MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Maryland Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan

January 10, 2018
Revised: May 23, 2018

Revised State Template for the

Consolidated State Plan

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act

U.S. Department of Education
Issued: March 2017

OMB Number: 1810-0576
Expiration Date: September 30, 2017

Introduction

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA),[1] requires the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. ESEA section 8302 also requires the Secretary to establish the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan. Even though an SEA submits only the required information in its consolidated State plan, an SEA must still meet all ESEA requirements for each included program. In its consolidated State plan, each SEA may, but is not required to, include supplemental information such as its overall vision for improving outcomes for all students and its efforts to consult with and engage stakeholders when developing its consolidated State plan.

Completing and Submitting a Consolidated State Plan

Each SEA must address all of the requirements identified below for the programs that it chooses to include in its consolidated State plan. An SEA must use this template or a format that includes the required elements and that the State has developed working with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

Each SEA must submit to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) its consolidated State plan by one of the following two deadlines of the SEA's choice:

- **April 3, 2017**; or
- **September 18, 2017**.

Any plan that is received after April 3, but on or before September 18, 2017, will be considered to be submitted on September 18, 2017. In order to ensure transparency consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department intends to post each State plan on the Department's website.

Alternative Template

If an SEA does not use this template, it must:
1) Include the information on the Cover Sheet;
2) Include a table of contents or guide that clearly indicates where the SEA has addressed each requirement in its consolidated State plan;
3) Indicate that the SEA worked through CCSSO in developing its own template; and
4) Include the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act. See Appendix B.

Individual Program State Plan

An SEA may submit an individual program State plan that meets all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements for any program that it chooses not to include in a consolidated State plan. If an SEA intends to submit an individual program plan for any program, the SEA must submit the individual program plan by one of the dates above, in concert with its consolidated State plan, if applicable.

---

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

Consultation

Under ESEA section 8540, each SEA must consult in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor, or appropriate officials from the Governor's office, including during the development and prior to submission of its consolidated State plan to the Department. A Governor shall have 30 days prior to the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan to the Secretary to sign the consolidated State plan. If the Governor has not signed the plan within 30 days of delivery by the SEA, the SEA shall submit the plan to the Department without such signature.

Assurances

In order to receive fiscal year (FY) 2017 ESEA funds on July 1, 2017, for the programs that may be included in a consolidated State plan, and consistent with ESEA section 8302, each SEA must also submit a comprehensive set of assurances to the Department at a date and time established by the Secretary. In the near future, the Department will publish an information collection request that details these assurances.

For Further Information: If you have any questions, please contact your Program Officer at OSS.[State]@ed.gov (e.g., OSS.Alabama@ed.gov).

Cover Page

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position): Mary L. Gable Assistant State Superintendent Division of Student, Family, and School Support/Academic Policy	Telephone: 410-767-0472
Mailing Address: 200 West Baltimore Street Baltimore, MD 21201	Email Address: Mary.gable@maryland.gov
By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D. State Superintendent of Schools	Telephone: 410-767-0462
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative	Date: 1/10/18
Governor (Printed Name) Larry Hogan	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: June 30, 2017
Signature of Governor	Date:

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included <u>all</u> of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

or

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:

☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

☐ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

Instructions

Each SEA must provide descriptions and other information that address each requirement listed below for the programs included in its consolidated State plan. Consistent with ESEA section 8302, the Secretary has determined that the following requirements are absolutely necessary for consideration of a consolidated State plan. An SEA may add descriptions or other information, but may not omit any of the required descriptions or information for each included program.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

1. <u>Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments</u> *(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1−200.8.)*[2]

2. <u>Eighth Grade Math Exception</u> (*ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))*:
   i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?
      - ☒ Yes
      - ☐ No

   ii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
      a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
      b. The student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
      c. In high school:
         1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
         2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
         3. The student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.
      - ☒ Yes
      - ☐ No

   iii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

When Maryland adopted the Common Core State Standards in June 2010 for mathematics, Local

---

[2] The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.

Educational Agencies (LEAs) developed plans for how to meet the needs of students who were able to move through the mathematics at an accelerated pace. State-level mathematics meetings provided opportunities for LEA Mathematics Supervisors to share a variety of methods for compacting mathematics content to allow students who were ready to take advanced level mathematics coursework in middle school to accelerate. Maryland's LEAs now use a variety of methods to provide students the opportunity to be prepared to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school. Algebra I is available to all eighth grade students in Maryland. Approximately 50 percent of Maryland students exit middle school having engaged in high school level mathematics.

3. <u>Native Language Assessment</u>s *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4)*:
    i. Provide its definition for "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population," and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

The definition of "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent" was established in collaboration with the 24 LEAs in the State. Maryland uses the Office of Civil Rights recommended threshold of a language group comprising five percent of the total tested population or 1000 whichever is less. Spanish is the only language in Maryland that is present to a significant extent: 5.8 percent of the total K-12 population: (51,772/886,221) and 75 percent of the total English Learner (EL) population (51,772/69,079). The second most prevalent language in the State, French, comprises only 2.5 percent of the EL population. EL French speakers in tested grades do not reach the 1,000 student threshold. Upon examination of each LEA's data, no other language exceeds the five percent/1,000 student threshold. Migrant students in Maryland are primarily Spanish; the American Indian/Alaska Native population comprises only .0027 percent of the total student population. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) will continue to drill down into annual LEA data, study grade level trends and distinct refugee and immigrant populations in specific LEAs, and consult with LEAs to determine if other thresholds need to be amended to Maryland's definition.

    ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

Maryland administers the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) which provides translations of the general administration directions for the English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics assessments in all assessed grades for the top 10 languages of participating states. In addition, PARCC mathematics assessments are provided in a translated paper version in Spanish and a transadapted online version in Spanish for all assessed grades. A transadaptation goes beyond the literal word-to-word translation and is adapted to fit the cultural and linguistic understanding of the target language.

    iii. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

Maryland is field testing a new science assessment, the Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (MISA), in 2017. The State will begin consultation on the development of the assessment in Spanish

after the validation of the field test is complete.

iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing
   a. The State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);
   b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and
   c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

a. The science assessment in Spanish will be developed after the 2017 field tests of the original English version of the MISA.
b. Several groups, including the EL/Title III LEA Supervisors, EL Task Force, and EL Advisory, were consulted to gain input regarding the use of assessments in other languages. EL/Title III Supervisors represent the State's 24 LEAs and help support the EL services, advocate for equitable educational access for ELs, and oversee general Title III administrative duties. The EL Task Force members are school-based administrators and teachers, LEA Supervisors, family engagement specialists, advocacy groups and educators from the MSDE as well as Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs). The members identify and address challenges related to ELs. The EL Advisory group also consists of educators and community members that are similar to the EL Task Force. The group provides on-going input and feedback with regard to education of ELs. In addition, several LEAs piloted the use of the translated/transadapted Spanish PARCC Mathematics assessments to gain insight and to establish promising practices for the selection of the accommodation as well as for test administration. Furthermore, since Maryland participates in the administration of the PARCC assessments, the input provided during group meetings and the peer review process has provided valuable input into the use of assessments in other languages.
c. The MISA is currently being piloted. The State will begin consultation on the development of the assessment in Spanish after the validation of the spring 2017 field test is completed
d. The MSDE will pursue funding opportunities that would allow development of a future version of the Early Learning Assessment in Spanish.

v. Universal Design for Learning (State added section)

In 2012, the Maryland State Board of Education adopted the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR), 13A.03.06., Universal Design for Learning (UDL), which requires local school systems to use UDL guidelines and principles in the development and provision of curriculum, instructional materials, instruction, professional development, and student assessments.

The English/Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics assessments developed by the PARCC consortium are constructed using UDL principles to make the tests as accessible as possible to all students, including English learners and students with disabilities. The focus is on giving all students an equal opportunity to demonstrate the skills and knowledge of the standards. PARCC employed UDL philosophy to establish the Accessibility Guidelines for Item Development. Following item

development UDL is leveraged from the initial design through item development, field testing, and implementation of the assessments for all students, including students with disabilities, English learners, and English learners with disabilities. This is done in part by having trained UDL content and accessibility experts as part of the ELA/Literacy and Mathematics content review teams.

The World-Class Instructional Design (WIDA) Accessibility and Accommodations Framework, represented below, provides support for all English learners, including targeted accommodations for students with Individual Education Plans (IEP) or 504 plans. These supports are intended to increase the accessibility for the assessments for all English learners. To incorporate UDL, test items are presented using multiple modalities, including supporting prompts with appropriate animations and graphics, embedded scaffolding, tasks broken into chunks, and modeling that uses task prototypes and guides.

Accommodations — ELLs with a disability (IEP or 504 Plan)

Universal Tools

Administrative Considerations — All ELLs

Universal Design

The National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) development partners applied their understanding of the characteristics of the population of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and UDL principles to inform the design of each item. Their focus was to ensure that any necessary additional adaptations and accommodations did not interfere with the measured construct. A strength of the NCSC Alternative Assessments based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AA-AAS) Evidence Centered Design-based approach was the support it provided for the development of items that (a) focused on construct-relevant content (knowledge, skills, and abilities intended to be measured), (b) minimized the evidence of construct-irrelevant skills (e.g., inability to read text due to the size of print, inability to access items due to absence of assistive device, inability to engage with the items), and (c) considered appropriate accessibility options. In addition, NCSC provided flexible materials, techniques, and strategies for instruction and assessment to address the needs of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) has integrated accessible content by developing various testlet levels, grade appropriate vocabulary, multiple and alternate pathways to the nodes, and item writing guidelines based on universal design. Prior to administering the DLM Alternate Assessment, educators provide information about the accessibility needs for each assessed student. The online test platform stores all of that information and uses some of it to activate certain features. The DLM offers a dynamic delivery system. The system relies on each student's level of success and position in the learning map to select the next item. DLM provides immediate, corrective feedback to the student.

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities *(ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))*:
    i. Subgroups *(ESEA section 1111(c)(2))*:
        a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

Maryland will include the required student groups in the accountability system which includes the following major racial and ethnic groups:
· American Indian/Alaskan Native
· Asian
· Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
· Black/African American
· Hispanic/Latino of any race
· White
· Two or More Races

---

        b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

Maryland includes the required student groups as part of the accountability system: The State intends to take steps to add "gifted and talented students" as an additional student group by the end of school year 2017-2018.

For all students and disaggregated by student groups, including homeless students, status as a child in foster care and students with a parent(s) in the military, Maryland will report on academic achievement as measured by the academic assessments. Additionally, Maryland will report information on academic progress and high school graduation rates for homeless students and students in foster care. However, these additional student groups will not be a part of the accountability system.

---

        c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student's results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.
        ☒ Yes
        ☐ No

d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:

☒ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or

☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or

☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

ii. <u>Minimum N-Size</u> *(ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))*:
   a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

Maryland has established the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability as greater than 9 (> 9) or an n size of 10 (n=10). This minimum will protect individual students from possible identification, consistent with the Family Education Rights to Privacy Act. However, the n-size for the graduation indicator will remain at 30 (n=30).

   b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

Maryland has established the minimum number of students as n=10 for public reporting and for accountability determinations. This minimum n-size allows for the maximum number of LEAs, schools, and student groups to be represented in the accountability system and provides an acceptable level of statistical reliability and validity.

The table below provides a breakdown of the number and percent of students and schools across student groups that would be included and in accountability determinations with a minimum n-size of 10 students.

Student Group	n = 10					
	Students Included	All Students	Percent Included	Schools Included	All Schools	Percent Included
All Students	432137	432176	99.99	1362	1371	99.34
American Indian or Alaska Native	10	1131	0.88	1	640	0.16

Asian	26075	28266	92.25	592	1145	51.70
Black or African American	142920	143782	99.40	1169	1340	87.24
Hispanic/Latino of any race	61789	63281	97.64	993	1328	74.77
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	29	599	4.84	2	383	0.52
White	175537	176450	99.48	1053	1308	80.50
Two or more races	16335	18667	87.51	676	1190	56.81
Special Education	49163	49560	99.20	1292	1362	94.86
English Learner	18908	20939	90.30	455	1000	45.50
Free / Reduced Meals	184300	184475	99.91	1336	1367	97.73

c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

Maryland strongly values a low n size and ensuring that LEAs and schools are held accountable for all students and student groups. The increase in the minimum number of students from an n=5 previously to an n=10 is in response to consultation with stakeholders. Maryland utilizes an n size of 10 for data reporting and this change will bring the accountability system and reporting into alignment.

The change to the n-size for accountability purposes was discussed at length in the ESSA Accountability Workgroup. This workgroup held 13 meetings from July 2016 through July 2017. The committee consists of both internal (to the MSDE) and external members. Representatives included ten LEAs. In addition to the work and recommendations of this group around the n-size, Maryland solicited feedback at the Regional Listening tours and in various focus group meetings.

d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.[3]

Maryland applies suppression rules to all public reports, including accountability data reports. In addition to suppressing all student group sizes less than n=10, Maryland utilizes top coding and bottom coding of >95 percent or <5 percent respectively. Maryland takes its obligation to protect individual-level data very seriously and works to continuously make improvements to data security and privacy practices across the agency.

e. If the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability

---

[3] Consistent with ESEA section1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974"). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report "Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information" to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

> purposes, provide the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

Maryland utilizes an n-size of 30 for cohort graduation determinations and an n-size of 10 for the purposes of student group accountability. The minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is 10 students.

        iii.   <u>Establishment of Long-Term Goals</u> *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))*:
           a. <u>Academic Achievement</u>. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))*
                1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

In Maryland, and elsewhere in the nation, the dialogue on schools has become focused on ensuring that the learning trajectory for all students is aimed toward college and career readiness and postsecondary success. An accountability system is the State's primary way of ensuring that schools and LEAs are making progress towards attaining state goals. If there are student groups not proficient, not making adequate progress toward proficiency, or not graduating then the accountability system should highlight equity gaps. In order to meet these goals and comply with the requirements set forth in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Maryland will establish long-term goals and annual measurements of interim progress in three areas: academic achievement based on a performance composite, graduation rate, and progress toward English language proficiency. The methodology for calculating the long-term goal will be the same for all schools and for all student groups.

Maryland is proposing the timeline for the long-term goals as 2030. The students graduating in 2030 will have entered kindergarten in the 2017-2018 school year and will have been instructed and assessed on the Maryland College and Career Readiness Standards (MCCRS) from kindergarten through high school. Maryland did not use students beginning in Pre-K to establish the timeline since Maryland does not have universal Pre-K. The long-term goals will be accomplished when a full generation of school-aged children have been educated under the rigorous MCCRS as well as the ESSA State plan. Each long-term goal has annual measurements of interim progress to assist schools and LEAs in determining if adequate progress is being made toward the long-term goal. The long-term goals and annual measurements of interim progress will be pivotal in driving school improvement work for all schools, all students, and all student groups.

2017-2018

Maryland heard from stakeholders that goals must be both ambitious and achievable. Maryland is proposing to implement an ambitious and rigorous long term academic achievement goal of reducing non-proficient students by half by the year 2030. Each school's interim targets for all students and each student group will be calculated based on each school's baseline data and will be unique to the school. All students are assessed in grades 3-8 and at least once in high school. Assessment data includes grade level assessments in grades 3-8 and end of course high school assessments including Algebra 1, Algebra 2, Geometry, English 10, and English 11. Long term and annual measurements of interim progress will be set using 2016-2017 data as the baseline year. Data from 2015-2016 is presented below and includes all assessments offered for elementary, middle, and high school in English Language Arts and Mathematics, including alternate assessments.

Student Group	English/Language Arts		Mathematics	
	2016	2030	2016	2030
All Students	39.34%	69.67%	33.76%	66.88%
American Indian or Alaska Native	34.49%	67.24%	26.19%	63.09%
Asian	66.24%	83.12%	67.26%	83.63%
Black or African American	23.85%	61.92%	16.26%	58.13%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	25.63%	62.82%	20.31%	60.16%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	42.23%	71.11%	36.26%	68.13%
White	52.93%	76.46%	48.71%	74.36%
Two or more races	45.34%	72.67%	38.54%	69.27%
Students with disabilities	8.52%	54.26%	9.31%	54.65%
English Learner	4.33%	52.16%	8.36%	54.18%
Economically disadvantaged students	21.61%	60.80%	16.64%	58.32%

New PARCC assessments were first administered in 2014-2015 to assess students on the MCCRS. PARCC assessments have five performance levels, and Maryland is proposing a proficiency level of

four or five for the English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics PARCC assessments. All students taking assessments, including students taking the Maryland State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) will be included. The MSAA has four performance levels. A performance level of three or four on the alternate assessment will be considered proficient.

Accomplishing the long-term goal of reducing the non-proficient in half by 2030 will mean that the number of students across the State demonstrating grade-level proficiency in ELA and mathematics (as currently indicated by a Performance Level of four or five on a PARCC assessment or a Performance Level of three or four on the Alternate Assessment) will nearly double.   With the most recent 2015-2016 statewide data for grades 3-8, combined, nearly 40 percent for ELA and 34 percent for mathematics achieved Performance Level four or above. Although this example is for grades 3-8, the goals in the chart reflect performance data from grades 3-8 and high school. Statewide, annual measurements of interim progress for ELA, based on 2015-2016 data would be 2.3 percent and for mathematics 2.5 percent.

Student groups with a baseline of 20 percent proficient would triple as schools and LEAs strive to accomplish the long-term goal and annual measurements of interim progress.

An important caveat to this section of Maryland's Plan is that Maryland does not currently have State data on several of the measures proposed. Most notably, Maryland is implementing a new statewide assessment program in science and several of the non-academic indicators will be new data collections. The academic and other indicators that Maryland generates at the close of the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years will serve as a baseline for the new system. Stakeholder voice and analysis will continue to play a prominent role in the refinement of the implementation of Maryland's Plan.

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.

3. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.

Maryland's proposed accountability system will prioritize outcomes for all students and student groups through goals that are ambitious and achievable. The expectation is that all students and all student groups can and will be successful.

Goals and annual measurements of interim progress will be calculated for each school for the "All Students" category and for each of the ESEA student groups. Each student group will start from a different baseline; however, student groups performing the lowest will have the largest improvement to make.   The overarching goal is to reduce the achievement gap for all students and student groups.

The figure below is for illustrative purposes and demonstrates the achievement gap narrowing between student group populations.

In recent years of data, the LEAs, schools, and student groups are performing at very different levels and will need to make substantial gains each year in order to achieve the long-term goal. Maryland is strongly committed to ensuring that every school and LEA, whether high or low-performing, must address the needs of student groups with particular attention to the student groups not improving or not meeting annual measurements of interim progress for multiple years.

Additional measures of school and LEA performance beyond those in the formal accountability system would be included on a public report card to provide further insight and comparative data to the public.

Since ELs in Maryland will be expected to achieve English language proficiency based upon a rigorous timeline of six years, progress in closing content assessment proficiency gaps will be addressed through ELs attaining English proficiency in a more timely fashion. Consequently, ELs

who are proficient in English are more likely to also demonstrate proficiency on PARCC English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments, and this helps close performance gaps based on these assessments.

      b.   Graduation Rate. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))*
          1.   Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Maryland began using the cohort graduation rate for accountability in 2011. Maryland submitted and was approved by the United Stated Department of Education (USED) as part of Maryland's Consolidated State Application in 2011, to use the 4-year cohort graduation goal of 95 percent. The methodology for calculating the 4-year graduation rate goals as adopted by the Maryland State Board in 2011, is the same for all students and all student groups at 95 percent. The long term and annual measurements of interim progress were determined using 2010-2011 data as the baseline, and as required the long-term goal timeline of 2020 is the same for all students and student groups.

The graduation goals associated with this plan, the long-term goals and annual measurements of interim progress, end in 2020. Schools and student groups graduating at a rate exceeding the State goal of 95 percent will be expected to demonstrate continuous progress towards all students graduating. Schools and student groups not graduating at the State goal will have annual measurements of interim progress set toward reaching that goal by 2020.

The table below presents:
Annual Measurable Objectives - 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Subject Title	Student Group Subgroup	2011 Baseline	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Grad. Rate	All Students	81.97	82.70	83.42	84.14	84.87	85.59	86.32	87.04	87.76	88.49
	American Indian	75.93	76.99	78.05	79.11	80.17	81.23	82.29	83.35	84.41	85.47
	Asian	93.04	93.15	93.25	93.36	93.47	93.58	93.69	93.80	93.91	94.02
	African American	74.02	75.18	76.35	77.51	78.68	79.85	81.01	82.18	83.34	84.51
	Hispanic/Latino	73.44	74.63	75.83	77.03	78.23	79.43	80.62	81.82	83.02	84.22
	Pacific Islander	90.24	90.51	90.77	91.04	91.30	91.57	91.83	92.09	92.36	92.62
	White	88.27	88.65	89.02	89.39	89.77	90.14	90.52	90.89	91.26	91.64
	Two or more Races	93.42	93.51	93.59	93.68	93.77	93.86	93.95	94.03	94.12	94.21
	Sp. Ed.	54.72	56.95	59.19	61.43	63.67	65.91	68.14	70.38	72.62	74.86
	EL	56.98	59.09	61.21	63.32	65.43	67.54	69.65	71.77	73.88	75.99
	FARMS	74.11	75.27	76.43	77.59	78.75	79.91	81.07	82.23	83.39	84.55

The goal and respective annual measurements of interim progress for both 4-year and 5-year cohort graduation rates were established in 2011 and approved by the Maryland State Board of Education. The extended graduation rate recognizes that students are entitled to a public education until they are 21 years old and may need additional time to complete graduation requirements. The extended graduation rate also recognizes the needs of students with disabilities who receive services and may require additional supports until they reach 21 years of age. The long-term goal and annual measurements of interim progress 5-year cohort were determined using 2010-2011 data as the baseline, and the long-term goal timeline of 2020 is the same for all students and student groups. As required, the long-term goal for the 5-year cohort graduation rate is more rigorous than the 4-year cohort graduation rate.

The table below presents
Annual Measurable Objectives - 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Subject	Student Group	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Grad.	All Students	84.57	85.15	85.72	86.30	86.88	87.46	88.04	88.62	89.20	89.78
	American Indian	78.01	78.95	79.90	80.84	81.78	82.73	83.67	84.62	85.56	86.50
	Asian	94.53	94.56	94.58	94.61	94.63	94.66	94.69	94.71	94.74	94.77
	African American	77.86	78.82	79.77	80.72	81.67	82.62	83.58	84.53	85.48	86.43
	Hispanic/Latino	78.15	79.09	80.02	80.96	81.90	82.83	83.77	84.70	85.64	86.58
	Pacific Islander	95.12	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00
	White	89.65	89.94	90.24	90.54	90.84	91.13	91.43	91.73	92.03	92.32
	Two or more	94.73	94.75	94.76	94.78	94.79	94.81	94.82	94.84	94.85	94.87
	Sp. Ed.	60.94	62.83	64.73	66.62	68.51	70.40	72.29	74.19	76.08	77.97
	EL	66.64	68.21	69.79	71.37	72.94	74.52	76.09	77.67	79.24	80.82
	FARMS	80.24	81.06	81.88	82.70	83.52	84.34	85.16	85.98	86.80	87.62

4. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

As with the academic achievement, the ambitious graduation rate goals set in 2011 were developed to reduce the percentage of non-graduating students by half. Through this methodology, steeper improvements are required from student groups with lower graduation rates. Maryland has made great improvements with 86.39 percent of all students graduating within 4-years for the class of 2014, however graduation gaps persist. During a re-setting process, Maryland will use data from 2019-2020 as a baseline to determine the appropriateness of using a similar methodology of reducing the non-graduating students by half or to set a State goal for all students and student groups. Maryland stakeholders have indicated strongly that goals must be both ambitious and attainable.

c. English Language Proficiency. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))*
1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Maryland has always established common entrance and exit assessments and criteria throughout the State's 24 LEAs. Since joining WIDA in 2011, the proficiency attainment goal has been an overall score of 5.0 or higher on ACCESS for ELLs and a required 4.0 or higher on Literacy. WIDA has reset the scale score points on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, which requires students to achieve higher language skills and allows students to meaningfully demonstrate what they know and can do on Maryland's more rigorous English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments. Additionally, Maryland data does not support the use of conjunctive exit criteria. After two years of data on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 and PARCC were reviewed, LEA stakeholders, WIDA experts, and SEA staff re-examined the attainment goal that will provide ELs an opportunity to demonstrate performance comparable to their native English-speaking classmates. Maryland has updated the proficiency attainment goal to an overall score of 4.5 or higher on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0.

