
8	551	335
High School	297	212
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. *See* Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* 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 *ESEA* 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	714	484
4	715	558
5	683	427
6	570	297
7	534	224
8	551	202
High School	282	190
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. *See* Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	64
K	24
1	13
2	20
3	21
4	13
5	10
6	9
7	10
8	15
9	10
10	9
11	9
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	160
Total	388
Comments: Send inquiry	

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

The small upward trend this season to Category 1 count was the result of:
• Some increase of crop acreage requiring the use of farm workers.
• Workers reporting lack of work in their homebase states.
• Drop in fuel cost has made travel possible.
• Regional recruiters who have developed working relationships in the community and are native Spanish speakers.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	39
K	13
1	7
2	9
3	12
4	7
5	8
6	3
7	2
8	6
9	2
10	2
11	4
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
Total	122
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.

The program served 16 less students, however, the MEP served 17 children ages 0-2. This was critical, without these services school age students would have stayed in the camps to babysit. The number of school age children changes year to year and this season we had an increase of infant and toddlers.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Collected and maintained the same as Category 1 count.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland operates one central data base (MIS2000). All 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 Alverez). If a duplicate record is identified (within MIS2000 or MSIX) 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.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MIS 2000 logic used to produce Maryland's Count:

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

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

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

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

,":MIS2000:schlhist" schlhist0

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

Where student0.StudentSeq=schlhist0.StudentSeq

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

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

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

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

Determines if Funding Date is within the period

or

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

Determines if Withdraw Date is within the period

or

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

Determines if LQM Date is within the period

or

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

Determines if Residence Date is within the period

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

And (schlhist0.LQM3Date>=!StartDate)

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

And (student0.ThirdBDay<=!EndDate)

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

And (student0.TwentySecondBDay>=!StartDate)

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

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

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

Definitions

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Use of the same system (MIS2000)

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State had a subcommittee revise Maryland's Migrant Education Program Re-interview Procedure with Random Sample in February of 2009. The intent of the re-interview is for someone who is familiar with the regulations of the MEP other than the original interviewer of an approved COE to verify all information and confirm Section III/Eligibility Data listed on that COE. There must be three attempts to contact the family, either by driving to the current street address listed in the Section I of the COE or by phone; if the family cannot be contacted after three attempts, this also must be noted on the Re-interview Outcome Summary Form and return to MSDE MEP Office. The procedures outline the preparing for the re-interview, conducting the re-interview at the home, conducting the re-interview by phone and the MEP Re-Interview Outcome Summary Form.

Training is provided before the re-interview is conducted.

To assure that 20% of the COEs would have a re-interview a random sample of 41% was pulled (66 COEs). Each COE was sequentially numbered prior to the sampling. Every 10th COE was pulled from each recruiter.

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

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

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

Completed forms are returned immediately to the MSDE MEP Office and no copy is kept by the re-interviewer. The Data Specialist and State Director compare the original COE with the re-interview Section III.

Re-interviews were conducted August 2009 by Regional Recruiters in the area they are not assigned.

The results were:
• 32 re-interviews were conducted and all the COEs were eligible (this met the goal of 20% actual interviews to be conducted).
• 28 COEs were families/individuals that had either left the area or after three attempts the recruiter was unable to reach the individual. Of the 28 COEs 27 were located in migrant housing (camps, farms, and roadside motels used by crew leaders)

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

List of Snap Reports

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

Table I Population Data Table III MEP Participation Table IV School Data
Count Regular Count
A-1List 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)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No corrective actions were identified for eligibility determinations.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None

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