Based upon an analysis of data and multiple models with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), LEA and MSDE assessment and EL specialists, Maryland will use a proficiency level growth-to-target model that is operationalized through a value table to create transparency. This decision is a result of significant internal and external stakeholder input, including community advocates, LEA EL supervisors, and the EL advisory council. Upon examination of historical State data, Maryland established ambitious long-term goals and annual measurements of interim progress based upon a student's baseline proficiency level and date of that initial summative assessment: **The goal is for all Maryland English Learners to attain the State English language proficiency (ELP) level within a maximum of six years which includes a baseline year, dependent upon the initial year proficiency level as indicated in the Growth-to-Target Model for ELP shared in the table below:**

Growth-to-Target Model for ELP

Expected ELP Growth by Years					
Initial Year Proficiency Level (based on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
1.0 – 1.9	1.0	.9	.7	.5	.4
2.0 – 2.9	. .9	.7	.5	.4	---
3.0 – 3.9	.7	.5	.3	---	---
4.0 – 4.4	.3	.2	---	---	---
Proficiency Attainment Met	---	---	---	---	---

The values in the above table represent the growth in levels on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 expected each year based upon attainment of proficiency at an overall level of 4.5 or higher. The annual measurements of interim progress were adjusted based upon the updated 2018 common exit criteria.

Multiple year aggregation is used to calculate growth. For instance, if a student has not met the growth target shared in the Growth-to-Target Model for ELP table in the current year, the growth of the current year will be combined with the prior year. Accumulative growth targets are used to take into consideration fluctuations in years with particularly high or low growth while still holding ELs accountable for staying on the overall English proficiency progress trajectory. A school is not penalized if the student reaches proficiency within the expected time frame. If an EL does not meet the annual measurement of interim progress in an individual year or using his/her accumulative growth, the student is not considered as to have met the annual measurement of interim progress.

Analysis of current data indicates that an average of 48 percent of all Maryland ELs exit within a 6-year timeframe. Therefore, the MSDE will collaborate with the CCSSO to develop a model for early identification of ELs who may not attain the State's ELP level within a maximum of six years to proactively address the needs of long-term ELs.

The mean for meeting the growth target indicated in the Growth-to-Target Model ELP table is 48 percent which means that an average of 48 percent of ELs in the dataset met this target. Therefore, Maryland will set the baseline target at 48 percent and the goal for 2030 at 74 percent of ELs achieving English language proficiency in six years, dependent upon the initial year proficiency level.

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.

Maryland data mirrors research and national trends regarding students at lower proficiency levels progressing more rapidly than students at a higher proficiency level. The review of actual trend data for Maryland's ELs informed the setting of the State's ambitious long-term goal and annual measurements of interim progress.

The annual measurements of interim progress are established through calculating the gap between the current performance, which is 48 percent of ELs achieving English proficiency within six years, based upon the initial year proficiency level, and 100 percent of ELs reaching this long-term goal. This is a gap of 52 percent. The annual measurements of interim progress are based upon reducing the gap by half, which is 26 percent. With a baseline of 48 percent combined with an additional 26 percent to decrease the gap by half, the final long-term goal is established at 74 percent. An increase of 2 percent each year is needed in order to decrease the gap by 26 percent and meet the long-term goal of 74 percent over 13 years as shown in the annual measurements of interim progress table below.

Annual Measurements of Interim Progress

Year	Target in %
Baseline: 2016-17	48
2017-2018	50
2018-2019	52
2019-2020	54
2020-2021	56
2021-2022	58
2022-2023	60
2023-2024	62
2024-2025	64
2025-2026	66
2026-2027	68
2027-2028	70
2028-2029	72
2029-2030	74

The annual measurements of interim progress were adjusted based upon the updated 2018 common exit criteria.

iv. Indicators *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))*
   a. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State's discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

The academic achievement indicator is a composite measure of student achievement in English Language Arts and mathematics, as measured by the Partnership for Assessment Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments, or Maryland State Alternative Assessment (MSAA). Half of the measure is the percentage of students achieving proficiency, and half of the measure is the average performance level.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
a. Academic Achievement	Performance Composite on State Assessments (ELA and mathematics)	Half of a school's score on this indicator will be the percentage of students performing at the "met expectations" (4) or "exceeded expectations" (5) levels on PARCC assessments, or the equivalent on MSAA (level (3) or (4) out of a possible four levels). Half will be a performance index, equal to the average of student performance levels on PARCC assessments (or the equivalent on MSAA). The proficiency rate and performance index will be standardized so that they are on a comparable scale. An analysis of current data indicates that using a composite is particularly important for schools at the high and low end of the achievement distribution. Using the composite recognizes schools with relatively low proficiency rates that have a large number of students close to proficiency (PARCC Level 3); using the composite also reveals schools whose high proficiency rate alone can "mask" low-achieving students, especially those at Levels 1 and 2. The MSDE, the State Board of Education, and Maryland stakeholders were very clear that, while proficiency is the State's long-term goal, schools should be accountable for the performance of all students at all levels. This measure will be calculated and reported separately for ELA and mathematics, with ELA and mathematics equally weighted. The MSDE is researching the possible inclusion of the use of other nationally recognized high school assessments to supplement the current State assessment program, where appropriate/necessary.

(i) The Academic Achievement indicator includes the same measure (percent of students achieving proficiency) as the State-wide long-term goals.
(ii) The Academic Achievement indicator includes a direct measure of proficiency on annual Statewide ELA and mathematics assessments, as measured by performance level "4" or higher on the PARCC assessments (or the equivalent level "3" or higher on the MSAA assessments). A

2015 study by Mathematica Policy Research (Nichols-Barrer, et. al) indicates that scores on the PARCC assessment are valid predictors of college readiness.
(iii) The results of the Academic Achievement indicator will be measured for all students and for student subgroups.
(iv) There are no additional measures for student growth at each public high school. Any additional measures for high schools are included in the Preparedness for Post-Secondary Success indicator. See Section iv (f) for explanation.

b. Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator). Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
b. Other Academic ("Academic Progress," for elementary and middle schools only)	Academic Growth (elementary and middle schools, grades 3-8)	Median student growth percentile (SGP) in ELA and mathematics. A student's SGP is calculated as an individual student's growth compared to other Maryland students who took the same assessment as the student in prior year(s) and achieved a similar score ("academic peers"). The SGP score indicates the percentage of academic peers equal to or above whom the student scored higher, with a possible value of 1 (low) to 99 (high). A school's SGP will be calculated as the median SGP of students for whom an SGP can be calculated. (SGP can only be calculated for grades 4-8 as there is no assessment prior to third grade and no required assessment in 9th grade.) The median will be used rather than the mean because the median is less influenced by outliers, and an analysis of Maryland's 2016 SGP data showed that medians are more descriptive of performance and variation in performance at the local system level. Maryland will monitor SGP to ensure precision and reliability and adjust as necessary. Beginning in 2017-18, the MSDE will study a growth-to-standard measure for reporting and inclusion in the accountability system, in combination with SGP. The MSDE will also provide information on the impact of such a measure. The State Board will then revisit

		growth-to-standard for inclusion in the accountability system. The anticipated timeline for study and determination of feasibility is three years. This measure will be calculated and reported separately for ELA and mathematics.
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (elementary and middle schools)	Elementary: "Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum" is a composite measure comprising: (a) Percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Integrated Science assessment (MISA). MISA was field tested with fifth graders in 2016-17 and is anticipated to be available for inclusion in the accountability system based on 2018 data. Until MISA scores are available, this component will be removed from both the numerator and denominator of the accountability system. (b) Percent of 5th grade students passing one each of coursework in social studies, fine arts, physical education, and health. ("Passing" means that students earn a non-failing grade, which means that they meet the standards for the course.)
		In addition, Early Childhood Education is a priority for the State Board and the State Superintendent of Schools. The MSDE will identify gauges for kindergarten readiness and academic growth through grade 3, to be deployed no later than school year 2018-2019, and incorporated into the ESSA accountability system in this measure as rapidly as feasible with the weights of the measures revised accordingly.
		Middle: "Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum" is a composite measure comprising: (a) Percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (MISA). MISA was field tested with eighth graders in 2016-17 and is anticipated to be available for inclusion in the accountability system in 2018-19. (b) Percent of students scoring proficient on the Middle School Social Studies Assessment (MSSA). MSSA will be field tested in 2018-19 and is anticipated to be available for inclusion in the accountability system in 2020-21. Until MISA and MSSA scores are available, these components will be removed from both the numerator and denominator of the accountability system. (c) Percent of 8th grade students passing one each of coursework in mathematics, ELA, social studies, and science. ("Passing" means that students earn

		a non-failing grade, which means that they meet the standards for the course.)
		The calculation for this measure is by grade span and student group and is the percent of students earning a non-failing grade for the identified courses out of all students enrolled in each school, LEA and State for the full academic year. The calculations will be assigned a score. "Assigned scores" means that points will be allocated by a standard-setting process that accounts for the distribution of current and historical data, applicable research, and stakeholder input. (Please see A.v.b. for further explanation)

A preliminary study of Maryland data, where available, indicates that these measures are statewide, valid, reliable, and allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Maryland Education Code Annotated, § 7-112.1 requires the MSDE to have a standardized course numbering system to facilitate the collection of data on student participation in courses offered by the public schools. Maryland Education Code Annotated, §7-119 requires that the MSDE have a uniform data collection method for tracking students participating in classes. Although Maryland does not have a statewide curriculum, local education agencies have aligned local courses to the nationally developed School Courses for the Exchange of Data (SCED) since 2012. Students passing the course, as aligned to the SCED course code, have met the credit for requirement. Passing is further defined statewide as meeting the requirements for the course, ready for the next level of instruction, and having an alpha or standards based grade.

In addition, once this accountability system has been implemented, any measure that relies on a non-standardized determination such as passing courses will be re-examined to guard against improper inflation. Although the MSDE recognizes that these measures may be susceptible to subjective influence, research on the importance of 8th and 9th grade performance on high school persistence and college readiness is too important to ignore.

All content to fulfill the "Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum" measures, including cross-discipline content, will be reviewed by an advisory committee which will give guidance and governance to MSDE over defining courses and other elements that meet the requirements of the accountability system. (For example, the MSDE will define what coursework fulfills the health element for elementary school students.)

c. <u>Graduation Rate</u>. Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation

rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
c. Graduation Rate	Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate	Percent of a school's cohort of first-time 9th grade students in a particular school year, adjusted for students who transfer in or out of the cohort after 9th grade, who graduate within four years.
	Five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate	Percent of a school's cohort of first-time 9th grade students in a particular school year, adjusted for students who transfer in or out of the cohort after 9th grade, who graduate within five years.
(i) The Graduation Rate indicator is based on the same measure (four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate) as the State-wide long-term goals. (ii) The Graduation Rate indicator will be measured for all students and for all student groups. (iii) A portion of the Graduation Rate indicator will be based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. (iv) At the State's discretion, the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate will be included. Four- and five-year graduation rates will be measured and reported separately. (v) Maryland has one high school diploma and does not award a state-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25). Students earn the State diploma by taking assessments aligned to State standards. Graduation requirements are part of State law (COMAR 13A.03.02). All students, including students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking alternate assessments, are included in the four-year adjusted cohort and any extended-year adjusted cohort and are counted as non-graduates if students do not meet the requirements for a Maryland Diploma.		

d. <u>Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator</u>. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State's definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
d. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	Progress toward English language proficiency	Percentage of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS 2.0 assessment for English language learners.
Based upon an analysis of data and multiple models with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), LEA and MSDE assessment and EL specialists, Maryland will use a proficiency level growth-to-target model with a target of proficiency within a maximum of six years (including a baseline year) and accounting for an appropriate trajectory of language acquisition. (Additional information can be found earlier in this document, under Title I/Part A, Section 4(iii)(c).)		

e. School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s). Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
e. School Quality or Student Success	Chronic Absenteeism (all grades)	The number of students absent 10 percent or more school days during the school year in membership at least ten days. This measure will be applied to grades K-12, in response to research on the impact of absenteeism and the importance of minimizing lost instructional time. The results will be assigned a score. "Assigned scores" means that points will be allocated by a standard-setting process that accounts for the distribution of current and historical data, applicable research, and stakeholder input.
	School Climate (all grades)	Aggregate measure of school climate survey of students and educators. Per Maryland statute (SB0871/ "Protect Our Schools Act of 2017," please see Appendix C), the survey will include at least one question to educators regarding the receipt of critical instructional feedback. The MSDE is currently collaborating with REL-Mid Atlantic and Mathematica to develop the appropriate survey instrument and to create a valid index of school climate. Both student and educator surveys will include items in the same four domains, selected in consultation with a steering committee of Maryland LEA representatives: relationships, safety, environment, and engagement. The MSDE will calculate an index for students and educators by averaging domain scale scores for each domain separately, by respondent type. The overall index will be calculated by averaging the resulting student and educator index scores. The determination of the weights of the scales for each climate domain and respondent type will be done with input from Maryland stakeholders, the steering committee, and the results of a psychometric analysis of field test data. In addition, the MSDE plans to implement a parent survey in coming years. The parent component

		will be included in the climate index for the accountability system only if data analysis supports that it is a reliable measure.
	Access to a well-rounded curriculum (all grades)	Elementary schools: Percent of 5th grade students enrolled in science, social studies, fine arts, physical education, and health. Middle schools: Percent of 8th grade students enrolled in fine arts, physical education, health, and computational learning. High schools: Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of program completion: enrolled in an Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) course; participated in dual enrollment; or enrolled in an MSDE-approved Career and Technical Education program at the CTE concentrator level or higher. For students pursuing a certificate of program completion, percent of students enrolled in a general education core academic and/or elective course. The calculation for this measure is by grade span and student group and is the percent of students enrolled in the identified courses out of all students enrolled in each school, LEA and State for the full academic year. The calculations will be assigned a score. "Assigned scores" means that points will be allocated by a standard-setting process that accounts for the distribution of current and historical data, applicable research, and stakeholder input.

(i) Preliminary analysis of chronic absenteeism data indicates that the measure will provide meaningful differentiation among school performance. The survey instrument is being designed to ensure differentiation as well. All measures of school quality/school success will be revisited once full data are available to ensure differentiation, and the measures will be adjusted accordingly if necessary. (For example, the State is considering giving additional significance to students who meet multiple criteria in the "access to a well-rounded curriculum" measure.)
(ii) All measures are Statewide. The proposed measures will be studied to ensure they are valid, reliable, and comparable across schools.
(iii) The results of each measure under the School Quality or Student Success indicator will be measured for all students and student groups.

The MSDE will study the inclusion of additional elements, as long as they meet the requirements of ESSA.

Maryland Education Code Annotated, § 7-112.1 requires the MSDE to have a standardized course numbering system to facilitate the collection of data on student participation in courses offered by the public schools. Maryland Education Code Annotated, §7-119 requires that the MSDE have a uniform data collection method for tracking students participating in classes. Although Maryland does not have a statewide curriculum, local education agencies have aligned local courses to the nationally developed School Courses for the Exchange of Data (SCED) since 2012. Students enrolled in a course, as aligned to the SCED course code, have access to the course.

All content to fulfill the "Access to a well-rounded curriculum" measures, including cross-discipline content, will be reviewed by an advisory committee which will give guidance and governance to MSDE over defining courses and other elements that meet the requirements of the accountability system. (For example, the MSDE will define what coursework fulfills the computational learning requirement for middle school students.)

f. Readiness for Post-Secondary Success (State added indicator)

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
"Readiness for Postsecondary Success," (for high schools only)	On-track in 9th grade	Percent of 9th grade students earning at least four credits in any of: mathematics, English language arts, science, social studies, and/or world language. The results will be assigned a score. "Assigned scores" means that points will be allocated by a standard-setting process that accounts for the distribution of current and historical data, applicable research, and stakeholder input.
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (high schools)	Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of program completion and achieving at least one of the following: - score 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement (AP) examination, or 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate (IB) Program examination; - met a standard set by the College Board on the SAT examination (score of 530 or higher (math) and 480 or higher (reading)); - met a standard set by ACT, Inc. on the ACT examination (score of 21); - earned credit for dual enrollment; - met the University of Maryland entry requirements; - completed a youth or other apprenticeship training program approved by the Maryland Apprenticeship Training Council; - completed an industry certification aligned with an MSDE-approved CTE program and achieved CTE concentrator level status or higher; - completed an MSDE-approved Career and

		Technology Education program; - met a standard on the ASVAB examination (standard to be determined pending study); - received The Seal of Biliteracy; or, - Students obtaining a Maryland High School Certificate of Program Completion: Entered the world of work through gainful employment; post-secondary education and training; supported employment; and/or other services that are integrated in the community. The results will be assigned a score. "Assigned scores" means that points will be allocated by a standard-setting process that accounts for the distribution of current and historical data, applicable research, and stakeholder input.

A preliminary study of Maryland data, where available, indicates that these measures are valid, reliable, and allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance. The MSDE will ensure that standards for externally-developed standardized assessments (SAT, ACT, etc.) are appropriate to the test and are, where possible, the result of an independent nationally-recognized standard-setting process. A study of the data for the "credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum" indicates that the measure is statewide as all students at all schools are able to meet at least one of the criterion.

Please note, in the original template provided by the U.S. Department of Education, "Other Academic Indicators" applies to public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, with the intention that additional measures for high schools be included in "School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)." However, Maryland statute SB0871 ("Protect Our Schools Act of 2017," Appendix C), prohibits any "School Quality or Student Success Indicator" based on student testing. The MSDE is therefore including additional academic measures for high school, defined as Readiness for Postsecondary Success, as a sixth indicator.

> v. <u>Annual Meaningful Differentiation</u> *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))*
> > a. Describe the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State's accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.

The MSDE worked under multiple considerations when devising its accountability system. Stakeholders consistently indicated the importance of both simplicity and a comprehensive, non-reductive system. Stakeholders and the MSDE further sought a system that presented actionable information that would be immediately useful for school improvement. The MSDE also carefully considered the behaviors that it wished to incentivize, realizing that schools would react to the definition, calculation, combination, and reporting of the indicators. In addition, Maryland statute SB0871 ("Protect Our Schools Act of 2017," Appendix C) requires that the State use a composite score, calculated numerically in a percentile form. Finally, the MSDE believes that a school cannot excel unless all its students excel. Throughout, the MSDE sought to continue its focus on achievement, growth, graduation, and equity, while creating a comprehensive understanding of student outcomes

and opportunities.

An overview of the summative determination, annual meaningful differentiation, and inclusion of student groups is presented below. An example can be found in section 4v(b) below.

Each school will receive an overall score (translated to a percentile rank as compared to schools of a similar type: elementary/middle and high schools) and category determination (5-star system). To make the summative determination, the following steps will be taken:

1. Each measure for all students and for each student group will be given a numerical score.
2. The results for 'all students' will be summed to a total score, out of 100 possible points. This total score will be given a percentile rank, category determination (5-star system), and description (interim and long-term goals met /not met and equity gap).
3. The total score, using all indicators, will be used to identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools as explained in section 4v(f), v(h), and v (i)- the lowest five percent of Title I elementary/middle schools and the lowest five percent of Title I high schools. Graduation rate will also be used to identify high schools with a 4-year cohort graduation rate below 67 percent.
4. A total score using all indicators will be calculated for each student group and will be utilized in the identification of Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools (student groups performing as low as the lowest five percent of Title I elementary/middle schools and the lowest five percent of Title I high schools) for 2018-2019.

Maryland will use a five-star system for the category determination. Stars will be assigned using the percentile rank of a school's cumulative score. The exact system for assigning the categories is currently under study, and will involve stakeholders. Stakeholder feedback indicated the desire for a meaningful system under which only schools that truly meet Maryland's standards for excellence would be awarded the top category, and schools in the lowest category unambiguously fail to meet those standards. In addition, the MSDE will describe a school's performance on the accountability system, to ensure clear communication about the performance of the school on all the indicators. The development of the description system will again involve stakeholders.

The below table is an example only of category assignments.

Category	Possible assignment of category (Actual assignment system will be developed in consultation with stakeholders)	Possible description of school (Actual terminology and symbols to be developed in consultation with stakeholders)
★ ★ ★ ★ ★	85th percentile of schools and above	Academic and Non-academic indicators:
★ ★ ★ ★	50th to 84th percentile of schools	⋂ Increasing; met school annual measure of interim progress
★ ★ ★	16th to 49th percentile of schools	⋂ Increasing; did not meet school annual measures of interim progress
★ ★	1st to 15th percentile of schools, if that school is not otherwise identified as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement school (determination described in Section A.4.vi.a-c).	⋃ Decreasing; met school annual measure of interim progress ⋃ Decreasing; did not meet school annual measure of interim progress ⇔ No change; met school annual measure of interim progress ⇔ No change; did not meet school annual measure of interim progress
★	Determination described in Section	Comprehensive Support and

A.4.vi.a-c	Improvement

Each indicator will be classified using the same five-star system.

Additional reported elements for all students will include: (1) score on each indicator and measure, for all students and disaggregated by student group; (2) the summation of the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Progress in Achieving ELP, and Graduation Rate indicators ("Academic Indicators") and the summation of the School Quality or Student Success measures ("Nonacademic Indicators"); (3) whether the school met its interim school targets and long-term goals for all students (Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving ELP); and (4) whether all students met the State assessment participation threshold.

(ii)The MSDE's has a strong commitment to equity, as described in its guiding principles: a school cannot succeed if all its students do not succeed. The 'all student' and all student groups will be included in the accountability system as required. Each indicator and measure will be disaggregated and reported for every student group. In addition, student group performance will be included in the differentiation/identification of schools for intervention.

Additional reported elements for student groups will include: (1) combined score for all indicators; (2) score on each indicator and measure; and (3) whether each student group (as applicable) met its goals for Academic Achievement, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving ELP.

> *b.* Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

Each indicator will be weighted as indicated in the table. The Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive a minimum of ten percent individually, per Maryland statute; in the aggregate, they are worth 65 percent of the total score also as required by Maryland statute SB0871 ("Protect Our Schools Act of 2017," Appendix C). For further information on the indicators, measures, and weights please see Appendix D.

	Elementary/Middle School	High School
a. Academic Achievement	Achievement composite: 20%	Achievement composite: 30%
b. Other Academic	Academic growth: 25% Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (as defined in A.iv.b): 10%	
c. Progress in Achieving ELP	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%
d. Graduation Rate		Graduation composite: 15%
e. School Quality or Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15% School climate: 10% Access to a well-rounded curriculum: (as defined in A.iv.e) 10%	Chronic absenteeism: 15% School climate: 10% Access to a well-rounded curriculum (as defined in

		A.iv.e): 10%
f. Readiness for Postsecondary Success		On-track in 9th grade: 5% Readiness for postsecondary success (as defined in A.iv.f): 5%

The entire accountability framework will sum to 100 points. Some indicators are composites or contain multiple measures. If a measure, or part of a measure, is not available for the 2017-18 school year, that measure will be taken out of the numerator and denominator and the accountability framework will sum to less than 100 points.

Measures will be assigned points using the preliminary system described below. "Points calculated as percent of a whole" means, for example, that if the school's value for that measure is 60 percent, and the measure is allocated ten points, the school would receive six points.

"Assigned scores" means that points will be allocated by a standard-setting process that accounts for the distribution of current and historical data, applicable research, and stakeholder input. The standard setting method will be used for new indicators and measures where, as accurately as MSDE can approximate them using current data, there will not be meaningful differentiation among schools if points were assigned as percent of a whole. It will also be used for indicators and measures where research indicates that a relatively "high" score is still not adequate for student success. For example, current data indicates that approximately 60 percent of Maryland schools have chronic absenteeism rates of less than ten percent, or inverse rates of greater than 90 percent. This measure is worth 15 points. If points were assigned as a percent of a whole, 60 percent of schools would receive at least 90 percent of 15 points, or 13.5 of 15 points for this measure. Also based on an approximation using current data, more than three-quarters of schools would receive at least 12.75 points. Assigning points based on the percent of a whole for this measure would not meaningfully differentiate among schools. It would also imply that a chronic absenteeism rate of 20 percent (or an inverse rate of 80 percent) is "acceptable" since it still would earn a school a relatively large number of points (12 points out of 15), when research shows that chronic absenteeism has a persistent negative impact on student academic, sociological, health, and social-emotional outcomes (see, for example, Gottfried, 2014) and many advocates and stakeholders agree that a rate of 20 percent is unacceptably high.

For similar reasons, the MSDE does not want to assign points for these measures using percentile ranks. For example, data that are skewed "low" would mean that most schools have a low raw score on a measure. However, if points were assigned using percentile ranks, then a school could earn a large number of points simply by outscoring other schools, even if that school's raw score was low on an absolute scale. Although assigning points using percentile ranks (or quartiles, deciles, etc.) would ensure differentiation among schools, it would not create a meaningful policy or standard to which schools should be held accountable.

During the 2017-18 school year, the MDSE will convene stakeholder groups to set standards or "cut points" such that points can be assigned for each one, using a combination of historical and current data (or simulations and approximations if data are not available) and research. Below the table are **example or preliminary** assignment schema for the applicable indicators/measures. **The number of cut points and the values of the cut points are subject to change pending the convening of the stakeholder groups.** The assignment schema (number and values of the cut points) will then be validated by the MSDE to ensure that **approximately a minimum percentage of schools** fall into each of at least two categories. This guarantees that each measure or indicator has at least three meaningful categories and that these categories differentiate among schools. The minimum percentage would be determined by the following formula: $(100/N)*(1/5)$, where N is the number of categories. For example, for a measure

with four categories, at least five percent of all schools will fall into each of at least two categories, ensuring that there are at least three categories of the measure (two levels with at least five percent each, and two levels combined with the remainder). The precise formula will be revisited as part of the schema validation process.

| INDICATOR	MEASURE	COMPONENTS		SCORING
		Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	
a. Academic Achievement	Achievement composite (as defined in A.iv.a): 20%	Math achievement: 10 points ELA achievement: 10 points		Points calculated as percent of a whole
b. Other Academic	Academic growth: 25%	Math growth: 12.5 points ELA growth: 12.5 points		Assigned scores
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (as defined in A.iv.b): 10%	Science achievement: 5 points Percent of 5th grade students passing "core" coursework: 5 points	Science achievement: 3.5 points Social studies achievement: 3.5 points Percent of 8th grade students passing "core" coursework: 3 points	Science and social studies achievement: Points calculated as percent of a whole Passing "core" coursework: Assigned scores
c. Progress in Achieving ELP	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	Percent of students making progress towards attaining English Language proficiency: 10 points		Points calculated as percent of a whole
e. School Quality or Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15%	Percent of students chronically absent: 15 points		Assigned scores
	School climate: 10%	Climate measure: 10 points		Assigned scores
	Access to a well-rounded curriculum (as defined in A.iv.e): 10%	Percent of 5th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points	Percent of 8th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points	Assigned scores

INDICATOR	MEASURE	COMPONENTS	SCORING
		High Schools	
a. Academic Achievement	Achievement composite: 30%	Math achievement: 15 points ELA achievement: 15 points	Points calculated as percent of a whole

|			
c. Graduation Rate	Graduation composite: 15%	Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate: 10 points Five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate: 5 points	Points calculated as percent of a whole
d. Progress in Achieving ELP	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	Percent of students making progress towards attaining English Language proficiency: 10 points	Points calculated as percent of a whole
e. School Quality or Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15%	Percent of students chronically absent: 15 points	Assigned scores
	School climate: 10%	Climate measure: 10 points	Assigned scores
	Access to a well-rounded curriculum (as defined in A.iv.e): 10%	Percent of students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum upon graduation: 10 points	Assigned scores
f. Readiness for Post-Secondary Success	On-track in 9th grade: 5%	Percent of 9th grade students passing "core" coursework: 5 points	Assigned Scores
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (as defined in A.iv.f): 5%	Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of completion and achieving at least one measure of readiness for postsecondary success: 5 points	Assigned Scores

Academic growth

The histograms show median student growth percentile at the school level for the 2015-16 school year, as well as an *example* assignment schema (number of categories and cut points between categories are subject to change). A total of 1,206 elementary, middle, and elementary/middle schools are included. With five categories, the required percent of schools in each of at least two of the categories would be $(100/5) * (1/5) = 4$ percent, or approximately 48 schools. This ensures that this measure has at least three meaningful levels. In the below example, three of the five categories for both math and ELA have at least 48 schools and the threshold is met. Number of categories and cut points between categories provided as an example only.

## Median SGP, ELA (2016, all students, elementary, middle, and elementary/middle schools)

| Very low: 2.5 points | Low: 5 points | Typical: 7.5 points | High: 10 points | Very high: 12.5 points |

Median SGP, math (2016, all students, elementary, middle, and elementary/middle schools)

| Very low: 2.5 points | Low: 5 points | Typical: 7.5 points | High: 10 points | Very high: 12.5 points |

Percent of students passing "core" coursework

The below histogram approximates the "on track in 9th grade measure) by showing the percent of 9th grade students passing at least four "core" courses (math, ELA, science, social studies, and/or world

language) in 2016. The data presented are not precisely identical to the MSDE's proposed new measure, as the exact courses that will fulfill the "credit for a well-rounded curriculum" (5th and 8th grade), "on-track" (9th grade), and "access to a well-rounded curriculum" (5th, 8th, and 12th grade) are currently being reviewed by an advisory committee; this committee will give guidance and governance to the MSDE over defining courses and other elements that meet the requirements of the accountability system. However, the distribution of this data is a reasonable proxy and demonstrates that these measures will result in differentiation among schools. (As previously stated, all measures will be re-examined to guarantee differentiation; the "assigned scores" methodology also ensures differentiation by using the formula that requires a certain percentage of schools in at least two categories when standard-setting the categories and cut points.) A total of 233 high schools are included. With five categories, the required percent of schools in each of at least two of the categories would be (100/5) *(1/5) = 4 percent, or approximately 10 schools. This ensures that each measure has at least three meaningful levels. In the below example, all five categories have at least 10 schools and the threshold is met. Number of categories and cut points between categories provided as an example only.

2016 Percent of 9th grade students passing at least four courses (math, ELA, science, social studies, and/or world language)

Chronic absenteeism

The below histogram shows *actual* rates of chronic absenteeism for the 2016-17 school year, as well as an ***example** assignment schema* (number of categories and cut points between categories are subject to change). A total of 1,402 schools are included, and there is clear differentiation among schools in the distribution of raw data. With five categories, the required percent of schools in each of at least two of the categories would be (100/5) *(1/5) = 4 percent, or approximately 56 schools. This ensures that each measure has at least three meaningful levels. In the below example, four of the five categories have at least 56 schools and the threshold is met. Number of categories and cut points between categories provided as an example only.

Climate survey

The MSDE is currently collaborating with REL-Mid Atlantic and Mathematica to develop the appropriate survey instrument and to create a valid index of school climate. The survey will consist of four domains, each with several component topics. The domains and topics will tentatively be drawn from either the National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments' U.S. Department of Education School Climate Survey (EDSCLS) or the Delaware School Climate Survey, and standardized so that the scales are aligned. Most domains and topics will be from EDSCLS. Although the survey instrument is still in development and there are not yet historical or estimated data, EDSCLS has calculated standardized scale scores across topics and domains, using a sample of schools from across the nation that voluntarily shared their data. The methodology is published in a comprehensive benchmark report, which also details that there was sufficient variation in survey responses such that the creation of categories/performance levels is valid. In particular, the EDSCLS report identified three categories/performance levels on a 100- to 500-point scale (least favorable: scale score below 300; favorable: scale score 300-400; most favorable: scale score above 400). The MSDE anticipates using or adapting a similar scale and set of categories/performance levels, but will also conduct analyses of the Maryland survey data using a similar approach to the EDSCLS analyses to finalize the categories/performance levels and standardize them to the scale of our survey. In addition, the MSDE will use the validation process explained herein to ensure that the categories will meaningfully differentiate among schools. A total of approximately 1,400 schools in Maryland will participate in the survey; with (for example) three categories, the required percent of schools in each of at least two categories would be $(100/3) *(1/5) = 6.67$ percent, or approximately 94 schools. This ensures that this measure will have at least three meaningful levels.

Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of completion and achieving at least one measure of readiness for postsecondary success

The below histogram shows historical data from Maryland's College- and Career-Readiness measure, last

part of the state's accountability system in the 2013-14 school year. The measure includes the percent of students who meet at least one of the following criteria: score 3 or greater on an Advanced Placement exam; score 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate exam; attain advanced standing (enrolled in the third course of the program) in a state-approved Career and Technology Education program of study; or entered a post-secondary institution within 16 months of graduation. Although these data are not an exact match for Maryland's new measure, the historical data do show that there is significant differentiation among schools. The College and Career Preparation Index of the School Performance Index was scaled from zero to one; the new measure will be from zero to 100 percent. A total of 225 high schools are included, and there is clear differentiation among schools in the distribution of raw data. With five categories, the required percent of schools in each of at least two of the categories would be (100/5) *(1/5) = 4 percent, or approximately 9 schools. This ensures that each measure has at least three meaningful levels. In the below example, all five categories have at least nine schools and the threshold is met. Number of categories and cut points between categories provided as an example only.

2014 College and Career Preparation Index (high schools)

The following is an example of summation and inclusion of student groups in the final meaningful differentiation. It does not reflect an actual school, and is not illustrative of complete information reported about each school. Student groups will be reported in addition to all students, as well as included in the "equity gap" calculation.

(1) Each measure is assigned points.

(2) The measure scores are summed to calculate a total. (If a school does not meet the minimum n-size for any measure, that measure will be removed from the total possible points and the percentile rank will be calculated using the percent of points out of the adjusted total possible.) The entire accountability framework will sum to 100 points. Some indicators are composites or contain multiple measures. If a measure, or part of a measure, is not available for the 2017-18 school year, that measure will be taken out of the numerator and denominator and the accountability framework will sum to less than 100 points. At the middle school level, for example, the results of the Maryland Social Studies Assessment will not be

available for 2017-2018 data and therefore 3.5 percent will be subtracted from the 100 percent.
(3) Based on the school's percentile rank (80th) of all students, a category will be assigned (four stars).
(4) CSI schools, per ESSA, will be differentiated into the lowest category (one star).
(5) TSI Schools will be determined based on a final calculation of each student group in comparison to the final sum of all students. Final category determinations and required descriptions will be developed with stakeholder consultation.
(6) A school's annual measurements of interim progress and equity status will be included in the description of the school. Maryland will determine an equity gap for a school and/or LEA based on the performance of student groups. Maryland is currently studying the appropriate calculation of the gap to ensure the calculation is fair, meaningful, and clear.

Elementary/Middle School Example:

INDICATOR	MEASURE	ALL STUDENTS	EQUITY GAP	MET ANNUAL MEASUREMENTS OF INTERIM PROGRESS?
a. Academic Achievement	Achievement composite: 20%	15 of 20	12%	Yes
b. Other Academic	Academic growth: 25%	18 of 25	4%	Yes
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (as defined in A.iv.b): 10%	8 of 10	1%	n/a
c. Progress in Achieving ELP	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	7 of 10	0%	Yes
e. School Quality or Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15%	12 of 15	11%	Yes
	School climate: 10%	6 of 10	0%	n/a
	Access to a well-rounded curriculum: (as defined in A.iv.e) 10%	9 of 10	0%	n/a
	TOTAL SCORE: 75 of 100		EQUITY MET? No	ANNUAL MEASUREMENTS OF INTERIM PROGRESS MET? Yes
	PERCENTILE RANK: 80th			
FINAL DESCRIPTION: ★ ★ ★ ★ Academic Measures ☊ Non-Academic Measures ⇔ Note: The final tables will also include a column for student group calculations.				

c. If the State uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), describe the different methodology or

methodologies, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.

Maryland currently has 16 schools that are defined as a P-2 school. Maryland includes schools that have no grades assessed in its accountability system by shifting the tested grade's data back to the non-tested school. In the subsequent year the results of the exiting grade (for example grade 3 for a K-2 school) are reported at both the sending school (K-2 school) and the testing school (3-5 school in this example).

vi.   Identification of Schools *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))*
     a.   Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

The MSDE is committed to providing access to a well-rounded education that prepares students to pursue post-secondary study and careers. As such, Maryland assumes responsibility for identifying and supporting schools that require targeted support to improve. In Maryland, Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools are the lowest achieving five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the "all students" group. Schools will be identified based on all indicators in the accountability system. Using these indicators Maryland will rank order all schools. Due to the transitions on State assessments and accountability hold, the first cohort of CSI schools in Maryland will use two years of available data from 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. In the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year, Maryland will identify the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools in the 2018-2019 school year and will identify these CSI schools at least once every three years based on all indicators in the accountability system which will be implemented in the 2017-2018 school year.

     b.   Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

In the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year, Maryland will identify all public high schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students based upon the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for comprehensive support and improvement in alignment with the graduation rates used in the statewide accountability system. Maryland will identify the low graduation rate CSI schools at least once every three years using two years of available data. The first cohort of low graduation rate CSI schools will be identified using 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 graduation rate data.

     c.   Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's

methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

In Maryland, Title I Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools that do not make improvements after three years will be considered chronically low-performing and these schools will be reclassified as chronically low performing CSI schools. The Maryland TSI schools will include schools where one or more specific student groups are low-performing or consistently underperforming. Student groups included for identification are students from major racial and ethnic groups (disaggregated as American Indian/Native American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino of any race, White, or Two or more races), who are economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learners. The State intends to take steps to add "gifted and talented students" as an additional student group by the end of school year 2017-2018.

The TSI schools with low-performing student groups are schools with at least one low performing student group of students, performing below the summative performance of the "all students" group in the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools, based on all indicators in the accountability system. Beginning in the 2021-2022 school year, Maryland will identify its first cohort of chronically low performing student group CSI schools. Chronically low performing student group CSI schools will be identified at least once every three years.

d. <u>Frequency of Identification</u>. Provide, for each type of school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

The first cohort of Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools in Maryland will be identified in the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year and will include these three types of schools:
   ● Lowest performing five percent of Title I elementary/middle and high schools (based on two years of data);
   ● Public high Schools with less than 67 percent four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (based on two years of data); and
   ● School Improvement Grant (SIG) IV schools. Existing SIG IV schools will be included on the Maryland 2018-2019 CSI Schools list. The five Maryland SIG IV schools began implementation of a five-year SIG grant in 2016-2017. SIG IV schools were identified as the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools in Maryland, based on 2015-2016 data. The SIG grant ends in 2020-2021.

Each of the above types of CSI schools will be identified at least once every three years.

In addition, low performing student groups TSI schools, which could be potentially reclassified as CSI schools, will be identified at least once every three years beginning in 2021-2022.

e. <u>Targeted Support and Improvement</u>. Describe the State's methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the

statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the
definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance.
(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))

Any school with one or more underperforming student groups, defined as a group that does not meet its school-level annual targets over two years based on all applicable indicators in the State accountability system will be identified as a consistently underperforming student group TSI school. Student groups included for identification are students from major racial and ethnic groups (disaggregated as American Indian/Native American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino of any race, White, or Two or more races), students who are economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learners. The State intends to take steps to add "gifted and talented students" as an additional student group by the end of school year 2017-2018.

The consistently underperforming student group TSI schools will be identified annually in the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year.

> f. <u>Additional Targeted Support</u>. Describe the State's methodology, for
> identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own,
> would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I)
> using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D),
> including the year in which the State will first identify such schools
> and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such
> schools. *(ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))*

The TSI schools that will receive additional targeted support will include schools where one or more specific student groups are performing below the summative performance on all indicators in the "all students" group in the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools or schools with consistently underperforming student groups. Student groups included for identification are students from major racial and ethnic groups (disaggregated as American Indian/Native American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino of any race, White, or Two or more races), students who are economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learners. The State intends to take steps to add "gifted and talented students" as an additional student group by the end of school year 2017-2018. TSI schools will be identified based on all indicators in Maryland's accountability system in the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year.

Schools identified for targeted support and improvement will include low-performing and consistently underperforming student groups.

Schools with one or more low performing student groups performing below the summative performance on all indicators of the "all students" student group in any of the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools will be identified as low performing student group TSI schools. Using all indicators from the Maryland accountability system, student group performance in each school will be compared to the summative "all students" group performance in the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools in order to identify these TSI schools. Low performing student group TSI schools will be identified at least once every three years beginning in the 2018-2019 school year.

g. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Maryland is committed to supporting all of its lowest performing schools. Therefore, in addition to identifying the required lowest performing five percent of Title I schools, Maryland will also identify for support the lowest performing five percent of all Maryland schools. These schools will be identified in the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year.   In 2016-2017, there were a total of 1,434 Maryland schools in the State, five percent of the total is 72 schools, inclusive of the Title I schools for the most part. Maryland will provide differentiated support to its non-Title I within the lowest performing five percent of schools based on all indicators in Maryland's accountability system. The support for these non-Title I lowest performing schools will be determined based on identified school needs and available resources.

vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))*: Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

Schools will be measured annually on the percentage of students in the school that participate in the required assessments for all students and for all student groups required and the information will be reported on the state report card. States are required to include either a denominator equal to 95 percent of all students and of each student group or the number of students participating in the assessments. (See Section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii) of ESSA). For schools that fail to achieve 95 percent participation, any student below the 95 percent threshold will be counted as "not proficient" in the calculation of proficiency rates even though they did not take the exam. Maryland is proposing to factor the participation rate into its school accountability system by applying the minimum requirements of Section 1111(c)(4)(E) of ESSA.

To ensure schools and school communities have as much actionable information as possible and upon the recommendation from stakeholders, proficiency results will be publicly available in two ways: 1) with participation rate factored in, or based on at least 95% of students in tested grades and 2) without participation rate, or based on the actual number of tested students.

viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement *(ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))*
a. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

The CSI schools that no longer meet identification criteria, as established by Maryland's accountability system, and have met targets for two consecutive years, will be eligible to exit. Low performing CSI schools will exit this status when the school is no longer in the lowest five percent of

Title I schools and sustain that growth (meet targets) for two consecutive years. Low graduation rate CSI schools will exit this status once the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is higher than 67 percent and sustained for at least two years. Chronically low performing student group CSI schools will exit this status when the annual targets are met for all student groups and there is no student group performing as low as the "all students" student group in the lowest five percent of Title I schools. CSI schools will have three years to meet established criteria. School leaders must demonstrate that significant progress has been made toward meeting annual targets for two consecutive years prior to exit.

CSI school leaders will be required to develop action plans that identify measurable benchmarks toward meeting annual targets and exit criteria in three years. Plans will be approved and monitored annually by staff from the MSDE. Additionally, school leaders will be required to develop a sustainability plan and have it approved by the MSDE prior to exit. Any CSI school failing to meet the exit criteria in three years will be required to participate in more rigorous interventions.

b. <u>Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support</u>. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

TSI schools that no longer meet identification criteria, as established by Maryland's accountability system, will be eligible to exit. TSI school leaders will be required to develop action plans that contain measurable benchmarks toward meeting exit criteria. Action plans will be approved and monitored annually by the LEA. TSI School leaders must demonstrate that significant progress has been made toward meeting annual targets for two consecutive years prior to exit. Additionally, school leaders will be required to develop a sustainability plan and have it approved by the LEA prior to exit. Low performing student group TSI schools failing to meet the state's exit criteria in three years will be identified as a CSI school. Consistently underperforming student group TSI schools that fail to exit after two years will be subject to more rigorous interventions by the LEA.

c. <u>More Rigorous Interventions</u>. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

The CSI schools that fail to meet exit criteria in three years will receive more rigorous interventions. The MSDE will lead implementation of intervention strategies at identified schools. The MSDE will convene an external stakeholder group to review the root cause analysis and revise the action plan. Significant staffing, scheduling, and programmatic changes will occur as a result of the revised action plan.

Local school superintendents will be required to make staffing changes based on recommendations from the MSDE and the stakeholder team. This will include assigning experienced and effective administrators and teachers to CSI schools identified for more rigorous interventions. Principals will be required to use the MSDE leadership coaches. Leadership coaches will meet regularly with school

principals to provide guidance on the implementation of school improvement strategies. Principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders will be required to participate in targeted professional learning experiences identified by the MSDE to address the unique needs of low-performing schools. School leaders will be held accountable for implementing resources and strategies provided during professional learning experiences. Data will be analyzed to determine necessary modifications to school schedules, course offerings, instructional material, and other programmatic revisions. In elementary schools, data from early childhood programs will be included in the data analysis.

The MSDE will lead a team composed of central office staff, school administration, and other stakeholder groups to conduct monthly on-site school visits to monitor progress toward meeting established goals. Visits will include analyzing data, conducting learning walks, and participating in classroom observations. Collaborative debriefs will occur after each visit. School administration will be required to implement recommendations that are developed as a result of monthly school visits. To support progress toward meeting established goals, the MSDE will facilitate professional learning for school-based and central office personnel that focus on providing, monitoring, and assessing tiered academic support and nonacademic support to students; building teacher and leader capacity; and engaging the community in school improvement efforts.

The MSDE will conduct quarterly fiscal review sessions with local school systems. The LEAs will be required to make modifications based on the outcomes of fiscal review sessions.

Distribution of funds will be based on a formula and driven by identified needs in the approved needs assessment and action plan. Schools will be held accountable for meeting established benchmarks and accountability measures in approved plans.

> d. <u>Resource Allocation Review</u>. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

A review of resource allocation, including identification of resource inequities, will be a part of the root cause analysis and monitoring process. Local school superintendents will be held accountable for developing and implementing strategies to address resource inequalities in the CSI and TSI schools. The MSDE will prioritize allocation of resources based on need and implementation of evidence-based strategies with strong accountability measures. A robust monitoring and evaluation process for the use of funds has been established by the MSDE. Each LEA provides a monthly spenddown report to the MSDE, as well as a summative fiscal report during all the LEA monitoring visits.

> e. <u>Technical Assistance</u>. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

The MSDE uses the Four Domains of Rapid School Improvement: A System Framework (2017) developed by the Center for School Turnaround at WestEd as a framework for school improvement. The four domains include turnaround leadership, talent development, instructional transformation, and culture shift which have been identified as the areas of critical practices for successful school improvement. An essential component of this framework is involvement of the community in the school improvement process. Each of the four domains emphasizes community partnerships to

promote student academic success and well-being. This framework embraces and expands the concept of community schools by identifying actions at the State, local school system, and school level for community involvement in school improvement. This framework allows for a coordinated and strategic approach to technical assistance for school improvement. The MSDE will collaborate with the LEAs on the development, implementation, and monitoring of intervention strategies. The level of technical assistance provided by the MSDE to the CSI and the TSI schools will differ. However, sufficient support will be provided to ensure evidence-based strategies aimed at improving student academic performance will be implemented with a high-level of fidelity.

All the CSI schools will be required to complete a needs assessment developed by the MSDE and have a root cause analysis conducted by a third party to uncover causes for school performance problems. The needs assessment and root cause analysis will be closely aligned with the Maryland accountability system, including Maryland school quality and school success indicators. The LEAs will be required to implement a collaborative process that includes input from diverse stakeholder groups (school administration, parents, community members, teachers, representatives of teacher bargaining units, early childhood community partners, business partners, higher education partners, etc.) to complete and review the needs assessment and root cause analysis. The MSDE will identify resources for the LEAs with TSI schools, including needs assessment, root cause analysis, collaboration support, and other areas to support students in these schools.

Based on the needs assessment and root cause analysis, the LEAs will be required to develop action plans for each school that include evidence-based interventions to address identified needs that resulted in identification as a CSI or TSI school. The LEAs must demonstrate that the action plan was developed by a diverse stakeholder group. The LEAs must also identify in their plans community partnerships that will be established to promote student achievement and overall student well-being. The CSI action plans must be approved by the MSDE while the TSI action plans must be approved by the LEA. To support all the LEAs in their school improvement efforts, the MSDE will develop a resource hub that contains evidence-based interventions, effective practices, research articles, rubrics, templates, planning documents, and other items that support the identification, implementation, and assessment of evidence-based interventions.

Technical Assistance for Instructional Transformation:

Maryland recognizes that the implementation of standards-based curriculum is critical for school improvement for CSI and TSI schools. As a result, each CSI school will be required to use English/language arts and mathematics curriculum that has been vetted by the MSDE. The LEAs and the MSDE will collaborate to provide training that supports curriculum implementation and rigorous instruction. Curriculum implementation will be monitored by the LEAs and the MSDE to ensure that it is being implemented with a high-level of fidelity. The LEAs with TSI schools will be required to support those schools to ensure effective standards-based instructional practices to improve student learning outcomes for all students, including all student groups.

Technical Assistance for Turnaround Leadership and Talent Development:

Maryland understands the importance of highly competent and committed leaders at all levels in school improvement. The MSDE has nationally recognized leadership training programs. Maryland will build upon the successes and lessons learned from these programs and refocus them to address the unique needs of low-performing school. Training programs will focus on providing targeted cycles of professional learning experiences to principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders to build capacity for implementing evidence-based interventions identified in action plans.

This approach provides the school leadership team with the skills and support necessary to achieve and sustain school improvement goals identified in their action plan.

The TSI leaders will be provided professional learning opportunities by the MSDE and the LEAs to foster the growth of effective leaders. Through these targeted professional learning experiences, school leaders at CSI and TSI schools will be equipped with the content and skills necessary to improve school performance.

Technical Assistance for Culture Shift:

School improvement depends on a variety of stakeholders both internally and externally working together as a team to improve student outcomes. As a result, all TSI and CSI schools will be required to establish a network of partners and community resources that support student achievement and well-being based on the needs assessment of each school. This includes providing necessary academic, health, and social service supports before, during, and/or after school. Identified support must be included in the plan of action and be aligned with goals for school improvement.

> f. Additional Optional Action. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

N/A

> 5. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)):* Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such description.[4]

Data from the 2015-2016 school year indicate that Maryland is still working on ensuring that low-income and children of color are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and/or inexperienced teachers. Maryland looks at this data by quartile for all schools and for Title I schools separately.
Maryland's Key Definitions:
- Ineffective Educator- An educator who is deemed unsuccessful by a State approved local evaluation model.
- Out of field teachers- Teachers teaching in a subject they are not certified to teach. Certification data will be used to meet the definition of out of field.
- Inexperienced teachers
  - Inexperienced teachers in the first year includes teachers with a year of experience or

---

[4] Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

less.
- o Inexperienced teachers 1-3 years includes teachers with one to three years of experience.

When measured by quartiles (lowest v. highest quartile) for all schools in the State the disproportionality (the gap) between low-income and non-low-income children being taught by an ineffective teacher is 4.3 percent, by an out-of-field teacher is 3.8 percent, and by an inexperienced (first year) teacher is 3.9 percent. Maryland follows both a gap and a threshold model; that is any gap greater than five percent and any individual category that is over five percent, requires attention. Statewide, low income children are taught at a rate of 5.9 percent by out-of-field teachers and 7.8 percent by inexperienced teachers both more than the acceptable threshold. These are two areas that Maryland continues to work to improve.

When reviewing the data for students of color and their counterparts statewide, the rate of disproportionately (the gap) for students of color being taught by ineffective teachers is 5.8 percent, for out-of-field it is 3.6 percent, and for inexperienced it is 1.9 percent, However, similar to the measurements for low income students, the thresholds for students of color (6.6 percent taught by ineffective, 5.8 percent taught by out-of-field, and 6.6 percent taught by inexperienced) are above Maryland's preferred threshold of five percent and are areas to be addressed.

The review of data by quartile for schools that receive Title I, Part A services reveals that the disproportionality for low-income and non-low-income children being taught by an ineffective teacher is 2.7 percent, by an out of field teacher is 4.5 percent, for inexperienced first year is .8 percent, and for inexperienced first through third year is 1.8 percent. However, when reviewing just the thresholds, low-income students are taught at a rate of 2.7 percent by ineffective teachers, 8.8 percent by out of field teachers, 8.9 percent by inexperienced first year teachers, and 16.8 percent by first through third year teachers. Each of these areas will be addressed.

Finally, Maryland reviewed the data for schools receiving Title I, Part A services by quartile for students of color as opposed to their counterparts. The disproportionality (the gap) for students of color being taught by ineffective teachers is 2.6 percent, by out of field teachers is 8.7 percent, by inexperienced first year teachers is .5 percent, and by inexperienced first through third year teachers is 8.5 percent. When reviewing the raw data and gauging thresholds, students of color are taught by ineffective teachers at a rate of 2.7 percent, by out of field teachers at a rate of 9.9 percent, by inexperienced first year teachers at a rate of 7.3 percent, and by inexperienced first through third year teachers at a rate of 21.8 percent. As noted for poverty level data, Maryland is working to develop a plan to improve the State's educator evaluation system.

Statewide Strategies

The MSDE, having reviewed the data and conducted a root cause analysis, identified statewide strategies to address equity in Maryland Public Schools with a focus on schools that receive Title I, Part A funds. These statewide strategies were developed in conversation with the LEAs and through a review of best practices and current research.

One strategy includes investigating and determining revisions to the teacher quality stipends for National Board Certification (NBC). This strategy is supported by a review of the literature which showed that successful NBC applicants tended to be more effective than other applicants (Cowan and Goldhaber, 2015; Harris and Sass, 2008; McColskey and Stronge, 2006). A review of other state plans and strategies offered evidence of best practices around leadership bonuses (Idaho), bolster mentorship opportunities (Kansas), and promote increases to access to distance learning programs (Nebraska); all strategies that Maryland is investigating for implementation (U.S. Department of Education State

Plans and Klein, 2015).

Maryland used research based information to determine how to develop a State plan and how to encourage LEAs to review and analyze data. This included reports from The Education Trust (2015), Public Agenda (2015), and the Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium (2012). These reports included suggestions such as prioritizing immediate actions, determining the kinds of potential approaches, and defining what an equitable school and an equitable classroom might look like. The Education Trust Report (2015) provides information on what could be included in a good plan such as a statewide analysis of data, identifying local school system level problems, and ways to build stakeholder buy-in. Public Agenda (2015) offers advice on how to kick off a discussion about equity and promotes a conversation about what makes teachers effective. The final resource, provided by the Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium (2012), offers a checklist to determine equity within a classroom or school that MSDE shared with each of the six LEAs with indications of gaps in the 2015-2016 school year.

Maryland remains committed to communicating the progress of its plan to ensure equitable access to excellent educators to the LEAs, the public, and other stakeholders. Maryland will continue to review data on an annual basis. This review will be shared with the LEAs through the MSDE's secure data server, Tumbleweed. The LEAs will be expected to address the data in their annual master plan submissions based on the revised process established for master plans with a specific focus on how the support will differ for schools that receive Title I, Part A funds.

Maryland will continue to print summary information in various formats that report on the collected data. These reports include (1) Analysis of Professional Salaries; (2) Staff Employed at School and Central Office Levels; (3) Professional Staff by Type of Degree and Years of Experience; and (4) Professional Staff by Assignment, Race/Ethnicity and Gender. These four reports are posted on the MSDE web site (www.marylandpublicschools.org). Additionally, the Staffing Report, which is produced biannually, will provide an additional update on this information. The 2016-2018 Maryland Teacher Staffing Report was published in September 2016 and can be found on Maryland's website at http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DEE/ProgramApproval/MarylandTeacherStaffingReport20162018.pdf .

This data analysis will occur annually after data is returned from the LEAs. Maryland will continue to periodically review and update its plan as necessary to reflect changes in the State's strategies and programs as required in ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(B).

6. School Conditions (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)):* Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

To reduce incidents of bullying and harassment, the MSDE will provide a variety of programs, practices, and strategies to promote positive school climate. These strategies include positive behavioral interventions and supports, conflict resolution, anti-bullying interventions, data analysis, student engagement, and technical assistance to improve school climate and engagement. Specifically, the MSDE will:
- Develop, in consultation with a broad spectrum of stakeholders, and implement a statewide multi-tiered system of support, that coordinates and aligns academic, behavioral health, and wellness resources to address all students' needs using sustainable evidence-based strategies and

interventions that vary in intensity, e.g. Universal Tier I – all students; Targeted Tier II – some students; and Individualized Tier III – individual students.

- Work with the State Board of Education Mental Health subcommittee to develop guidance and policy to address the mental health needs of students, including students at risk of committing suicide or who may be at risk of human trafficking.
- Provide training, technical assistance, and coaching to LEAs in the implementation and management of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS). There will be four PBIS coach's meetings annually.
- Provide technical assistance to school systems utilizing their own data, offering supports in areas and methods for improvement in anti-bullying interventions (i.e. staff relationship building, staff awareness, cross-cultural awareness, reduction of incidents, suspensions, length of suspensions and alternative choices).
- Provide access to tools that will help schools promote the importance of good attendance, including a focus on high risk groups of students. Tools will include resources and supports that can assist all students and families that may experience barriers to school attendance.

To reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, the MSDE will fully implement programs and strategies that address the mental and behavioral health of students by ensuring identified students are connected to school-based professionals and community resources and provide assistance so that school staff are trained in the identification of students in need. Specifically, the MSDE will:

- Partner with the Center for Dispute Resolution, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law, and other community partners to support schools in building sustainable conflict resolution programs including Peer Mediation and Restorative Practices.
- Fully implement Maryland's plan to reduce and eliminate disproportionality in school discipline. The Maryland plan is designed to provide professional development opportunities, support implementation of strategies that enhance culture and climate at the school level, foster relationships between students and adults, and monitor data. Effective 2018-2019, schools identified using the methodology approved by the Maryland State Board of Education will be required to develop a plan to reduce disproportionate impact within one year and eliminate it within three years.
- Promote the Youth Mental Health First Aid curriculum that teaches school staff and other adults serving youth between the ages of 12-18 to support young people who may be experiencing a mental health crisis or illness.
- Provide a comprehensive prevention and intervention human trafficking education program pilot in three LEAs. The pilot will include ten schools in each of the LEAs.
- Work with the Maryland State Board of Education Mental Health subcommittee to develop guidance and policy to address the mental health needs of students, particularly students at risk of committing suicide or who may be at risk of human trafficking.
- Provide leadership and support to Governor's Opioid Operational Command Center to develop a strategy for implementing a statewide educational program available to all schools in the State for reducing overdose deaths.

To reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety the MSDE will continue to implement and provide technical assistance and promote programs and practices mentioned previously in this section, including a statewide multi-tiered system of support, positive behavioral interventions, restorative practices, review and analysis of data, and reduction of disproportionality. Furthermore, the MSDE will build consensus related to a statewide definition for multi-tiered system of support and develop a fidelity assessment to ensure that LEAs implement the

system with fidelity. In addition, the MSDE will review LEA coordinated student services programs to identify the program and professional development needs that exist in student services per Maryland regulations. This will enable the MSDE to better support school counselors, school psychologists, school health coordinators, pupil personnel workers, and school safety officers through the professional development and identification of programs, practices and strategies to engage professionals, students, and community members.

There is a statewide taskforce currently reviewing aversive behavioral interventions. The charge of the taskforce is to consider the circumstances under which, and the schools or types of schools in which, restraint and seclusion shall be prohibited, contraindications for restraint and seclusion, and who may authorize restraint and seclusion. The taskforce will share its findings with the Maryland State Board of Education at the September 2017 State Board meeting. In addition, recommendations for changes in State regulations shall be submitted to the State Board in December 2017. The State ESSA plan will be modified to reflect the final regulations once they are adopted by the State Board.

To specifically improve school conditions for students with disabilities, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services provides technical assistance and support to local school systems and public agencies to expand inclusive learning opportunities through the implementation of intervention/instructional best practices including:

- Participation in a National Inclusion Cohort, with technical assistance provided to the Maryland Access and Equity Focus Group by national experts, in the development of a State Implementation Plan for Inclusion.
- Statewide professional development for local school system and public agency special education and general education, Birth-21 leaders and staff on evidence-based intervention/instructional practices, through webinars, teleconferences, face-to-face meetings.
- Development and dissemination of resources: Preschool Least Restrictive Environment Technical Assistance Bulletin; Birth to Kindergarten Natural/Least Restrictive Environments Team Decision-Making Module (web-based); Maryland Learning Links (website); Parent's Guide to Preschool Special Education Services.
- Providing funding to local school system and public agency B-K programs to establish implementation sites to further expand statewide knowledge of effective intervention/instructional practices and school and community-based inclusive service delivery models.
- Continued use of Maryland Learning Links, a resource for educators and families related to special education in Maryland to provide information about special education current topics, including archived information.

7. <u>School Transitions</u> *(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D))*: Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

Maryland believes that to support students through grade span transitions, support appropriate promotion practices, and decrease the risk of students dropping out, it is important to provide multiple resources. These resources include, but are not limited to, promoting opportunities for collaboration on transitions from Head Start and community-based preschool programs to elementary schools, developing predictors of post- school success, summer bridge programs, encouraging strong school to family/community engagement, and providing multiple opportunities and pathways for all students,

with a specific focus on English Learners (EL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), and students partaking in the Free and Reduced Priced Meals Program(FARMS). Each of these strategies contribute to ensuring that all children have a significant opportunity to meet challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards, as applicable, attain, at a minimum, a high school diploma and be prepared for college and careers. Focus on post school success predictors allows educators to align student work, promote appropriate study and learning practices, and prepare students for life after high school. Summer bridge programs help many of our most at risk students retain knowledge over the summer while also promoting long term learning. Students require differentiated support and instruction which emphasizes the importance of multiple pathways for all students. Finally, Maryland believes that strong family and community engagement is a shared responsibility of families, schools, and communities to support student learning and achievement, continuous from birth through the school-age years. In order to engage all parents, including the parents whose first language is not English, tools and resources will be provided in multiple languages.

Transitions in early childhood are ongoing processes that have many steps along the way for children and families. To support the transition process from early care and education programs into elementary schools, MSDE's Division of Early Childhood Development will develop a transition resource guide that LEAs, schools, and early care and education programs, like Head Start and other community-based programs, can access as they prepare for and plan transitional supports for children as well as for families. Furthermore, the MSDE will develop professional Learning for early childhood providers for students with disabilities on social-emotional learning, including support for evidence-based practices such as Reflective Coaching/Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (SEFEL) to increase the rate of growth of positive social-emotional skills for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with developmental delays/disabilities, and ensure successful transitions to early care and education settings. In addition to addressing transitions between programs, the guide will also address transitions between grade levels and describe ways to build ongoing partnerships between programs and schools in order to support children and families. LEAs will develop agreements between Head Start and other community-based programs that serve 4-year-old PreK students that specify transition activities, as well as shared professional development opportunities, data sharing, and alignment of curricula opportunities that will occur.

Key indicators of successful transitions in early childhood are positive feelings and perceptions by the family of the community or school-based learning environment, the use of developmentally appropriate and evidence-based practices, and collaborative and mutually supportive efforts among families and providers/teachers across all environments in which the child routinely spends time. High quality early care and education programs are associated with better academic and social outcomes for all children and are especially important for children with disabilities. Maryland's birth to kindergarten-entry system of comprehensive and coordinated services for children with disabilities and their families supports a smooth transition process that actively engages parents and other important caretakers in decision-making focused on the unique needs of each child.

Community agencies and local schools must collaboratively develop processes and procedures to facilitate smooth transitions, including who is responsible for implementing these procedures. Additionally, State policies and procedures on early childhood transitions provide the foundation and direction for a process that is shared by all stakeholders and implemented effectively at the local program level for children and families. [COMAR 13A.13.01 & 13A.13.02]

In secondary education, student-centered approaches provide for a seamless transition to positive outcomes including graduation, competitive employment, enrollment in post-secondary education, and

active participation in the community. Beginning early in middle school, a comprehensive program of academic and career advisement, including opportunities to practice self-advocacy and self-direction strategies within school and the community, empowers youth to exercise informed choice and decision-making. This includes lessons in career awareness based on Maryland's 10 career clusters, engaging in career interest inventories, exploring careers through Career and Technology Education (CTE) programs of study, and participating in work-based learning experiences as well as student leadership organizations. Enrollment in rigorous academic courses, combined with students receiving ongoing academic and career advisement, allows for better alignment of courses taken in high school to what students want to do when they leave high school. This connection provides a necessary context to support students in planning their futures and making better informed decisions.

In 2012, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation to increase the age of compulsory school attendance from sixteen to eighteen. Phase one became effective July 1, 2015, and increased the age of compulsory school attendance from sixteen to seventeen. Phase two became effective July 1, 2017 and increases the age of compulsory school attendance from seventeen to eighteen.

To ensure effective student transitions and decrease the risk of dropping out, the MSDE will:

- Engage local school systems in statewide professional development to provide technical assistance on proper implementation of the law. Program specialists will convene statewide meetings for local Directors of Student Services, School Counseling Supervisors, and Supervisors of Pupil Personnel. The MSDE will also provide individual support as requested to LEAs, families, and students.

- Provide technical assistance on the implementation of evidence-based strategies designed to keep students engaged.

- Revise and update the Dropout Prevention Resource Guide originally published by the MSDE in 2012. The Dropout Prevention Resource Guide contains information on programs, initiatives, tools, and evidence-based practices to address school completion.

- Offer alternate paths for students through online student courses and support LEAs in the implementation of data driven personalized and blended learning opportunities.

- Provide access to multiple formats of digital resources that have been vetted for content and accessible to students with disabilities and EL students through a state repository and school library media databases.

All resources, supports, and strategies will be thoroughly vetted to ensure that they meet ESSA evidence standards.

These strategies support all students, including students with disabilities. For students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), Maryland requires transition planning to begin at age 14 to ensure positive results. In addition, it is imperative that students with IEPs participate in career exploration activities that are based on their interests identified in their transition plans and that they have access to career pathways involving CTE and magnet programs throughout high school paired with an array of work-based learning opportunities (paid and unpaid) that will enable them to be proactive and informed as they navigate their post-school career path.

Outside of the school day, Maryland's 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) Summer

Bridge Programs are Educational Bridge Programs that provide extended-year (summer) learning opportunities focused on improving academic achievement of students entering grades 1, 6, and 9 as well as projects that improve college readiness and workforce advancement. Bridge programs support grade level transitions for students entering grades 1, 6, and 9 with social/emotional, as well as study and work skills, to prepare them for navigating to the next level of education with more ease.

In order to identify and address challenges related to ELs, the MSDE has convened the EL Task Force. This group, comprising school-based administrators and teachers, LEA Supervisors, family engagement specialists, advocacy groups and representatives from the MSDE as well as institutes of higher education, focuses on issues related to certification of teachers instructing ELs, the State's plan for addressing ELs' needs, parental involvement, the Seal of Biliteracy, dual language programs, social and emotional supports for ELs, ELs in early years, and transitions. Additionally, the MSDE, in collaboration with six LEAs, will implement a GED Option Pilot Program for ELs for overage under-credited ELs. This program will serve as a diploma pathway pilot for older ELs who have arrived in the United States in recent years, experienced interrupted education, and have a lower level of proficiency in English. One goal of the program is for each participating EL who passes the four GED tests while participating in the GED Option Pilot Program for ELs to receive a high school diploma through the LEA in conjunction with the MSDE and the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation. Transition into adult education programs, if needed, will also be a component of the pilot. The EL/Tile III Office and the Division of Early Childhood Development will continue to collaborate to provide professional learning and instructional strategies for educators in pre-school programs and childcare centers.

Family and community engagement is a shared responsibility of families, schools, and communities to support student learning and achievement. The MSDE's Internal Family Engagement Team will develop and implement a Family and Community Engagement Outreach Plan. The plan will include the development of tools, resources, and information representing the continuum of a student's education -- beginning at birth through post-secondary --from home to school settings including infants and toddlers to early care and education programs like home visiting, Head Start, libraries and community-based programs to pre-kindergarten/elementary through high school; between grade levels; new settings; and high school to post-secondary education and career. A parent portal will be created on the MSDEs website that will bring together existing Division websites to provide a "one stop" for parents and stakeholders to access information, in multiple languages, like tip sheets on a variety of topics including the Early Childhood Family Engagement Framework Toolkit, Maryland Learning Links, financial literacy, Ask Us Now! and secondary transition resources. In addition, representatives from the Internal Team will host Town Hall meetings and webinars for parents by partnering with LEAs, non-profit- and community-based organizations to address equitable access to a well-rounded education. An added component to this work is the addition of the "on track in 9th grade" measure in Maryland's new accountability system. This measure is the percentage of 9th grade students earning a total of four or more combined credits in at least four of the following subjects: ELA, Math, science, social studies, and/or world languages. By adding this to the accountability framework, Maryland is indicating the importance of tracking student transitions and providing support for all students.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

1. <u>Supporting Needs of Migratory Children</u> *(ESEA section 1304(b)(1))*: Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:

   i.   The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;

   ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;

   iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and

   iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

i. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) will ensure that the unique educational needs of all migratory children, inclusive, but not limited to the following: preschool migratory children, migratory children experiencing homelessness, neglected or delinquent, migratory children with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), English learners, and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through the needs assessment process which is conducted by recruiters, the Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), and the MSDE. The needs for migratory children are determined through a data-driven Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Service Delivery Plan (SDP) process. Students will also be evaluated for Priority for Service (PFS) status. The PFS migrant children meet both of the following criteria: students who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the State's challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards; and *s*tudents whose education has been interrupted. PFS students receive distinct service attention in order to immediately address discontinuity due to educational disruption. The MSDE, LEAs, and communities will establish partnerships to provide services for migrant students and families. The State will provide continuous efforts through on-going professional development opportunities to support the identification and recruitment of migratory children, preschool migratory children, and migratory children who have dropped out of school. The LEAs will schedule parent involvement activities to help parents prepare their children for school and promote their success.

Preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school have unique educational needs attributed to frequent mobility. The most prominent needs are consistent reinforcement of learning content in all academic subjects, supportive services for students and families, and equitable access to resources. Maryland will continue to aggressively identify and adequately serve eligible students in the areas of identified need. Maryland will continue to monitor student academic progress and provide feedback on academic performance for migratory students annually.

ii. The MSDE ensures migratory children will have the opportunity to meet the same challenging academic achievement standards that all children are expected to meet. The Maryland Migrant Education Program (MEP) will engage in partnerships with other Federal, State, or locally operated programs for available services, as well as, collaborate internally with other Title Programs such as Title III, Part A to address the unique needs of migratory children. The SDP, an action plan inclusive of service delivery strategies, outcomes, goals,

and definitions for the MEP, will be utilized to spearhead these efforts and close achievement gaps for migrant students. Maryland will perform a triennial review of the MEPSDP by convening stakeholders to review the MEP, analyze evaluation results, and engage in data-driven program improvement and planning.

The MEP will continue to fully implement the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) initiatives as required by the United States Department of Education used to ensure migrant students' educational disruptions are lessened across state lines. Full implementation of MSIX supports migrant students in experiencing a seamless and streamlined transfer of all student records and academic progress, so that they are able to have continuity in their education in spite of their mobility.

iii. The State SDP provides a framework that enables the MEP to focus on high priority service delivery strategies and to determine their effectiveness in meeting the needs of its migrant students. Partnerships will be established between the Maryland MEP, LEAs, and other service providers to integrate and utilize multiple data sources to inform the unique educational needs of migratory children. The Maryland MEP staff will collect and analyze the following data points to evaluate program services (inclusive of, but not limited to):

- Counts of students identified and served (MIS2000 database);
- Reviews of services provided (school year and summer programming);
- Onsite records;
- Migrant student achievement and gap analysis (local and state test scores);
- Quality control efforts for the Identification and Recruitment system; and,
- Migrant Student Information Exchange Data Reporting Requirements,

The SDP outlines evaluative measures that enable the Maryland MEP to track implementation and determine whether its programming is having the desired impact on migrant student achievement.

The diverse representation of the Needs Assessment Committee that oversaw the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process brought considerable expertise to the data analysis and decision-making processes to best serve migrant students in Maryland. The MSDE will continue to utilize this reviewer process and evaluative procedure to assess the performance measures for the Migrant Education Program.

To continue to address the unique educational needs of migrant students, the Maryland MEP and the LEAs will continue to provide summer programs and a supplemental educational service during the regular school year to support migrant students. In addition, these services will be extended to eligible preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school.

iv. The goal of the MEP is to ensure that migratory children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the year are correctly identified. The following MEP goal areas are identified and included in the Service Delivery Plan:

Goal Area 1: School Readiness;
Goal Area 2: Reading Achievement;
Goal Area 3: Mathematics Achievement; and,
Goal Area 4: High School Graduation/Out- of- School- Youth.

The Measurable Program Objectives (MPOs) created during the SDP process are listed by goal area.

Goal Area 1: School Readiness
1A By the end of the 2018-2019 school year and each year thereafter, 50 percent of identified migrant students ages 4-5 will attend curriculum-driven programs and demonstrate improvement on the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, as available.

Goal Area 2: Reading Achievement
2A In 2018-2019 and each year thereafter, migrant students' gap in reading proficiency when compared with non-migrant students will decrease by three percent per year.

Goal Area 3: Math Achievement
3A In 2018-2019 and each year thereafter, migrant students' gap in math proficiency when compared with non-migrant students will decrease by three percent per year.

Goal Area 4: High School Graduation/ Out of School Youth (OSY)
4A In 2018-2019 and each year thereafter, migrant student will reach 90 percent graduation rate.
 4B In 2018-2019, and each year thereafter, there will be a one percent increase in the amount of eligible migrant OSY who receive MEP sponsored support services that contribute to their graduation, GED, life skills, and/or career readiness goals.

Annually, the Maryland Migrant Education Program (MMEP) will use multiple data sources to obtain information to improve program delivery and to measure progress toward goals as identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA), as set forth in the Service Delivery Plan (SDP), and in alignment with the Government Performance Results Act Migrant Education Program measurements (GPRA). Student Performance records and participation will be reviewed and compared to current program information to identify and address specific data trends and programmatic needs. Annual data collection will be assessed against programmatic benchmarks as established through the most current SDP and programmatic assessments conducted to assist the MMEP in program evaluation efforts. To continuously improve the program and services provided to Migrant students and families in Maryland, state assessment data, program attendance and participation, and benchmark testing are continuously examined and evaluated against program objectives. These results influence decision-making in regard to resources and programming for the subsequent program year to fulfill program goals and objectives. The program evaluation incorporates all mandatory aspects from the Office of Migrant Education (OME) evaluation checklist, including disaggregation of Priority of Services (PFS) and non-PFS students.

The MMEP has prioritized building stronger relationships with LEAs to support State and LEA initiatives around state assessment proficiencies and graduation rates. Collaborative discussions with LEAs and a wide range of stakeholders have focused on how the MMEP can help facilitate migratory students in attending LEA offered services for migrant students to meet state assessment proficiencies. Collaborative discussions have also included a

variety of topics that include parent and family engagement, additional academic supports for English Learners, access to health services, and other available resources. The MMEP will continue to support LEAs and migratory students in meeting the rigorous academic performance standards of Maryland.

2. Promote Coordination of Services (*ESEA section 1304(b)(3)*): Describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.

The State will ensure appropriate use of Title I, Part C funds to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children. The MEP will provide assistance to the LEAs with record transfers of pertinent school records, including information on health (without supplanting the responsibility of the school system). The Maryland MEP will utilize Title I, Part C funds to coordinate with the MIS2000 database as its record system and the National Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) data system, which includes counts of students identified and served, to ensure accurate and timely record transfer.

3. Use of Funds *(ESEA section 1304(b)(4))*: Describe the State's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State's assessment of needs for services in the State.

Title I, Part C funds will be utilized to provide support to LEAs most in need during the regular school year, as well as, summer intercession programs. The State will also utilize these funds to support interstate student record exchange and information in order to communicate the unique needs of migratory children, migratory preschool children, migratory students who have dropped out of school, and Priority for Service (PFS) students. In addition, these funds will be used to support local recruiters and school personnel with identification and recruitment efforts, conducting needs assessments, and family engagement activities for migrant students and families.

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

1. Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs *(ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B))*: Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

The MSDE will ensure a plan for the successful transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs. The MSDE will facilitate the collaboration with LEAs and juvenile justice system agencies in order to coordinate and eliminate gaps in a child or youth's education and to ensure that youth are placed in appropriate educational programs that meet their needs. The MSDE will work with the LEAs and State agencies to implement a transition plan that will include the following strategies:

- records or credits are transferred with youth;
- pre-placement programs that allow adjudicated or incarcerated youth to audit or attend courses on college, university or community college campuses, or through programs provided in institutions; and
- worksite schools, in which institutions of higher education and private or public employers partner to create programs to help students make a successful transition to postsecondary education and employment.

The MSDE will work with LEAs and State agencies to provide essential support services to ensure the success for the youth which may include:

- personal, vocational and technical, and academic, counseling; placement services designed to place the youth in a university, college, or community college program;
- information concerning, and assistance in obtaining, available student financial aid;
- counseling services; and,
- job placement services.

For the immediate re-enrollment of youth returning from justice placements, the MSDE will provide guidance and training to LEAs and State Agencies to help them avoid placement in alternative education settings, GED/high school equivalent. In addition, the MSDE will train or make provisions for training on best practices for ensuring smooth transitions from LEAs to educational programs in the justice system and back again to an appropriate education setting upon reentry.

The MSDE will develop and issue an application to LEAs and State Agencies, for the opportunity to apply for Title I, Part D funding, to establish and/or improve education programs for neglected, delinquent, or at-risk children and youth. The funding will be distributed in two parts: Subpart 1 for State Agencies serving neglected or delinquent children and youth; and Subpart 2 for LEAs with high numbers of children and youth in locally operated juvenile correctional facilities, including community day programs. The MSDE will continue to share resource products developed by the Neglect and Delinquent Technical Assistance Center (NDTAC), United States Department of Education, and used other credible entities.

---

2. Program Objectives and Outcomes *(ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A))*: Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

The objectives for the MSDE, Title I, Part D program are adopted from the federal program goals for both Subpart 1 and Subpart 2. The MSDE will work with State Agencies to: (1) Improve educational services in Maryland's State institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth so that such children and youth have the opportunity to meet the same challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards that all children in the State are expected to meet; (2) Provide children and youth with the services to enable them to transition successfully from institutionalization to further schooling or employment; (3) Prevent at-risk youth from dropping out of school; and (4) Provide dropouts, and children and youth returning from correctional facilities or institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth, with a support system to ensure their continued education.

The MSDE has established the following objectives and outcomes to be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program, Subpart 1 and Subpart 2, in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program:

Goal	Program Objective	Program Outcome
Goal Area 1: Improvement in Reading Achievement	Objective 1: In 2018-2019 and each school year thereafter, there will be a ten percent increase of long-term students served by Title I, Part D who show improvement of ½ to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test scores in reading.	Outcome: Improved performance in reading to meet the same challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards.
Goal Area 2: Improvement in Math Achievement	Objective 2: In 2018-2019 and each school year thereafter, there will be a ten percent increase of long-term students served by Title I, Part D who show improvement of ½ to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test scores in math	Outcome: Improved performance in math to meet the same challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards.
Goal Area 3: Increased student outcomes through transition planning to successfully support students after exit	Objective 3: In 2018-2019 and each school year thereafter, students served by Title I, Part D will show a five percent increase in student outcomes (i.e., school enrollment, credit accrual, vocational, GED, post-secondary education opportunities) while being served in facilities

Objective 3B: In 2018-2019 and each school year thereafter, students served by Title I, Part D will show a five percent increase in student outcomes (i.e., school | Outcome: Successful transitions of youth in secondary school completion, appropriate training, employment, or further education. |

enrollment, credit accrual, vocational, GED, post-secondary education opportunities) after program exit.		

The MSDE will work with LEAs and other agencies serving children and youth to: (1) carry out high quality education programs to prepare children and youth for secondary school completion, training, employment, or further education; (2) provide activities to facilitate the transition of such children and youth from the correctional program to further education or employment; (3) operate programs in local schools for children and youth returning from correctional facilities and programs which may serve at-risk children and youth; and (4) support LEAs and other agencies in on-going professional development, sharing of best practices and use of evidence based strategies to best support these youth.

The MSDE will facilitate two statewide administrative and technical assistance meetings annually to address challenges and barriers to services and program opportunities. The meetings will include representatives from the state juvenile justice department and other related entities. The MSDE will conduct annual monitoring of programs receiving subgrants to ensure compliance to Title I, Part D assurances and program objectives are being met. The MSDE will work with LEAs and State Agencies to facilitate a three-year evaluation cycle of Title I, Part D programs to determine effectiveness of programs and services.

D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

1. <u>Use of Funds</u> *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D))*: Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

Maryland will assist the LEAs in providing professional development that is job embedded and personalized to the needs of the teachers and the students. Feedback from the State-wide ESSA plan survey, as well as from the ESSA Listening Tours held regionally around the State also strongly supported the need for professional learning that is job embedded and personalized to meet teacher and student needs. In personalizing professional learning for educators, the State and the LEAs must examine student data. Student achievement is improved through formative and summative student assessment data that is used to guide instruction to meet individual student needs in each LEA. State strategies to improve student achievement include the following:

- The State will develop a plan for personalized professional learning for teachers, principals, and principal supervisors that is aligned to student data and needs. The professional learning shall:
    - o support LEAs in identifying all educator professional learning needs regarding student achievement;
    - o encourage innovative, evidence-based instructional strategies;
    - o support LEAs in the development of personalized professional growth for all educators;
    - o research and gather information on methods to evaluate the effectiveness of professional learning initiatives; and,
    - o strengthen and support job embedded professional learning strategies, including but not limited to peer coaching, peer collaborative, and communities of practice.

- The State will develop an educator growth-mindset through personalized educator professional learning that is aligned to student needs in each LEA. The State will provide opportunities for collaboration across LEAs, specific instructions, guidance, models, and templates. The LEA professional learning programs shall include:
    - o a needs assessment;
    - o student data;
    - o strategies for improvement based upon evidence, needs, and data;
    - o an implementation plan;
    - o educator growth plans;
    - o resources to support implementation; and,
    - o reflection and evaluation of strategies

Effective schools must have effective leaders. A committee of LEA stakeholders that included school-based staff as well as central office staff emphasized the need for professional learning targeted to principal supervisors, principals, assistant principals, aspiring principals, and teacher leaders. Feedback from the state-wide ESSA plan survey, as well as from the ESSA Listening Tours held regionally around the state stressed the need for teacher leadership opportunities and development. State strategies to develop principal supervisors, principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders include the following:

- The State shall hold back up to three percent of Title IIA funds for professional learning programs to build leadership capacity on the school level. This professional learning shall be targeted to principal supervisors, principals, assistant principals, aspiring principals, and other

school leaders. In collaboration with the LEAs, the State shall develop a strategy for professional learning for principal supervisors, principals, assistant principals, aspiring principals, and other school leaders, aligned with Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL), which were adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education on February 28, 2017. This may include:

- o residency programs;
- o focused academies;
- o professional learning communities (PLCs);
- o webinars;
- o online courses;
- o regional workshops;
- o action research; and/or, sub-grants to LEAs to build the capacity of school leaders, which may include residencies, academies, and other evidence-based initiatives.

- Principal supervisors, principals, assistant principal, aspiring principals, and other school leaders must be skilled in providing and recognizing the implementation of evidence-based instructional strategies aligned to student needs. The State shall provide support and targeted professional learning to principal supervisors, principals, assistant principals, aspiring principals, and other school leaders. The professional learning will:
  - o prepare new principals to be effective on the first day of their assignment;
  - o build the capacity for principals to become strong instructional leaders;
  - o provide a system of support through a principal and assistant principal network;

  - o provide for continuous professional growth; and,
  - o assist principals in the development and support of teacher leaders.

- In consultation with LEAs, the State will develop a statewide definition of teacher leaders that:
  - o defines leaders both emerging and established; and
  - o describes the characteristics of effective teacher leaders.

  - o In collaboration with LEAs, the State will create a leadership framework that:
  - o develops pedagogy, content, community, and collaboration;
  - o builds capacity of principal supervisors and principals to grow, maintain, and support teacher leaders; and
  - o capitalizes on established principal and teacher leaders.

2. <u>Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools</u> *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E))*: If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose.

Data indicate that more unqualified, and possibly ineffective, teachers serve in the most challenging classrooms in the state. Causes range from structural processes directing teacher placement related to seniority status to difficulties in recruiting for Title I, Part A schools, and extended challenges associated with recruiting for rural areas. The State is committed to:

- supporting LEAs with the recruitment and retention of effective teachers in Title I, Part A Schools and extending to rural schools;
- collaborating with LEA human resources to implement structures that ensure equitable placement of teachers; and
- creating regional access to, support for, and stakeholder collaboration in the development of

localized centers of sharing and ongoing learning.

Slightly more than two percent of all Maryland teachers are rated ineffective. Ineffective teachers are primarily inexperienced staff in Title I, Part A schools. All State-led professional learning initiatives shall give priority to low performing schools. It shall also give priority to Title I, Part A schools. In order to provide equity, implementation of high quality instruction aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards must be delivered with fidelity to all student groups beginning with pre-kindergarten. This includes equitable access to instruction and instructional materials for students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy and mathematics levels. State Kindergarten Readiness data shows the gaps that exist for students entering kindergarten are the same gaps that exist on State assessments in grade 3. Feedback from the LEA committee of stakeholders and CCSSO critical friends, indicates that implementation of high quality instruction and instructional materials aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards, delivered with fidelity to all student groups is needed to provide equity. The State will collaborate with LEAs in the:
- implementation of evidence-based strategies aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards beginning with pre-kindergarten that will lead to improving achievement for all student groups;
- creation of professional learning for all school staff, including administrators, teachers in public schools and in community-based early childhood programs, teachers, specialists, and support staff, on communicating and ensuring success for all student groups;
- formation of a state-wide curricular materials collaborative that will provide LEAs the ability to share information, ratings, and alignment of curricular support materials;
- development of an educator repository of digital resources and Open Educational Resources (OER) that provides equitable access to high quality, vetted content;
- development and implementation of professional learning that addresses strategies for the integration of digital resources into teaching and learning; and
- creation of professional learning for school library media specialists and educators related to the use of the MDK12 Digital Library databases to support instruction and provide statewide equity.

3. Underline System of Certification and Licensing *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B))*: Describe the State's system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

Maryland has five pathways leading to initial professional certificate: traditional Maryland State-approved education preparation program; out-of-state, approved education preparation program; the experienced professional route; transcript analysis requiring a potential educator to "fill in the gaps" with coursework; or, a Maryland state-approved alternative preparation program.

The pathways and certificate renewal requirements result in the following types of teacher, specialist, and administrator certificates:
- the Professional Eligibility Certificate (PEC);
- the Standard Professional Certificate I (SPC I);
- the Standard Professional Certificate II (SPC II); and,
- the Advanced Professional Certificate (APC).

Each certificate has its own requirements for initial award as well as for renewal. Over the course of

the next year, MSDE plans to introduce language that would facilitate development of specialized certificates.

- A certificate that would allow the hiring of individuals with specialized knowledge and skills (symphonic violinists, diesel technicians, nanotechnologists, etc.) to teach in specialized teaching circumstances without undue requirements placed on them.
- A new route for those individuals entering the State with National Board Certification, designed to ease the entry requirements for those not prepared in Maryland.

MSDE and stakeholder groups are also revising and/or refining requirements for
- initial certification and renewal in the areas of reading/literacy,
- content with guaranteed alignment to both national standards as well as local priorities,
- pedagogy with intentional focus on cultural competency and relationship-based classroom management,
- inclusion-based and knowledge-based instruction for students with special needs, and,
- the art of building parent engagement.

In addition, Maryland is examining the testing requirements for prospective teachers, specialists, and administrators related to certification to determine if changes are warranted.
- Revise the language pertaining to the conditional certificate to amend the timeline and requirements to enhance the probability of those who hold the certificate to advance to professional certification.

4. Improving Skills of Educators *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J))*: Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.

The State will assist the LEAs in training teachers, principals, and other school leaders to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels. A committee of LEA stakeholders that included school-based staff as well as central office staff examined this issue and requested that the State assist the LEAs in training teachers to identify these needs. The stakeholder group requested that the State assist the LEAs in training teachers to identify these needs, by investigating tools, surveys, rubrics, continuums, or frameworks that can be used by teachers, principals, and other school leaders to anonymously self-assess their abilities to identify the personal professional learning needed by the educator to meet student needs and allow for the analysis and delivery of targeted content for educators of students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels. The tools, surveys, rubrics, continuums, or frameworks will improve and target educator professional practices by:

- personalizing professional learning and targeting teacher learning related to professional practices, especially for the instructional needs of students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels;
- validating educators for what they already know;
- identifying strengths and weaknesses;
- being made voluntary and streamlined;
- assisting educators in determining their own professional learning needs as related to the

needs of their students;
- assisting educators to reflect deeply;
- developing a culture of professional growth;
- providing differentiation to meet the needs of students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels;
- providing support for LEAs to offer transparency;
- building trust for school-based educators; and,
- empowering educators by soliciting teacher and administrator voices in the professional learning process.

The tools, surveys, rubric, continuums, or frameworks will:
- be made available to LEAs, schools, and teachers for self-assessment;
- be provided to educators to allow for self-reflection of both strengths and weaknesses to guide educator choice for professional learning;
- be adaptable by the LEA/school to target the specific student populations in the LEA/school;
- be made voluntary, streamlined, and not time consuming; and,
- provide data summaries for LEAs/schools; and protect the anonymity of individual teacher data.

The State will collaborate with the LEAs on professional learning needs of schools, related to specific student groups and foster collaboration across LEAs to support these students. Feedback provided from the State ESSA survey and the State ESSA Listening tour specified the need for State facilitated opportunities for collaboration across schools and the LEAs throughout Maryland. In addition, the committee of LEA stakeholders identified the need for State-level professional learning initiatives to be scalable and replicable on the local level, where possible. As a result of this feedback, the State developed and led professional learning initiatives shall be:
- aligned to LEA principal, teacher, and student needs;
- scalable and replicable on the local level, where possible;
- collaborative, focused, and evaluative; and,
- differentiated in content and delivery to meet the needs of students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels.

A committee of LEA stakeholders that included school-based staff as well as central office staff requested that the State gather information on national research in professional learning best practices to improve student achievement through national meetings and multi-state collaboration. The stakeholder committee requested that the State bring the information back to locals. Local staff shall be included in national meetings with the State, where appropriate and practical.

The State will provide opportunities and structures to collaborate and partner with the Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) on professional learning needs, such as induction, cultural proficiency, Universal Design of Learning (UDL), Specially Designed Instruction, and behavioral improvement programs. In addition, the State shall foster collaboration with internal and external stakeholder groups who interact with students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels. Such collaboration with internal and external stakeholder and advocacy groups will ensure cohesive, aligned support to all student populations.

National research is compelling on the need for curricular materials that are aligned to rigorous state standards. Feedback from LEAs has demonstrated a need for the State to facilitate collaboration on the selection of curricular materials aligned to the rigorous state standards. Such an alignment of materials will provide equity for all student population, especially students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy and mathematics levels. The State will develop an LEA curricula materials collaborative that will provide LEAs the ability to share information with inter-rater reliable ratings of curricular materials.

To support these alignment and focused efforts at the educator preparation level, revisions of literacy coursework required both for elementary and secondary teachers are currently underway with the secondary frameworks having been released in January 2017 and elementary frameworks scheduled for release in January 2018.   These courses and those developed by the upcoming revision of early childhood and elementary mathematics coursework for prospective teachers focus intentionally on students with special needs at both ends of the spectrum, and on children for whom English is not the primary language, etc. Revised coursework is intentional and quite specific in requiring course developers and professional development specialists to address these needs.

The MSDE's planned focus on regional accessibility location aligned with State-led initiatives and cross-LEA sharing will assist in assuring the implementation of the above initiatives.

5. <u>Data and Consultation</u> *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K))*: Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2101(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

To ensure that the LEAs are providing and implementing a system of professional growth and improvement for teachers, principals, and other school leaders, the State will review the LEAs' professional learning plans annually.

Each LEA will provide to the State, a report on their comprehensive professional learning program that shall include:
- a needs assessment;
- student data; and,
- strategies for improvement based upon needs and data.

The State shall collect data from LEAs through:
- annual reports;
- monitoring and support visits;
- surveys;
- examination of state achievement data; and,
- needs assessments.

The State will also collect data during:
- quarterly meetings;
- focus groups; and,
- webinars.

The LEAs will be given an annual risk assessment rating of their Title IIA grant plans. The rating will

be based upon a rubric that has been developed in consultation with the LEAs. The LEAs that have a Risk Level 1, 2, or 3 will be monitored every 3 years through site visits. LEAs that have a Risk Level of 4 or 5 will be monitored annually through site visits. Site visits for Risk Levels 1, 2, or 3 will occur on a rotational visit.

The State will consult on an ongoing basis with LEAs and other stakeholders through a Committee of stakeholders, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners and other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II A. Sub-committees of these stakeholders will be formed to address specific goals and focus areas of the State Title IIA plan, as well as to update and improve activities and initiatives in the State Title IIA plan. Research, evidence-based strategies, and State/local data will inform the work of the committee and sub-committees.

6. Teacher Preparation *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M))*: Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.

Changes are being proposed with regard to teacher preparation, interventions to promote equitable access to effective teachers, and to the concept of professional learning, particularly in relation to regional access to all of the above. Each of these changes requires collaboration, the facilitation of pilot projects designed to distinguish theoretical design from effective implementation practices, and ongoing and frequent feedback that ensures responsiveness to the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the change.

Revision of the Institutional Performance Criteria required for State Program Approval for educator preparation programs culminating in certification will include enhanced and scaffolded clinical experiences to ensure that all beginning teachers have had direct experience with students from a wide array of backgrounds and educational experiences. (This was the one most clearly identified need as MSDE listened to nearly 500 voices in five ESSA Listening Tour meetings held in January 2017 and read in almost 3000 survey responses from statewide constituents). In addition, educator preparation programs will be required to include overt teacher candidate instruction in the tools of the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and demonstrate competency with its use during field experience and internships. UDL is designed precisely to equip teachers to effectively instruct all students, with particular focus on students outside the margins, those with particular gifts, and those with disabilities and challenges.

The State will establish regional hubs alluded to above, Regional Teacher Learning Centers (RTLC) at existing higher education regional centers. These RTLCs would serve a variety of uses, such as:
- cost-effective and locally-responsive supports to existing teacher preparation programs;
- centers for professional development in partnership among the LEAs and IHEs;
- delivery centers for alternative preparation programs designed to provide more equitable access to capable and experienced teachers for all students;
- collaboration among colleges and universities across the State to provide a widely diverse set of clinical field and internship experiences not always available within the general area of the home college.
- collaboration among IHEs to provide and monitor extended internships out of the regional center allowing some students to return to their family homes to ensure program completion.

- a more affordable model for the preparation of certified teachers through partnerships among the successful secondary Teacher Academy of Maryland programs, local community colleges, and four-year IHEs located at the regional center;
- centers for the innovative use of technology to widen access to best LEA and IHE practices available throughout the State, accessible without long-distance travel and designed for specific needs of the region;
- points of intersection between teacher preparation, induction and professional learning activities to provide seamless transitions and a common message for in-state and out-of-state prepared teachers and, due to the nature of the RTLC, a more local response to individual school system needs.

All resources, supports, and strategies will be thoroughly vetted to ensure that they meet ESSA evidence standards.

During the next two years, the MSDE will explore the development of an undergraduate, online/hybrid teacher education program with as yet undetermined partners in concert with the State's priorities of assuring broad access for all potential teachers to a high-quality program leading to certification. As identified, the MSDE will assure that these programs address the needs of a vastly diverse population. While a wide variety of online programs is available, the MSDE will seek to facilitate a Maryland-developed and approved program containing the rigor and accountability of all other programs in the State.

New Teacher Induction: State regulations ensure the fidelity of new teacher induction programs offered by LEAs. The Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.07.01 requires that each LEA shall establish and maintain a comprehensive teacher induction program for all new teachers until they achieve tenure and veteran teachers new to an LEA. A strong induction program, effective mentoring, and providing time to teachers/mentors/co-teachers have proven to be effective drivers of teacher growth and success, as well as student growth and success. COMAR specifies that induction programs shall include:
- standard elements for the selection and expectation of mentors at both pre-service and in-service levels of practice
- standards for effective mentoring;
- orientation programs;
- ongoing support from a mentor;
- observation and co-teaching opportunities;
- professional learning;
- ongoing formative review of performance;
- induction program staff;
- participation by all new teachers;
- evaluation; and,
- reduced workload for new teachers and mentors, to the extent practical, given fiscal and staffing concerns.

Each LEA shall provide an annual professional learning plan that outlines the elements of the induction program and demonstrates how the LEA is supporting new teacher growth. The State will provide:
- ongoing guidance and support to the LEAs regarding the teacher induction program requirements;
- collaboration and support for the LEAs in the mentoring of non-tenured teachers to

prepare them to increase student achievement through instruction aligned to Maryland's challenging academic standards; and,

- professional learning to meet mentor and new teacher needs. This may include meetings, webinars, regional workshops, and online courses.

The State shall facilitate collaboration between the LEAs and the IHEs to strengthen and provide alignment to the teacher pathway from pre-service to in-service. This collaboration will:

- develop standard elements for selection, training and assessment of mentors for both pre-service, induction, and pre-tenure mentor programs;
- inform teacher preparation programs of the needs of the schools;
- increase the capacity of pre-service teachers;
- strengthen the relationships and inform the design of the efforts of Professional Development Schools (PDS) and the LEAs;
- provide a realistic expectation related to planning, implementation, and assessment aligned to the State's rigorous academic standards; and,
- provide realistic expectations to increase teacher retention.

Four committees of the Maryland General Assembly Senate Bill 493, the Teacher Incentive and Retention Act, are currently finalizing recommendations to the high-level oversight Work Group. All stakeholders to educator preparation in Maryland are represented on both the Work Group and each committee. Recommendations are being made concerning:

- adjunct certification (nanotechnology, diesel mechanics, etc.);
- incentives for teacher retention (additional planning time for new teachers, etc.);
- the possible effective uses of micro-credentialing for professional growth and certification renewal;
- increased rigor in educator preparation programs with particular focus on candidates' abilities to meet the needs of all children on the cognitive spectrum; and,
- demonstrated cultural competency through direct experience and performance assessment.

E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

1. <u>Entrance and Exit Procedures</u> *(ESEA section 3113(b)(2)):* Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

Maryland has always had standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English Learners (ELs), established in consultation with all 24 Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the State and national experts. ELs in every LEA are considered to have attained English proficiency if their overall composite proficiency level is 5.0 on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0. To ensure that all students who may be ELs are assessed, Maryland has also adopted a common home language survey. The Maryland State Department of Education's (MSDE's) *English Learners: Eligibility, Guidance, and Laws* document requires that all students identified by the home language survey are assessed (1) no later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year for students who enter at the start of the school year; or (2) within the first two weeks of attendance for those children who have not been identified as a potential EL prior to the beginning of the school year. This element is monitored by the MSDE Education Program Specialists and is included in the Maryland's Title III monitoring tool.

2. <u>SEA Support for English Learner Progress</u> *(ESEA section 3113(b)(6))*: Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:
   i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State's English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and
   ii. The challenging State academic standards.

i. The MSDE staff convenes statewide briefings for all 24 LEAs that include professional learning activities around effective practices towards meeting interim progress goals. The LEA EL supervisors have the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues from other LEAs with similar geographic and demographic characteristics. Additionally, the MSDE supports LEA collaboration meetings twice a year that are designed by participants. The LEAs with new EL supervisors are provided personalized mentoring and technical assistance at least monthly by MSDE EL staff. For the 2017-18 school year, statewide briefings will examine the new accountability system and provide individualized technical assistance to LEAs based on local and State data comparisons. Additionally, the MSDE and the LEAs will use the new State model to identify potential long-term ELs to proactively address the needs of these students in each LEA.

ii. The focus of the MSDE's State and regional professional development has been for content teachers and building administrators in supporting ELs achievement in meeting academic standards. During technical assistance and monitoring, MSDE EL Specialists examine class schedules, program models, and curriculum to ensure that ELs have equitable access to grade-level content. The majority of the State's EL population is in K-2. In summer 2017, the MSDE will offer three regional symposia for administrators and teachers focused on academic achievement of students in grades PreK-2; Master EL teachers will provide focus sessions on English Language Arts and mathematics.

3. Monitoring and Technical Assistance *(ESEA section 3113(b)(8))*: Describe:
  - i. How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and
  - ii. The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

---

i. Two MSDE Education Program Specialists conduct extensive monitoring visits of all 21 LEAs that receive a Title III subgrant in a three-year cycle. The Title III monitoring tool has been revised to align to ESSA and Maryland's new accountability system and shared and reviewed with all LEAs. Prior to the visit, a collaboration meeting is held with LEA leadership and the MSDE EL Program Specialist. The monitoring visit includes classroom observations and desk monitoring of all aspects of the LEA program for ELs. Verbal and written feedback is provided, including commendations and findings. Although LEA English Language Proficiency data is reviewed on a regular basis, monitoring visits provide an opportunity to analyze progress, targets, and strategies for improvement. Starting in 2017-18, monitoring visits will include discussion of plans for addressing the needs of students who have been identified as potential long-term ELs.

ii. The MSDE has always collaborated with LEAs whose ELs have not met both academic and English language proficiency state goals. MSDE Education Program Specialists will adopt tools utilized in the past and update them to align with ESSA goals to further assist LEAs identified as not being effective in educating ELs. Working in partnership with the LEAs, the MSDE requires that the LEAs (1) find root causes through in-depth data analysis and program evaluation; (2) gather all stakeholders' input and feedback; and (3) create a plan with both short- and long-term goals, objectives and deliverables. MSDE Education Program Specialists schedule monthly conference calls or face-to-face meetings with these identified LEAs to monitor the plan and provide targeted technical assistance as needed and offer customized professional development. Reporting and data analyses on students' attainment of English Language Proficiency within Maryland's proposed accountability program indicator will help inform program success and areas in need of strengthening.

F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

1. <u>Use of Funds</u> *(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)):* Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

The purpose of Title IV, Part A, Subpart I is to increase the capacity of States, Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), schools, and local communities to –

- Provide all students with access to a well-rounded education;
- Improve school conditions for student learning; and
- Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students.

Maryland will reserve the allowed, not more than one percent, for administrative costs of carrying out its responsibilities under this subpart, including public reporting on how funds made available under this subpart are being expended by LEAs, including the degree to which the LEAs have made progress toward meeting the objectives and outcomes outlined in the LEA applications for these funds.

Additionally, Maryland will use the remainder of funds at the State level to provide monitoring of and training, technical assistance, and capacity building to, LEAs that receive an allotment of these funds. This will include eliminating State barriers to the coordination and integration of programs, initiatives, and funding streams that meet the purposes of this subpart to facilitate better coordination with other agencies, schools, and community-based services and programs.

Finally, Maryland will support LEAs in providing programs and activities that:
- Improve access and opportunity and should include at a minimum:
    - Providing support for students taking the Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) exams;
    - Advanced level coursework for all students;
    - Access to instruction in all content areas beginning in Prekindergarten;
    - Strategies to encourage and provide access to integrated STEM core concepts and practices for all students, specifically for female and students of color;
    - More college preparatory support in all schools, specifically focusing on low-income schools (i.e. Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program);
    - Diverse fine arts options for all students to foster creative problem solving, individual growth, meaningful expression, and innovation;
    - Quality physical education for all students to gain the academic and health benefits of movement and fitness;
    - Comprehensive health education that provides students the skills to adopt and sustain behaviors that promote a healthy lifestyle and reduce health risks;
    - Uninterrupted sequences of world language study beginning as early as possible that enable high levels of proficiency; and,
    - Schools/LEAs need to continue to increase career and technology programs/options offering high skill/high wage opportunities for all schools.
- Improve the effective use of technology through access to programs and activities that:
    - Provide and/or expand access to high quality digital learning experiences and resources through a state-wide learning management system, a digital repository, and school library media databases (MDK12 Digital Library);
    - Ensure that online courses and web based digital resources comply with accessibility guidelines;

- Collaborate nationally to identify, evaluate, and integrate Open Educational Resources into teaching and learning;
- Provide a flexible delivery format that allow for participation in online professional development and student courses (Learning Management System); and,
- Provide additional support to LEAs for school library media programs that encourage the development of digital literacy skills for educators and students.

- Improve the communication between home and schools. Specifically, child care centers, early childhood programs, out-of-school time programs, LEAs, schools, and libraries must be intentional about providing information, reports, and data in a format and language parents understand, as well as ensuring opportunities for the involvement of parents and family members whose first language is not English, of children with disabilities, of migratory children, of foster care children, and families experiencing homelessness.
- Provide training of general education teachers across all content areas on language acquisition and strategies for serving English Learners (ELs) as this increases access for ELs to a well-rounded education; and,
- Increase the training of teachers across all content areas on identifying and serving gifted and talented students to increase access and success for all students.

2. Awarding Subgrants *(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B))*: Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).

Maryland will allocate these funds using the same formula that is used for Title I, Part A which is based on poverty and schools are served in rank order. All LEAs in Maryland receive Title I, Part A funds and will be eligible to receive Title IV, Part A funds with an approved plan for these funds that addresses one or more of the priorities above. No subgrant shall be less than $10,000 as per the law.

G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

1. Use of Funds *(ESEA section 4203(a)(2))*: Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) will use 93 percent of the funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program to fund afterschool programs that can meet and adhere to the requirements detailed below. The selection of programs is made after a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process with consideration for the final individual award amount based on the number of students proposed to serve and the number of days of program operation. The 21st CCLC competition in Maryland is open to Maryland LEAs, interagency, interdepartmental, community and faith-based or other private or public organizations, or a consortium of two or more of the aforementioned, proposing to provide afterschool programming. For the purposes of this narrative, afterschool programs are defined in Maryland as programs that occur before school, after school, during the summer, and on Saturdays.

Maryland has identified several Absolute and Competitive Priorities for the 21st CCLC program. *Absolute Priorities* are those priorities which must be addressed by all proposals; failure to do so will disqualify a proposal from consideration. *Competitive Priorities* are optional and, if addressed, may earn additional points.

Eligible organizations must use funds to provide activities outside of school hours that:
- Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing instructional services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet State and local student academic achievement standards in core academic subjects, such as reading, mathematics, and science;
- Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development and engagement activities, substance abuse and alcohol prevention, service-learning, violence prevention, counseling, art, music, recreation, technology education, and character education programs that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and,
- Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy instruction and related educational development.

All programs must:
- Target students and families of students who attend Title I school-wide programs or schools that serve a high percentage (at least 40 percent) of students from low-income families;
- Include partnerships of eligible entities consisting of:
  - (i) LEAs and/or school(s); and,
  - (ii) community-based organization(s) or other public or private entity(ies).
- Integrate character education in alignment with programs in place in the schools of the target population; and,
- Integrate service-learning in accordance with the Maryland Seven Best Principles

In addition, applicants were given the opportunity to earn additional points by addressing competitive priorities in their programs. The competitive priorities were as follows:

- Proposing a program aligned with preparing students to successfully reach Maryland's College and Career Readiness Standards (MCCRS);
- Proposing a program whose focus is science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) including all seven State STEM standards of practice;
- Propose a program whose focus is ensuring the healthy development of youth providing healthy recreational enrichment that promotes positive physical, emotional, and social development that better student's health and wellness; or
- Proposing a program whose focus is providing students with high quality arts programming that includes hands on experiential learning in the creative exploration of visual and performing arts.

The MSDE will use the remaining seven percent of the funds received for administrative and State activities purposes. The administrative cost will be used for oversight of the overall program. State level activities funds reserved will be used for fiscal monitoring, programmatic monitoring, program evaluation and professional development. Professional development opportunities are designed to assist with quality program implementation. Trainings include, but are not limited to, New Grantee and Continuation Orientations and Regional Professional Learning Institutes. The MSDE implemented a training program for a pilot group of sub-grantees to assess program quality. Staff will be trained on the selected tool and the monitoring process will be revised to include a more comprehensive, standardized review of program quality. Training in program quality, as well as other professional development opportunities, will be available to MSDE staff.

2. Awarding Subgrants *(ESEA section 4203(a)(4)):* Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.

The MSDE utilizes a multi-stage process of reviewing applications and awarding 21st CCLC funds. When a Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued, the date and time for application is posted on both the MSDE web site and in the RFP. Grantees are encouraged to submit their applications electronically to an email dropbox but on-site delivery is also available.

All applications received by the announced deadline are pre-screened using eligibility requirements that pertain to the submitting Lead Agency, the proposed leadership team, and to requirements regarding the number of days the program proposes to serve students each week during the school year and, if applicable, the number of days of operation during the summer. Applications not meeting the pre-screening submission requirements will not be further reviewed.

During the timeframe of the RFP release and the application deadline, the MSDE is recruiting, selecting, contracting with, and training application reviewers. The MSDE publicly solicits, screens, and selects impartial, qualified reviewers who are not employees of the MSDE to review and score applications. The MSDE will assemble review teams based on experience as a reviewer, employment history, and geographic distribution.

Reviewers individually comment on each application assigned to that team and assign each a numerical score using the 21st CCLC scoring rubric. The scoring rubric includes sections that ask reviewers to rate the program's extent of need, operational plan, management plan, evaluation plan, and sustainability. Reviewers will then meet in teams to arrive at consensus scores for each standard on the rubric.

After the conclusion of the review process, the MSDE will rank applications in order by total consensus score plus competitive priority bonus points. Proposals scoring at 80 percent and above will be eligible for the next review stage.

Applications scoring at 80 percent or above are sorted into two groups: 1) returning applicants, and 2) new applicants. Returning applicants are those that either currently have a 21st CCLC grant with the MSDE or have had a grant within the last three years. New applicants do not have a history of receiving 21st CCLC funding from the MSDE.

Returning applicants receive and respond in writing to any clarification questions raised by the reviewers. New applicants must participate in a validation interview. The MSDE, in collaboration with the applicant, will arrange the date and time for the validation interview to take place within seven business days of contact by the MSDE. This interview will be attended by MSDE representatives. The peer review team will be invited to attend; however, their attendance is not mandatory. The proposed program leadership team and program partners must attend the validation interview. Attendees should be limited to active participants in the proposed program. It is mandatory that all partners attend.

Prior to the validation interview, applicants will, in writing, respond to a standard set of questions, as well as, clarify any questions or concerns raised by the reviewers. The MSDE will forward the questions at least one week before the interviews. The purpose of the validation interview is:
  i. Provide the leadership team and partners the opportunity to validate details about their proposed program to ensure participating students meet challenging State academic standards;
  ii. Provide MSDE representatives and the review team an opportunity to discuss the written responses to interview questions with the leadership team and partners;
  iii. Communicate the aspects of their proposed program that may need clarification and improvement; and,
  iv. Establish a timeline for required revisions, if any.

The MSDE shall make final determination for awards based on the results of the Validation Process and the availability of funds. Proposals will be funded as the total federal allocation to the State allows.

H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

1. <u>Outcomes and Objectives</u> *(ESEA section 5223(b)(1))*: Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.

The Rural and Low-Income School Program is designed to support Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in meeting performance goals as defined in Maryland's accountability system to increase student outcomes. Rural LEAs receiving grants under this program will be expected to set performance goals consistent with an expectation to increase student achievement, enhance student support, and promote academic enrichment. The grant focuses on the implementation of initiatives to address any factors adversely affecting student outcomes.

Maryland works with LEAs during the application process to ensure that:
- o   Proposed interventions/initiatives fit with State priorities;
- o   evidence-based practices are being used to narrow the achievement gap;
- o   processes and structures are in place to effectively implement the initiatives; and
- o   incremental data will be collected to ensure implementation is on track for achieving intended outcomes.

Maryland focuses on the objectives of all allowable programs under ESSA 5222 as a statewide goal. Specifically:
- Title I, Part A- to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education and to close achievement gaps. The focus statewide is on supporting local school systems and schools with high percentages of poor children to support the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. This includes providing funds to support additional academic support and learning opportunities to help low-achieving children who attend Title I schools master challenging curricula and meet State standards.
- Title II, Part A- to foster continuous professional growth that empowers Maryland educators to develop world-class students, who are life-long learners and productive, responsible citizens of a global society. This includes a focus on job-embedded and personalized professional development.
- Title III- to provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure that the systems establish, implement, and sustain high-quality language instruction programs. The focus is to ensure that ELs in Maryland achieve English language proficiency based upon a rigorous timeline of six years.
- Title IV, Part A- to increase the capacity of the LEAs to provide all students with access to a well-rounded curriculum, improve school conditions for learning, and improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students.
- Parental involvement -to conduct outreach to parents, family members, and communities and support programs, activities, and procedures to support the involvement of parents and family members in school programs.

The MSDE will provide technical assistance to ensure LEAs identify targeted resources to address data-driven needs.

2. Technical Assistance *(ESEA section 5223(b)(3))*: Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.

Maryland provides technical assistance by working with the LEAs to identify priority needs through the application process and comprehensive master plan required under State law. The master plan is the comprehensive plan the LEAs develop and implement that describes the goals, objectives, and strategies that are used to improve student achievement and meet State performance standards and local performance standards. During the grant period, Maryland will collaborate with LEAs to monitor implementation of practices and programs and determine factors that may be adversely impacting the accomplishment of the outcomes outlined in Rural and Low-Income School grant application. Technical assistance will be on-going for capacity building to increase student outcomes and will include data analysis, discussions regarding adjustments to ensure that intended outcomes are appropriate and achievable, and fidelity of implementation to make certain LEAs are making progress towards meeting intended outcomes. The grant manager will coordinate the technical assistance efforts.

I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B

1. <u>Student Identification</u> *(722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) will support the Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in identification and assessment of children and youth experiencing homelessness by ensuring that each local school system develops, reviews, and revises policies and procedures to eliminate barriers to enrollment and retention to ensure school success. The MSDE has a designated McKinney-Vento State Coordinator to facilitate the coordination of services to homeless students with LEAs and other State agencies. The Coordinator works in partnership with each designated LEA McKinney Vento liaison to support these efforts. The McKinney-Vento State Coordinator provides ongoing consultation, guidance, technical assistance, resources, and monitoring of local school systems on the McKinney-Vento law, policies, and best practices. The Coordinator works in partnership with educators, State partners, and community partners to strengthen collaborative efforts that sustain statewide initiatives to support and reinforce the identification and assessment of children and youth experiencing homelessness. The MSDE has established a Homeless State Advisory Committee comprised of State and local community partners who meets regularly to identify gaps in services and trends within this population of students, and to review all relevant information, regulations, laws, and policies affecting homeless students.

2. <u>Dispute Resolution</u> *(722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.

The MSDE adheres to regulations set forth in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR 13A.05.09.07) Programs for Homeless Children that establish dispute resolution procedures for all LEAs and includes timelines regarding the educational placement of children and youth experiencing homelessness.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION TIMELINE

ACTION	WHO RESPONSIBLE	TIME LINE
Submit a written complaint	Parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth	Immediately
Receipt of written complaint	Principal/school administrator	Resolution of complaint within 5 school days to include written explanation and rights to appeal.
If parent, guardian or unaccompanied youth dissatisfied with decision, may file a written complaint with local superintendent.	Parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth	Within 5 school days
LEA issues a decision	Local superintendent	Within 10 school days
If parent, guardian or unaccompanied youth	Parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth	Within 30 days

dissatisfied with decision, may appeal the decision to the local board.		
Local board to make decision upon receipt.	LEA local board	Within 45 days
If parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth is dissatisfied with local board decision, may appeal to the State board.	Parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth	Within 30 days

The MSDE consults with individual LEAs regarding dispute resolution issues as needed.

The COMAR regulations require:
- Each LEA to establish an expedited dispute resolution process;
- A student to remain enrolled in school during the dispute resolution process; and
- Immediate admission of the student to the school sought, pending resolution of the dispute if the dispute arises over school selection or enrollment.

The MSDE works with all LEAs to establish and implement a dispute resolution procedure that complies with federal law and State regulations, which reflects best practices. Homeless families and youth within LEAs are made aware of dispute resolution rights and how to utilize the dispute resolution process. A list of legal and advocacy service providers in the area that can provide additional assistance during any part of the process is provided. The MSDE works with LEA liaisons to develop a step-by-step description of how to appeal the school's decision that includes a form that parents, guardians, or unaccompanied youth can complete and submit to the school to initiate the dispute process. Links to individual LEA dispute policies are available on the MSDE website. Training on the dispute resolution process is provided for all homeless liaisons. The MSDE and LEAs will collect and maintain communication logs of disputes and reported barriers, and use this information to inform training of LEAs for a cycle of continuous improvement in resolving disputes in an equitable and timely manner.

The MSDE ensures LEAs provide notification that if a parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth are English learners, use a native language other than English, or need additional supports because of a disability then translators, interpreters, or other support services will be made available without charge. The MSDE will work with LEAs to ensure students receive all services for which they are eligible until final resolution of all disputes and appeals.

3. Support for School Personnel *(722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.

The MSDE will coordinate and facilitate supports for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance

officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of children and youth experiencing homelessness, including runaway and homeless children and youth. The MSDE will train or make provisions for training programs on recommended best practices for addressing specific needs, identification, and awareness of children and youth experiencing homelessness, trauma, risk factors, cultural, and behavioral issues at statewide meetings, conferences, national trainings/conferences of student services staff, pupil personnel workers, administrators, school counselors, school social workers, school transportation staff, and special education teachers and/or MSDE Divisions (upon request). The MSDE will facilitate the sharing of model training materials and resources with LEA liaisons (National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE) and National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth (NAEHCY)). The MSDE will provide guidance and technical assistance to LEA liaisons with developing and implementing a strategy for ongoing training of school personnel and require documentation of trainings. The MSDE will provide guidance on the protection of information about a student's living situation as part of the student's record as required under The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

4. Access to Services *(722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe procedures that ensure that:
   i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;
   ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and
   iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

i. The MSDE facilitates collaboration strategies between LEAs, Head Start, Judy Centers, Office of Child Care, and the State publicly-funded Pre-K programs to ensure that children and youth experiencing homelessness have access to publicly-funded preschool programs, administered by the State or LEA, as provided to other children in the State. The McKinney-Vento State Coordinator is a member of the Early Childhood State Advisory Council, the Special Education State Advisory Council, and the Interagency Council for Infants & Toddlers, which support and help inform these efforts.

The MSDE ensures that families of young children experiencing homelessness are provided information about early education resources that are available for them. The federal Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act (42 U.S.C. 9835(m)) requires Head Start programs to prioritize enrollment of homeless three and four-year olds, permit them to enroll without first producing required documentation, and coordinate their services with the Head Start Collaboration office at the MSDE, the LEA liaisons, and other homeless services providers. Judith P. Hoyer Early Childhood and Family Education Centers ("Judy Centers") in Maryland prioritize homeless children and youth for receipt of early childhood education

services. The offices of the State Coordinator for Homeless Education and the Judy Centers collaborate to ensure LEAs comply. State regulations set forth in Maryland State law guarantee homeless four-year olds access to public pre-Kindergarten programs within LEAs. The offices of the state coordinator for Homeless Education and Early Learning and Early Care will collaborate to ensure access. All homeless families will be able to immediately enroll their four-year old children in local public pre-K programs where capable.

ii. The MSDE will work with the LEAs to develop procedures to award credit to homeless youths who satisfactorily completed full or partial coursework at a prior school, as part of the immediate enrollment process, and to transmit that information to future schools. The MSDE will develop and disseminate model procedures which the LEAs may choose to adopt. The MSDE will monitor the administrative procedures and regulations of LEAs to ensure they include strategies for meeting this requirement. The MSDE will train or make provisions for training to LEA liaisons on best practices for ensuring homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services. The MSDE will work with LEA homeless liaisons to provide support to enable students to attend school consistently and progress academically including, establishing processes to award partial credit for work completed. By working with LEA liaisons to help keep students in their schools of origin, the challenges associated with school change will be avoided. The MSDE will work with LEA liaisons to work with family courts and LEA personnel to create or improve diversion programs or alternative education programs.

iii. The MSDE annually reviews all LEA administrative plans, policies, and procedures that are pursuant to the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.05.09.03 – General Responsibilities. COMAR Chapter 09: Programs for Homeless Children regulations establishes minimum requirements to ensure that each child of a homeless individual and each homeless youth has equal access to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as provided to other children and youth consistent with Title VII, Subtitle B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. These State procedures include General Responsibilities, Transportation, School Enrollment, and Dispute resolution requirements for homeless children, youth, and their families.

The MSDE will offer technical assistance and professional development activities annually to assist LEAs to develop, review, and revise policies to eliminate barriers to enrollment, retention, and success in school of homeless students. MSDE will address transportation issues; enrollment delays; and lack of available records normally required for enrollment (i.e., birth certificates, previous school records, medical records, proof residency). MSDE will coordinate with local social services agencies and other agencies or programs providing services to homeless students and their families. MSDE will coordinate with LEAs on inter-district issues (i.e., transportation, school records, or transfer of school records) and to ensure that services are provided to each eligible homeless student that are comparable to services offered to other students in the LEA (including public preschool programs, educational programs, programs to career and technological education, special education programs, programs for gifted and talented students, before school and after school programs, school meal programs, and transportation). The MSDE and the LEAs will ensure homeless students will be given the opportunity to immediately enroll in magnet schools, charter schools, advanced placement coursework, career and technical education, and online learning.

MSDE will annually monitor LEAs with a protocol that includes indicators to ensure LEAs provide access to the following services and programs, including, but not limited to: public

preschool programs, unaccompanied youth, alternative school placement, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, gifted and talented programs, charter schools, magnet, and other specialized programs. The MSDE will provide technical assistance and guidance to LEAs not in compliance with establishing and implementing policies and procedures that aid in the removal of barriers for school enrollment of homeless children and youth.

If homelessness prevents a student from paying any normally required fees or meeting normally required deadlines in accordance with State, local, and school policies, the MSDE will work with LEAs to eliminate barriers by providing resources that may assist in funding support with fees and assistance with school entry.

5. Strategies to Address Other Problems *(722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—
    i.   requirements of immunization and other required health records;
    ii.   residency requirements;
    iii.   lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;
    iv.   guardianship issues; or
    v.   uniform or dress code requirements.

The MSDE annually reviews all LEA administrative plans, policies, and procedures that are pursuant to the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.05.09.04, 13A.05.09.05, and 13A.05.09.06, 13A.05.05.07- (School Health Services for all students) regarding school placement, school enrollment, school transportation, and school health services for all students. [COMAR link:
http://www.dsd.state.md.us/COMAR/SubtitleSearch.aspx?search=13A.05.09.*]

Strategies to address problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by lack of school records or other documentation will include, but are not limited to the following:
The MSDE will work with LEAs to ensure the enrolling school immediately refers the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth to the LEA liaison for McKinney Vento. The LEA liaison must assist in obtaining the immunizations, screenings or other required health records, proof of residency, proof of guardianship, and birth certificates. The McKinney Vento liaison must document all actions until records are received. LEAs will collaborate with Title I, Part A, Special Education, Early Childhood Programs, etc. to seek resources to assist students in need of uniforms for uniform schools.
The MSDE will conduct annual monitoring program reviews of LEAs supporting McKinney Vento children and youth. The Program review tool will include indicators to ensure LEAs implement strategies to avoid delays in enrollment. The MSDE will work with LEAs to ensure a school selected on the basis of a best interest determination immediately enrolls the homeless child or youth, even if the child or youth is unable to produce the immunization and other required health records; residency requirements; birth certificates; school records or other documentation; guardianship issues or uniform and dress code requirements. The MSDE will provide technical assistance and guidance to LEAs not in compliance with establishing and implementing policies and procedures that eliminate enrollment days.

6. <u>Policies to Remove Barriers</u> (*722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

Maryland is committed to the development, review and revision of State and LEA policies that remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences. To demonstrate the State's efforts, the MSDE adheres to the following practices:

- Continue to provide formal guidance to LEAs that all homeless students should be enrolled – in class, and participating fully in school activities – inclusive of eliminating any barriers to participation in extracurricular activities --within one school day of an attempt to enroll;
- Provide guidance, develop and/or disseminate assessment procedures to facilitate immediate enrollment where a child's grade/credits are unknown (e.g. missing documents or arrival from out of LEA/state without documents);
- Develop, disseminate, and/or facilitate the sharing of sample self-enrollment and caretaker forms (electronic or paper) to facilitate enrollment of unaccompanied homeless youth, and provide related training;
- Provide training and issue guidance to LEAs on how to collect missing documents after enrollment, and when/how to use affidavits in lieu of certain missing documents;
- Assist LEAs with making resources available to families (e.g. National Center for Homeless Children (NCHE) Parent Pack and/or thumb drives) to provide to homeless parents and youth so that they can maintain important documents;
- Ensure that transportation delays do not prevent immediate enrollment by working with LEAs to implement long-term transportation services when requested by eligible homeless family or youth;
- Provide guidance to LEAs on transportation strategies and supports (e.g. public transit tokens or short-term cab) until long-term arrangements are in place;
- Provide LEAs with initial guidance and training as needed on new federal transportation requirements;
- Collaborate with the MSDE's and the LEA's Office of Pupil Transportation to develop strategies – potentially including policy changes, training, or resource decisions - to support the LEAs in the establishment of prompt transportation arrangements of homeless students upon enrollment in school;
- Ensure the LEAs develop agreements between LEAs on handling inter-LEA and interstate transportation needs;
- Provide guidance and training on the requirement that LEAs treat schools within a feeder system as a homeless student's "school of origin";
- Provide guidance and training on the inclusion of preschools within the current definition of "school of origin," and the requirement that transportation to the school of origin apply to preschool;
- Ensure that the LEAs provide guidance to families on how to ensure that documents

> stored on a thumb drive remain secure; and,
> - Ensure that all LEA liaisons will continue to participate in training on immediate enrollment.

7. <u>Assistance from Counselors</u> *(722(g)(1)(K))*: A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

The MSDE will ensure that the unique educational needs of homeless children and youth are identified and addressed through the use of student services personnel at the LEAs. School counselors, LEAs, and community partners will collaborate to provide supportive college readiness counseling services for homeless youth. The MSDE will provide continuous efforts through ongoing professional development opportunities to support the identification and support of homeless youth so that school counselors can focus specifically on their unique college readiness needs.

Additional assistance from counselors will include: guidance and advisement on school and community based learning supports and resources in all academic subjects; providing wrap around supportive services for students and families; ensuring equitable access to resources due to the abrupt interruption of learning often caused by the frequent mobility; advocacy for access to the same challenging academic content that all children are expected to meet; collaboration with other offices and agencies to provide summer and extended day opportunities for credit recovery and advancement; and, providing access to information on financial supports provided by McKinney Vento and Title I, Part A funds for access to reduced college costs, college field trips, and other college readiness activities.

School counselors will meet with homeless youth to create a four-year college readiness plan, as well as meet with homeless youth to identify courses, activities and resources which will provide them much needed social-emotional support as well as college and career readiness support. Counselors will work with content specialists to assure that homeless youth are enrolled in transition courses, if needed, to prepare them for college. School counselors will share information about financial aid nights, college preparation courses, college nights, college speakers, and career fairs to enhance the opportunities for homeless youth. Homeless students pursuing post-secondary education at a two-year or four-year higher education institution in Maryland are eligible for a tuition waiver until 24 years of age, as long as the student meets the McKinney-Vento eligibility criteria for homelessness. A Maryland stakeholder group is formed to serve as the catalyst for assisting students with any barriers they face with enrollment in Maryland's colleges and universities.

Appendix A: Measurements of interim progress

Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency, set forth in the State's response to Title I, Part A question 4.iii, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students, including those listed in response to question 4.i.a. of this document. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State's measurements of interim progress must take into account the improvement necessary on such measures to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps.

A. Academic Achievement

English/Language Arts Academic Achievement Target Projections																
Student Group	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2030 - 2016
All Students	39.3%	41.5%	43.7%	45.8%	48.0%	50.2%	52.3%	54.5%	56.7%	58.8%	61.0%	63.2%	65.3%	67.5%	69.7%	30.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	34.5%	36.8%	39.2%	41.5%	43.9%	46.2%	48.5%	50.9%	53.2%	55.6%	57.9%	60.2%	62.6%	64.9%	67.2%	32.8%
Asian	66.2%	67.5%	68.7%	69.9%	71.1%	72.3%	73.5%	74.7%	75.9%	77.1%	78.3%	79.5%	80.7%	81.9%	83.1%	16.9%
Black or African American	23.9%	26.6%	29.3%	32.0%	34.7%	37.5%	40.2%	42.9%	45.6%	48.3%	51.1%	53.8%	56.5%	59.2%	61.9%	38.1%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	25.6%	28.3%	30.9%	33.6%	36.3%	38.9%	41.6%	44.2%	46.9%	49.5%	52.2%	54.9%	57.5%	60.2%	62.8%	37.2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	42.2%	44.3%	46.4%	48.4%	50.5%	52.5%	54.6%	56.7%	58.7%	60.8%	62.9%	64.9%	67.0%	69.1%	71.1%	28.9%
White	52.9%	54.6%	56.3%	58.0%	59.7%	61.3%	63.0%	64.7%	66.4%	68.1%	69.7%	71.4%	73.1%	74.8%	76.5%	23.5%
Two or more races	45.3%	47.3%	49.2%	51.2%	53.2%	55.1%	57.1%	59.0%	61.0%	62.9%	64.9%	66.8%	68.8%	70.7%	72.7%	27.3%
Students with disabilities	8.5%	11.8%	15.1%	18.3%	21.6%	24.9%	28.1%	31.4%	34.7%	37.9%	41.2%	44.5%	47.7%	51.0%	54.3%	45.7%
English Learner	4.3%	7.7%	11.2%	14.6%	18.0%	21.4%	24.8%	28.2%	31.7%	35.1%	38.5%	41.9%	45.3%	48.8%	52.2%	47.8%
Economically disadvantaged students	21.6%	24.4%	27.2%	30.0%	32.8%	35.6%	38.4%	41.2%	44.0%	46.8%	49.6%	52.4%	55.2%	58.0%	60.8%	39.2%

Mathematics Academic Achievement Target Projections																
Student Group	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2030 - 2016
All Students	33.8%	36.1%	38.5%	40.9%	43.2%	45.6%	48.0%	50.3%	52.7%	55.1%	57.4%	59.8%	62.2%	64.5%	66.9%	33.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	26.2%	28.8%	31.5%	34.1%	36.7%	39.4%	42.0%	44.6%	47.3%	49.9%	52.6%	55.2%	57.8%	60.5%	63.1%	36.9%
Asian	67.3%	68.4%	69.6%	70.8%	71.9%	73.1%	74.3%	75.4%	76.6%	77.8%	79.0%	80.1%	81.3%	82.5%	83.6%	16.4%
Black or African American	16.3%	19.3%	22.2%	25.2%	28.2%	31.2%	34.2%	37.2%	40.2%	43.2%	46.2%	49.2%	52.2%	55.1%	58.1%	41.9%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	20.3%	23.2%	26.0%	28.9%	31.7%	34.5%	37.4%	40.2%	43.1%	45.9%	48.8%	51.6%	54.5%	57.3%	60.2%	39.8%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	36.3%	38.5%	40.8%	43.1%	45.4%	47.6%	49.9%	52.2%	54.5%	56.8%	59.0%	61.3%	63.6%	65.9%	68.1%	31.9%
White	48.7%	50.5%	52.4%	54.2%	56.0%	57.9%	59.7%	61.5%	63.4%	65.2%	67.0%	68.9%	70.7%	72.5%	74.4%	25.6%
Two or more races	38.5%	40.7%	42.9%	45.1%	47.3%	49.5%	51.7%	53.9%	56.1%	58.3%	60.5%	62.7%	64.9%	67.1%	69.3%	30.7%
Students with disabilitie s	9.31%	12.6%	15.8%	19.0%	22.3%	25.5%	28.7%	32.0%	35.2%	38.5%	41.7%	44.9%	48.2%	51.4%	54.7%	45.4%
English Learner	8.4%	11.6%	14.9%	18.2%	21.5%	24.7%	28.0%	31.3%	34.5%	37.8%	41.1%	44.4%	47.6%	50.9%	54.2%	45.8%
Economically disadvantaged students	16.6%	19.6%	22.6%	25.6%	28.6%	31.5%	34.5%	37.5%	40.5%	43.4%	46.4%	49.4%	52.4%	55.3%	58.3%	41.7%

B. Graduation Rates

The table below presents
Annual Measurable Objectives - 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Subject Title	Student Group Subgroup	2011 Baseline	2012 2012	2013 2013	2014 2014	2015 2015	2016 2016	2017 2017	2018 2018	2019 2019	2020 2020
Grad. Rate	All Students	81.97	82.70	83.42	84.14	84.87	85.59	86.32	87.04	87.76	88.49
	American Indian	75.93	76.99	78.05	79.11	80.17	81.23	82.29	83.35	84.41	85.47
	Asian	93.04	93.15	93.25	93.36	93.47	93.58	93.69	93.80	93.91	94.02
	African American	74.02	75.18	76.35	77.51	78.68	79.85	81.01	82.18	83.34	84.51
	Hispanic/Latino	73.44	74.63	75.83	77.03	78.23	79.43	80.62	81.82	83.02	84.22
	Pacific Islander	90.24	90.51	90.77	91.04	91.30	91.57	91.83	92.09	92.36	92.62
	White	88.27	88.65	89.02	89.39	89.77	90.14	90.52	90.89	91.26	91.64
	Two or more Races	93.42	93.51	93.59	93.68	93.77	93.86	93.95	94.03	94.12	94.21
	Sp. Ed.	54.72	56.95	59.19	61.43	63.67	65.91	68.14	70.38	72.62	74.86
	EL	56.98	59.09	61.21	63.32	65.43	67.54	69.65	71.77	73.88	75.99
	FARMS	74.11	75.27	76.43	77.59	78.75	79.91	81.07	82.23	83.39	84.55

The table below presents
Annual Measurable Objectives - 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Subject	Student Group	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Grad.	All Students	84.57	85.15	85.72	86.30	86.88	87.46	88.04	88.62	89.20	89.78
	American Indian	78.01	78.95	79.90	80.84	81.78	82.73	83.67	84.62	85.56	86.50
	Asian	94.53	94.56	94.58	94.61	94.63	94.66	94.69	94.71	94.74	94.77
	African American	77.86	78.82	79.77	80.72	81.67	82.62	83.58	84.53	85.48	86.43
	Hispanic/Latino	78.15	79.09	80.02	80.96	81.90	82.83	83.77	84.70	85.64	86.58
	Pacific Islander	95.12	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00
	White	89.65	89.94	90.24	90.54	90.84	91.13	91.43	91.73	92.03	92.32
	Two or more	94.73	94.75	94.76	94.78	94.79	94.81	94.82	94.84	94.85	94.87
	Sp. Ed.	60.94	62.83	64.73	66.62	68.51	70.40	72.29	74.19	76.08	77.97
	EL	66.64	68.21	69.79	71.37	72.94	74.52	76.09	77.67	79.24	80.82
	FARMS	80.24	81.06	81.88	82.70	83.52	84.34	85.16	85.98	86.80	87.62

C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

Maryland data mirrors research and national trends regarding students at lower proficiency levels progressing more rapidly than students at a higher proficiency level. The review of actual trend data for Maryland's ELs informed the setting of the State's ambitious long-term goal and annual measurements of interim progress.

The annual measurements of interim progress are established through calculating the gap between the current performance, which is 48 percent of ELs achieving English proficiency in 6 years, and 100 percent of ELs reaching this long-term goal. This is a gap of 52 percent. The annual measurements of interim progress s are based upon reducing the gap by half, which is 26 percent. With a baseline of 48 percent combined with an additional 26 percent to decrease the gap by half, the final annual measurement of interim progress is established at 74 percent. An increase of 2 percent each year is needed in order to decrease the gap by 26 percent and meet the long-term goal of 74 percent over 13 years as shown in the Annual Measurements of Interim Progress table below.

Annual Measurements of Interim Progress

Year	Target in %
Baseline: 2016-17	48
2017-2018	50
2018-2019	52
2019-2020	54
2020-2021	56
2021-2022	58

2022-2023	60
2023-2024	62
2024-2025	64
2025-2026	66
2026-2027	68
2027-2028	70
2028-2029	72
2029-2030	74

Appendix B: General Education Provisions Act

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

(4) An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to and involve the families of LGBT students

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Public Law 103-382. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0005.

General Education Provisions Act Assurance Language

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) follows Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA). One of the major initiatives of the Department is to ensure equitable participation for all students in Maryland. This includes equitable access to, participation in, and appropriate educational opportunities for all individuals served. Federally funded activities, programs, and services will be accessible to all teachers, students, and program beneficiaries. The MSDE ensures equal access and participation to all persons regardless of their race, color, ethnicity, religion, national origin, age, citizenship status, disability, gender or sexual orientation.

The MSDE will enforce all federal and State laws around equitable participation, including regulations meant to overcome barriers. The MSDE will hold all local school systems accountable for ensuring equitable access and will require that the local school systems explain their methods for doing so as part of their application to the State for federal (and State) funds. This includes appropriate accommodations to meet the needs of all students, staff, community members, and other participants.

Specific strategies to ensure equitable access may include, but are not limited to:

- Printing materials in language(s) other than English;
- Professional Development on cultural differences and gender awareness;
- Fostering a positive school climate through restorative practices;
- Conducting outreach efforts in multiple modalities;
- Providing assistive technology devices when appropriate; and,
- Utilizing technology to increase communication and make programs more accessible.

SENATE BILL 871

By: Senator Zucker
Introduced and read first time: February 3, 2017
Assigned to: Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs

Committee Report: Favorable with amendments
Senate action: Adopted with floor amendments
Read second time: March 24, 2017

CHAPTER _____

1   AN ACT concerning

2   **Education – Accountability – Consolidated State Plan and Support and**
3   **Improvement Plans**
4   **(Protect Our Schools Act of 2017)**

5   FOR the purpose of requiring a certain educational accountability program to include at
6   least a certain number of school quality indicators; requiring one of the school quality
7   indicators to be a certain school climate survey; authorizing certain school quality
8   indicators to include certain factors; prohibiting certain school quality indicators
9   from being based on student testing, subject to a certain exception; ~~requiring that~~
10   ~~certain indicators be given equal weight under certain circumstances; prohibiting a~~
11   ~~certain total of certain indicators from exceeding a certain percentage of a certain~~
12   ~~score~~ requiring the State Board of Education to establish a certain composite score
13   that provides for certain differentiation; requiring a certain composite score to
14   include certain indicators and incorporate a certain methodology; prohibiting a
15   certain total of academic indicators from exceeding a certain percentage of a
16   composite score; requiring a certain composite score to be calculated in a certain
17   manner; prohibiting a certain composite score from being reported in a certain
18   format; prohibiting certain indicators from being weighted in a certain manner;
19   specifying that the final weights of certain indicators, subject to certain provisions of
20   law, are determined by the State Board, with certain stakeholder input; requiring a
21   certain academic indicator to be a certain measure; requiring a county board of
22   education to develop and implement a Comprehensive Support and Improvement
23   Plan for certain schools under certain circumstances; providing for the content and
24   requirements of a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plan; requiring a
25   school to develop and implement a Targeted Support and Improvement Plan for

EXPLANATION: CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW.
    [Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.
    Underlining indicates amendments to bill.
    ~~Strike out~~ indicates matter stricken from the bill by amendment or deleted from the law by
    amendment.

1   certain schools under certain circumstances; providing for the content and
2   requirements of a Targeted Support and Improvement Plan; requiring certain
3   entities to approve, monitor, and annually review a certain plan; requiring a plan to
4   be implemented in compliance with certain collective bargaining agreements;
5   requiring the State Department of Education to distribute federal funds for the
6   implementation of a certain plan in a certain manner; requiring a county board, after
7   a certain time period, to consult with a school to develop certain strategies under
8   certain circumstances; <u>authorizing a certain plan to include a lengthening of the</u>
9   <u>school year, notwithstanding certain laws, regulations, or executive orders;</u> requiring
10 the Department, after a certain time period, to collaborate with a certain county
11 board in determining the appropriate intervention strategy under certain
12 circumstances, subject to certain limitations; <u>specifying that a certain decision of the</u>
13 <u>Department is final;</u> providing for the construction of certain provisions of this Act;
14 and generally relating to education accountability plans.

15 BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments,
16   Article – Education
17   Section 7–203
18   Annotated Code of Maryland
19   (2014 Replacement Volume and 2016 Supplement)

20 BY adding to
21   Article – Education
22   Section 7–203.4
23   Annotated Code of Maryland
24   (2014 Replacement Volume and 2016 Supplement)

25   Preamble

26   WHEREAS, All students in the State should have a fair, equal, and significant
27 opportunity to obtain a high–quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on
28 challenging State academic achievement standards and State academic assessments; and

29   WHEREAS, The State should focus on closing the achievement gaps between
30 high– and low–performing students and minority and nonminority students; and

31   WHEREAS, Parents and students should hold schools, county boards of education,
32 and the State accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students, and
33 identifying and improving low–performing schools to provide a high–quality education;
34 now, therefore,

35   SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND,
36 That the Laws of Maryland read as follows:

37   **Article – Education**

38 7–203.

1   (a)   **(1)**   The State Board, the State Superintendent, each county board, and
2   each public school shall implement a program of education accountability for the operation
3   and management of the public schools.

4   **(2)**   A CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN TO IMPROVE STUDENT OUTCOMES
5   SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
6   EDUCATION UNDER THE FEDERAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
7   SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SUBTITLE.

8   (b)   (1)   In this subsection, "grade band assessment" means one assessment of
9   a middle school student's knowledge in a core academic subject area during grades 6
10   through 8.

11   (2)   The education accountability program shall include the following:

12   (i)   The State Board and the State Superintendent shall assist each
13   county board to establish educational goals and objectives that conform with statewide
14   educational objectives for subject areas including reading, writing, mathematics, science,
15   and social studies;

16   (ii)   With the assistance of its county board, each public school shall
17   survey current student achievement in reading, language, mathematics, science, social
18   studies, and other areas to assess its needs;

19   (iii)   1.   The State Board and the State Superintendent shall
20   implement assessment programs in reading, language, mathematics, science, and social
21   studies that include written responses;

22   2.   The assessment program required in this subsection shall:

23   A.   Provide information needed to improve public schools by
24   enhancing the learning gains of students and academic mastery of the skills and knowledge
25   set forth in the State's adopted curricula or common core curricula;

26   B.   Inform the public annually of the educational progress
27   made at the school, local school system, and State levels; and

28   C.   Provide timely feedback to schools and teachers for the
29   purposes of adapting the instructional program and making placement decisions for
30   students; and

31   3.   Beginning in the 2014–2015 school year, the following
32   assessments shall be implemented and administered annually:

33   A.   At the middle school level, a statewide, comprehensive,
34   grade band assessment program that measures the learning gains of each public school

1 student towards achieving mastery of the standards set forth in the common core curricula
2 or the State's adopted curricula for the core content areas of reading, language,
3 mathematics, science, and social studies; and

4   B.   At the high school level, a statewide, standardized,
5 end–of–course assessment that is aligned with and that measures each public school
6 student's skills and knowledge of the State's adopted curricula for the core content areas of
7 reading, language, mathematics, science, and social studies;

8   (iv)   Each public school shall establish as the basis for its assessment
9 of its needs, project goals and objectives that are in keeping with the goals and objectives
10 established by its county board and the State Board;

11   (v)   With the assistance of its county board, the State Board, and the
12 State Superintendent, each public school shall develop programs to meet its needs on the
13 basis of the priorities it sets;

14   (vi)   Evaluation programs shall be developed at the same time to
15 determine if the goals and objectives are being met; and

16   (vii)   A reevaluation of programs, goals, and objectives shall be
17 undertaken regularly.

18   (3)   (i)   After the 2014–2015 school year, the State Board shall determine
19 whether the assessments at the middle school and high school levels required under
20 paragraph (2)(iii)3 of this subsection adequately measure the skills and knowledge set forth
21 in the State's adopted curricula for the core content areas of reading, language,
22 mathematics, science, and social studies.

23   (ii)   If the State Board makes a determination under subparagraph
24 (i) of this paragraph that an assessment does not adequately measure the skills and
25 knowledge set forth in the State's adopted curricula for a core content area, the Department
26 shall develop a State–specific assessment in that core content area to be implemented in
27 the 2018–2019 school year.

28   (c)   **(1)**   National standardized testing may not be the only measure for
29 evaluating educational accountability.

30   **(2)   (I)**   AN EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM SHALL
31 INCLUDE AT LEAST THREE SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS THAT MEASURE THE
32 COMPARATIVE OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED TO STUDENTS OR THE LEVEL OF
33 STUDENT SUCCESS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

34   **(II)   1.**   ONE OF THE SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS UNDER
35 SUBPARAGRAPH (I) OF THIS PARAGRAPH SHALL BE SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEYS.

1   2.   THE SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEYS SHALL INCLUDE AT
2 LEAST ONE ~~OR MORE QUESTIONS~~ QUESTION TO EDUCATORS REGARDING THE
3 RECEIPT OF CRITICAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEEDBACK.

4   ~~(II)~~ (III)   ~~SCHOOL~~ OTHER SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS MAY
5 INCLUDE:

6   ~~1. FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS:~~

7   ~~A.~~ 1. CLASS SIZE;

8   ~~B.~~ 2. CASE LOAD;

9   ~~C.~~ 3. ~~SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEYS~~ ACCESS TO OR CREDIT
10 ~~FOR COMPLETION OF A WELL-ROUNDED CURRICULUM BY THE END OF NINTH~~
11 ~~GRADE, INCLUDING MATHEMATICS, ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, SCIENCE, SOCIAL~~
12 ~~STUDIES, AND RELATED ARTS;~~

13   ~~D. 4.~~ 3.   OPPORTUNITIES ~~TO ENROLL IN ADVANCED~~
14 ~~PLACEMENT COURSES AND INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS;~~

15   ~~E.~~   ~~OPPORTUNITIES FOR DUAL ENROLLMENT;~~

16   ~~F.~~   ~~OPPORTUNITIES TO ENROLL IN CAREER AND~~
17 ~~TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAMS; AND~~

18   ~~G.~~   ~~OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDUSTRY CERTIFICATION;~~
19 ~~AND~~

20   ~~2. FOR ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS:~~

21   ~~A. CLASS SIZE;~~

22   ~~B. CASE LOAD;~~

23   ~~C. CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM; AND~~

24   ~~D. SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEYS.~~ FOR:

25   A. ADVANCED PLACEMENT COURSES AND
26 INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS;

27   B. CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAMS;
28 AND

C.   DUAL ENROLLMENT;

~~5.~~ 4.   CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM;

~~4.~~ 5.   DATA ON DISCIPLINE AND RESTORATIVE PRACTICES; AND

~~7.~~ 6.   ACCESS TO TEACHERS WHO HOLD AN ADVANCED PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE OR HAVE OBTAINED NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION.

~~(III)~~ (IV)   ~~THE EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN ITEM (III)3 OF THIS PARAGRAPH, THE~~ THE SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS USED IN SUBPARAGRAPH (I) OF THIS PARAGRAPH MAY NOT BE BASED ON STUDENT TESTING.

~~(IV)~~ (V)   1.   ~~BOTH ACADEMIC INDICATORS AND SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS SHALL BE GIVEN EQUAL WEIGHT IN REPORTING INTERIM PROGRESS TOWARD THE STATE BOARD'S GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.~~

~~2.~~   ~~THE COMBINED TOTAL OF THE ACADEMIC INDICATORS MAY NOT EXCEED 51% OF THE COMPOSITE SCORE~~ THE STATE BOARD SHALL ESTABLISH A COMPOSITE SCORE THAT PROVIDES FOR MEANINGFUL DIFFERENTIATION OF SCHOOLS UNDER THE SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.

2.   THE COMPOSITE SCORE ESTABLISHED UNDER SUBSUBPARAGRAPH 1 OF THIS SUBPARAGRAPH SHALL:

A.   INCLUDE BOTH ACADEMIC AND SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS; AND

B.   INCORPORATE A METHODOLOGY THAT COMPARES SCHOOLS THAT SHARE SIMILAR DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, INCLUDING THE PROPORTION OF ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS, AS DEFINED BY THE STATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH FEDERAL LAW; AND

C.   BE REPORTED IN A MANNER THAT STATES FOR EACH SCORE THE INDIVIDUAL INDICATOR SCORE THAT IS USED TO CALCULATE THE COMPOSITE SCORE FOR EACH SCHOOL.

3.   THE COMBINED TOTAL OF THE ACADEMIC INDICATORS MAY NOT EXCEED ~~55%~~ 65% OF THE COMPOSITE SCORE.

4.   THE COMPOSITE SCORE:

100

1   **A.**   S~~HALL~~ ~~BE~~ ~~CALCULATED~~ ~~NUMERICALLY~~ ~~IN~~ ~~A~~
2 ~~PERCENTILE FORM; AND~~

3   **B.**   M~~AY~~ ~~NOT~~ ~~BE~~ ~~REPORTED~~ ~~USING~~ ~~A~~ ~~LETTER~~ ~~GRADE~~
4 ~~MODEL.~~

5   **5.**   N~~O ACADEMIC INDICATOR MAY BE WEIGHTED AS LESS~~
6 ~~THAN 10% OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE COMPOSITE SCORE.~~

7   **6.**   N~~O SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATOR DESCRIBED UNDER~~
8 ~~SUBSECTION (C)(2) OF THIS SECTION MAY BE WEIGHTED AS LESS THAN 10% OF THE~~
9 ~~TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE COMPOSITE SCORE.~~

10   **7.**   S~~UBJECT~~ ~~TO~~ ~~THIS~~ ~~SUBSUBPARAGRAPH~~
11 ~~SUBPARAGRAPH, THE FINAL WEIGHTS OF THE ACADEMIC AND SCHOOL QUALITY~~
12 ~~INDICATORS SHALL BE DETERMINED BY THE STATE BOARD, WITH STAKEHOLDER~~
13 ~~INPUT.~~

14   **(VI)** O~~F THE ACADEMIC INDICATORS ESTABLISHED BY THE~~
15 ~~STATE BOARD UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (V) OF THIS PARAGRAPH, ONE SHALL BE~~
16 ~~ACCESS TO OR CREDIT FOR COMPLETION OF A WELL–ROUNDED CURRICULUM THAT~~
17 ~~IS INDICATIVE OF ON–TRACK PROGRESS AT KEY TRANSITION POINTS WITHIN~~
18 ~~ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION.~~

19   (d)   The Department shall assist each county board to establish an education
20 accountability program by providing:

21   (1)   Guidelines for development and implementation of the program by the
22 county boards; and

23   (2)   Assistance and coordination where it is needed and requested by the
24 county boards.

25   (e)   (1)   The Department shall survey a statewide, representative sample of
26 public schools and public school teachers annually to measure:

27   (i)   The amount of instructional time spent on social studies and
28 science instruction in elementary schools;

29   (ii)   The availability and use of appropriate instructional resources
30 and teaching technology in social studies and science classrooms;

31   (iii)   The availability and use of appropriate professional development
32 for social studies and science teachers; and

1   (iv)   The number of secondary school social studies and science classes
2   that are taught by teachers who are:

3   1.   Certified in the subject being taught; and

4   2.   Not certified in the subject being taught.

5   (2)   The Department shall:

6   (i)   Compile the results of the survey conducted under paragraph (1)
7   of this subsection; and

8   (ii)   Publish the results on the Department's Web site.

9   (f)   The State Superintendent shall send the Governor and, subject to § 2–1246 of
10   the State Government Article, the General Assembly a report each January that includes:

11   (1)   Documentation of the progress of the Department, the county boards,
12   and each public school in this State towards their respective goals and objectives; and

13   (2)   Recommendations for legislation that the State Board and the State
14   Superintendent consider necessary to improve the quality of education in this State.

15   (g)   On the recommendation of the State Superintendent, the State Board shall
16   include in its annual budget request the funds it considers necessary to carry out the
17   provisions of this section.

18   **7–203.4.**

19   (A)   (1)   FOR EACH PUBLIC SCHOOL IDENTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT
20   FOR COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT, THE COUNTY BOARD SHALL
21   DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN
22   TO IMPROVE STUDENT OUTCOMES AT THE SCHOOL.

23   (2)   THE PLAN DEVELOPED UNDER PARAGRAPH (1) OF THIS
24   SUBSECTION SHALL:

25   (I)   BE DEVELOPED IN CONSULTATION WITH PRINCIPALS,
26   PARENTS, LOCAL COMMUNITY ~~MEMBERS~~ LEADERS, LOCAL EMPLOYER LEADERS,
27   LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEADERS, TEACHERS, SCHOOL STAFF, AND THE EXCLUSIVE
28   BARGAINING REPRESENTATIVE;

29   (II)   INCLUDE THE SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS DESCRIBED
30   UNDER § 7–203(C) OF THIS SUBTITLE;

31   (III)   INCLUDE EVIDENCE–BASED INTERVENTIONS;

1   (IV)   BE BASED ON SCHOOL–LEVEL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS; AND

2   (V)   IDENTIFY RESOURCE INEQUITIES AND BUDGETARY NEEDS.

3   (3)   THE SCHOOL ~~AND THE~~, COUNTY BOARD, AND THE DEPARTMENT
4 SHALL APPROVE THE PLAN.

5   (4)   THE DEPARTMENT SHALL MONITOR AND ANNUALLY REVIEW THE
6 PLAN.

7   (B)   (1)   FOR EACH PUBLIC SCHOOL IDENTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT
8 FOR TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT, THE SCHOOL SHALL DEVELOP AND
9 IMPLEMENT A TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN TO IMPROVE
10 STUDENT OUTCOMES AT THE SCHOOL.

11   (2)   THE PLAN DEVELOPED UNDER PARAGRAPH (1) OF THIS
12 SUBSECTION SHALL MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF SUBSECTION (A)(2) ~~AND (3)~~ OF
13 THIS SECTION.

14   (3)   THE COUNTY BOARD SHALL MONITOR AND ANNUALLY REVIEW
15 THE PLAN.

16   (C)   PLANS DEVELOPED UNDER SUBSECTIONS (A)(1) AND (B)(1) OF THIS
17 SECTION SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING COLLECTIVE
18 BARGAINING AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE COUNTY BOARD AND THE EXCLUSIVE
19 BARGAINING REPRESENTATIVE.

20   (D)   THE DEPARTMENT SHALL DISTRIBUTE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE
21 IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANS DEVELOPED UNDER SUBSECTIONS (A)(1) AND (B)(1) OF
22 THIS SECTION BASED ON A FORMULA AND DRIVEN BY THE IDENTIFIED NEEDS OF
23 EACH SCHOOL IDENTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT.

24   (E)   (1)   AFTER A 2–YEAR PERIOD FROM THE DATE OF A PLAN'S
25 IMPLEMENTATION UNDER SUBSECTIONS (A)(1) AND (B)(1) OF THIS SECTION, IF A
26 COUNTY BOARD DETERMINES THAT STUDENT OUTCOMES HAVE NOT IMPROVED AT A
27 PUBLIC SCHOOL, THE COUNTY BOARD SHALL CONSULT WITH THE SCHOOL TO
28 DEVELOP ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES AND INTERVENTIONS INCLUDING FUNDING,
29 COMMUNITY SUPPORTS, AND GRANTS PROVIDED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL
30 OPPORTUNITIES ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

31   (2)   NOTWITHSTANDING ANY LAW, REGULATION, OR EXECUTIVE
32 ORDER, A PLAN UNDER THIS SECTION MAY INCLUDE A LENGTHENING OF THE
33 SCHOOL YEAR BEYOND 180 DAYS OR ANY OTHER LIMITATION.

1   ~~(2)~~ (3)   NOTHING IN THIS SUBSECTION SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO
2   AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT TO REQUIRE A COUNTY BOARD TO IMPLEMENT A
3   SPECIFIC INTERVENTION STRATEGY.

4   (F)   (1)   AFTER A 3–YEAR PERIOD FROM THE DATE OF A PLAN'S
5   IMPLEMENTATION UNDER SUBSECTIONS (A)(1) AND (B)(1) OF THIS SECTION, IF THE
6   DEPARTMENT DETERMINES THAT STUDENT OUTCOMES HAVE NOT IMPROVED AT A
7   PUBLIC SCHOOL AND INTERVENTION IS NECESSARY, THE DEPARTMENT SHALL
8   COLLABORATE WITH THE COUNTY BOARD IN DETERMINING THE APPROPRIATE
9   INTERVENTION STRATEGY, SUBJECT TO EXISTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
10 AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE COUNTY BOARD AND THE EXCLUSIVE BARGAINING
11 REPRESENTATIVE.

12   (2)   AN INTERVENTION STRATEGY DETERMINED UNDER PARAGRAPH
13 (1) OF THIS SUBSECTION MAY NOT INCLUDE:

14   (I)   CREATING A STATE–RUN SCHOOL DISTRICT;

15   (II)   CREATING A LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM IN ADDITION TO THE
16 24 SCHOOL SYSTEMS ESTABLISHED IN THIS ARTICLE;

17   (III) CONVERTING OR CREATING A NEW PUBLIC SCHOOL
18 WITHOUT LOCAL BOARD APPROVAL;

19   ~~(II)   CONVERTING A PUBLIC SCHOOL TO A CHARTER SCHOOL;~~

20   ~~(III)~~ (IV)   ISSUING SCHOLARSHIPS TO PUBLIC SCHOOL
21 STUDENTS TO ATTEND NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS THROUGH DIRECT VOUCHERS, TAX
22 CREDIT PROGRAMS, OR EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS; AND

23   ~~(IV)~~ (V)   CONTRACTING WITH A FOR–PROFIT COMPANY.

24   (3)   A DECISION OF THE DEPARTMENT UNDER THIS SUBSECTION IS
25 FINAL.

26   SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect July
27 1, 2017.

Appendix D: Maryland's Accountability Framework

Maryland Accountability Program: A Framework of Indicators
Elementary Schools

Academic Achievement

20%	Performance Composite for English/Language Arts and Math

Academic Progress

25%	Growth for English/Language Arts and Math

10%	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum

65%

English Language Proficiency

10%	Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

School Quality/Student Success

15%	Chronic Absenteeism

10%	Survey

| 10%	Opportunities/Access to a well-rounded curriculum

35%

Maryland Accountability Program: A Framework of Indicators
Middle Schools

Draft v6

Academic Achievement	**20%** Performance Composite for English/Language Arts and Math	
Academic Progress	**25%** Growth for English/Language Arts and Math	**65%**
	10% Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum	
English Language Proficiency	**10%** Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
School Quality/Student Success	**15%** Chronic Absenteeism	**35%**
	10% Survey	
	10% Opportunities/Access to a well-rounded curriculum	

Maryland Accountability Program: A Framework of Indicators
High Schools

Draft v7

Academic Achievement	**30%** — Performance Composite for English/Language Arts and Math	
Graduation Rate	**15%** — Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Composite	**65%**
English Language Proficiency	**10%** — Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Readiness For Postsecondary Success	**5%** — On-Track in 9th Grade **5%** — Credit for Completion of a Well-Rounded Curriculum	
School Quality/Student Success	**15%** — Chronic Absenteeism **10%** — Survey **10%** — Opportunities/Access to a well-rounded curriculum	**35%**

INDICATOR	MEASURE	COMPONENTS		DEFINITION
		Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	
a. Academic Achievement	Achievement composite: 20%	Math achievement: 10 points ELA achievement: 10 points		Half of a school's score on this indicator will be the percentage of students performing at the "met expectations" (4) or "exceeded expectations" (5) levels on PARCC assessments, or the equivalent on MSAA (level (3) or (4) out of a possible four levels). Half will be a performance index, equal to the average of student performance levels on PARCC assessments (or the equivalent on MSAA). The proficiency rate and performance index will be standardized so they are on a comparable scale. This measure will be calculated and reported separately for ELA and mathematics with ELA and mathematics equally weighted
b. Other Academic	Academic growth: 25%	Math growth: 12.5 points ELA growth: 12.5 points		Median student growth percentile (SGP) in ELA and mathematics. Maryland will monitor SGP to ensure precision and reliability and adjust as necessary. Beginning in 2017-18, Maryland will study a growth-to-standard measure for reporting and inclusion in the accountability system, in combination with SGP. The MSDE will also provide information on the impact of such a measure. The State Board will then revisit growth-to-standard for inclusion in the accountability system. The anticipated timeline for study and determination of feasibility is three years. This measure will be calculated and reported separately for ELA and mathematics.
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum: 10%	Science achievement: 5 points Percent of 5th grade students passing "core" coursework: 5 points	Science achievement: 3.5 points Social studies achievement: 3.5 points Percent of 8th grade students passing "core" coursework: 3 points	Elementary: Composite measure comprising: percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Integrated Science assessment (MISA), MISA was field tested with fifth graders in 2016-17 and is anticipated to be available for inclusion in the accountability system in 2018-19 (until MISA scores are available, this component will be removed from both the numerator and denominator of the accountability system) and percent of 5th grade students passing one each of coursework in social studies, fine arts, physical education, and health. ("Passing" means that students earn a non-failing grade, which means that they meet the standards for the course.) In addition, Early Childhood Education is a priority for the State Board

				and State Superintendent of Schools. The MSDE will identify gauges for kindergarten readiness and academic growth through grade 3, to be deployed no later than school year 2018-2019, and incorporated into the ESSA accountability system in this measure as rapidly as feasible with the weights of the measures revised accordingly. Middle: Composite measure comprising: percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (MISA), MISA was field tested with eighth graders in 2016-17 and is anticipated to be available for inclusion in the accountability system in 2018-19; percent of students scoring proficient on the Middle School Social Studies Assessment (MSSA), MSSA will be field tested in 2018-19 and is anticipated to be available for inclusion in the accountability system in 2020-21; and the percent of 8th grade students passing one each of coursework in mathematics, ELA, social studies, and science. ("Passing" means that students earn a non-failing grade, which means that they meet the standards for the course.) Until MISA and MSSA scores are available, these components will be removed from both the numerator and denominator of the accountability system.
c. Progress in Achieving ELP	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	Percent of students making progress towards attaining English Language proficiency: 10 points		Percentage of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS 2.0 assessment for English language learners. Based upon an analysis of data and multiple models with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), LEA and MSDE assessment and EL specialists, Maryland will use a proficiency level growth-to-target model with a target of proficiency within a maximum of six years (including a baseline year) and accounting for an appropriate trajectory of language acquisition.
e. School Quality or Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15%	Percent of students chronically absent: 15 points		The number of students absent 10 percent or more school days during the school year in membership at least ten days. This measure would be applied to all grades, in response to research on the impact of absenteeism and the importance of minimizing lost instructional time.
	School climate: 10%	Climate measure: 10 points		Aggregate measure of school climate survey of students, educators, and parents. Per Maryland statute (SB0871/ "Protect Our Schools Act of 2017"), the survey will include at least one question to educators regarding the receipt of critical instructional feedback. The MSDE is

				currently collaborating with REL-Mid Atlantic and Mathematica to develop the appropriate survey instrument.
	Access to a well-rounded curriculum: 10%	Percent of 5th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points	Percent of 8th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points	Elementary: Percent of 5th grade students enrolled in science, social studies, fine arts, physical education, and health. Middle: Percent of 8th grade students enrolled in fine arts, physical education, health, and computational learning.

INDICATOR	MEASURE	COMPONENTS	DEFINITION
		High Schools	
a. Academic Achievement	Achievement composite: 30%	Math achievement: 15 points ELA achievement: 15 points	Half of a school's score on this indicator will be the percentage of students performing at the "met expectations" (4) or "exceeded expectations" (5) levels on PARCC assessments, or the equivalent on MSAA (level (3) or (4) out of a possible four levels). Half will be a performance index, equal to the average of student performance levels on PARCC assessments (or the equivalent on MSAA). This measure will be calculated and reported separately for ELA and mathematics, with ELA and mathematics equally weighted.
c. Graduation Rate	Graduation composite: 15%	Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate: 10 points Five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate: 5 points	Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate: Percent of a school's cohort of first-time 9th grade students in a particular school year, adjusted for students who transfer in or out of the cohort after 9th grade, who graduate within four years. Five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate: Percent of a school's cohort of first-time 9th grade students in a particular school year, adjusted for students who transfer in or out of the cohort after 9th grade, who graduate within five years.
d. Progress in Achieving ELP	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	Percent of students making progress towards attaining English Language proficiency: 10 points	Percentage of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS 2.0 assessment for English language learners. Based upon an analysis of data and multiple models with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), LEA and MSDE assessment and EL specialists, Maryland will use a proficiency level growth-to-target model with a target of proficiency within a maximum of six years (including a baseline year) and accounting for an appropriate trajectory of language acquisition.

e. School Quality or Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15%	Percent of students chronically absent: 15 points	The number of students absent 10 percent or more school days during the school year in membership at least ten days. This measure would be applied to all grades, in response to research on the impact of absenteeism and the importance of minimizing lost instructional time.
	School climate: 10%	Climate measure: 10 points	Aggregate measure of school climate survey of students, educators, and parents. Per Maryland statute (SB0871/ "Protect Our Schools Act of 2017"), the survey will include at least one question to educators regarding the receipt of critical instructional feedback. The MSDE is currently collaborating with REL-Mid Atlantic and Mathematica to develop the appropriate survey instrument.
	Access to a well-rounded curriculum: 10%	Percent of students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum upon graduation: 10 points	High schools: Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of program completion: enrolled in an Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) course; participating in dual enrollment; or enrolled in an MSDE-approved Career and Technical Education program at the CTE concentrator level or higher.; For students pursuing a certificate of program completion- enrollment in a general education core academic and/or elective course.
f. Readiness for Post-Secondary Success	On-track in 9th grade: 5%	Percent of 9th grade students passing "core" coursework: 5 points	Percent of 9th grade students earning at least four credits in any of: mathematics, ELA, science, social studies, and/or world language.
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum: 5%	Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of completion and achieving at least one measure of readiness for postsecondary success: 5 points	Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of program completion and achieving at least one of the following: - score 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement (AP) examination, or 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate (IB) Program examination; - met a standard set by the College Board on the SAT examination (score of 530 or higher (math) and 480 or higher (reading)); - met a standard set by ACT, Inc. on the ACT examination (score of 21); - earned credit for dual enrollment; - met the University of Maryland entry requirements; - - completed a youth or other apprenticeship training program approved by the Maryland Apprenticeship Training Council; - completed an industry certification aligned with an MSDE-approved CTE program and achieved CTE concentrator level status or higher; - completed an MSDE-approved Career and Technology Education program; - met a standard on the ASVAB examination (standard to be determined pending study); - received The Seal of Biliteracy; or,

			- Students obtaining a Maryland High School Certificate of Program Completion: Entered the world of work through gainful employment; post-secondary education and training; supported employment; and/or other services that are integrated in the community.

Maryland Accountability Program: A Framework of Indicators and Measures Elementary Schools				
Indicator	**Description**	**Weight of Indicator**	**Measures**	**Weight of Measures**
Academic Achievement	Performance Composite for English/Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics	20%	Proficiency – percent of students receiving a 4 or higher on PARCC or 3 or higher on the Multi State Alternative Assessment (MSAA)	10% (calculated 5% for ELA; 5% for Math)
			Average of student performance levels on PARCC (or MSAA) assessments	10% (calculated 5% for ELA; 5% for Math)
Other Academic Indicator (Academic Progress)	Growth For English/Language Arts and Math	25%	Median student growth percentile (SGP) in ELA and Math; beginning in 2017-2018, MD will study a growth-to-standards measure for combination with the SGP. The MSDE will also provide information on the impact of such a measure. The State Board will then revisit growth-to-standard for inclusion in the accountability system.	12.5% for ELA
				12.5% for Math
	Credit for Completion of a well-rounded curriculum	10%	Percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (MISA) – Field tested with Maryland fifth graders in 2016-2017; will include as an accountability measure once scores are available (anticipated in 2018-2019)	5%
			Percent of 5th grade students passing one each of coursework in Social Studies, Fine Arts, Physical Education and Health. ("Passing" means that students earn a non-failing grade, which means that they meet the standards for the course.)	5%
	K-3 Progress		In addition, Early Childhood Education is a priority for the State Board and State Superintendent of Schools. The MSDE will identify gauges for kindergarten readiness and academic growth through grade 3, to be deployed no later than school year 2018-2019, and incorporated into the ESSA accountability system in this measure as rapidly as feasible with the weights of the measures revised accordingly.	
English Language Proficiency	Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	10%	Percentage of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS assessment for English language learners	10%
School Quality/Student Success	Chronic Absenteeism	15%	The number of students absent 10 percent or more school days during the school year in membership at least ten days.	15%
	Survey	10%	Aggregate measure of school climate survey of students, educators, and parents	10%
	Opportunities/Access to a well-rounded	10%	Percent of 5th grade students enrolled in: Science, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Physical Education, **and** Health	10%

			curriculum		

Maryland Accountability Program: A Framework of Indicators and Measures Middle Schools					
Indicator	**Description**	**Weight of Indicator**	**Measures**		**Weight of Measures**
Academic Achievement	Performance Composite for English/Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics	20%	Proficiency – percent of students receiving a 4 or higher on PARCC or 3 or higher on the Multi-State Alternative Assessment (MSAA)		10% (calculated 5% for ELA; 5% for Math)
			Average of student performance levels on PARCC (or MSAA) assessments		10% (calculated 5% for ELA; 5% for Math)
Other Academic Indicator (Academic Progress)	Growth For English/Language Arts and Mathematics	25%	Median student growth percentile (SGP) in ELA and Math; beginning in 2017-2018, MD will study a growth-to-standards measure for combination with the SGP. The MSDE will also provide information on the impact of such a measure. The State Board will then revisit growth-to-standard for inclusion in the accountability system.		12.5% for ELA
					12.5% for Math
	Credit for Completion of a Well-Rounded Curriculum	10%	Percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (MISA) – Field tested with Maryland eighth graders in 2016-2017; will include as an accountability measure once scores are available (anticipated in 2018-2019)		3.5%
			Percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Social Studies Assessment – Field tested in 2018-2019; will include as an accountability measure once scores are available (anticipated in 2020-2021)		3.5%
			Percent of students passing all ELA, Math, Social Studies and Science courses in 8th grade. ("Passing" means that students earn a non-failing grade, which means that they meet the standards for the course.)		3.0%
English Language Proficiency	Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	10%	Percentage of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS assessment for English language learners		10%
School Quality/Student Success	Chronic Absenteeism	15%	The number of students absent 10 percent or more school days during the school year in membership at least ten days.		15%
	Survey	10%	Aggregate measure of school climate survey of students, educators, and parents		10%
	Opportunities/Access to a well-rounded curriculum	10%	Percent of 8th grade students enrolled in: Fine Arts, Physical Education, Health, and Computational Learning.		10%

Maryland Accountability Program: A Framework of Indicators and Measures High Schools				
Indicator	**Description**	**Weight of Indicator**	**Measures**	**Weight of Measures**
Academic Achievement	Performance Composite for English/Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics	30%	Proficiency – percent of students receiving a 4 or higher on PARCC or 3 or higher on the Multi-State Alternative Assessment (MSAA)	15% (calculated 7.5% for ELA; 7.5% for Math)
			Average of student performance levels on PARCC (or MSAA) assessments	15% (calculated 7.5% for ELA; 7.5% for Math)
Graduation Rate	Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Composite	15%	Percent of a school's cohort of first-time 9th grade students in a particular school year adjusted for students who transfer in or out of the cohort after 9th grade who graduate within **four** years	10%
			Percent of a school's cohort of first-time 9th grade students in a particular school year adjusted for students who transfer in or out of the cohort after 9th grade who graduate within **five** years.	5%
English Language Proficiency	Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	10%	Percentage of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS assessment for English language learners	10%
Readiness for Postsecondary Success	On-Track 9th grade	5%	Percent of 9th grade students, earning at least four credits in any of: ELA, mathematics, science, social studies or world language	5%
	Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum	5%	Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of program completion and achieving at least one of the following: • Score of 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement examination or 4 or higher on	5%

			an International Baccalaureate Program examination • Met a standard set by the College Board on the SAT (480 or higher on reading; 530 or higher on Math) • Met a standard set by ACT on the ACT examination (score of 21) • Earned Credit for Dual Enrollment • Met the University of Maryland entry requirements • completed a youth or other apprenticeship training program approved by the Maryland Apprenticeship Training Council; • completed an industry certification aligned with an MSDE-approved CTE program and achieved CTE concentrator level status or higher; • completed an MSDE-approved Career and Technology Education program; • Met a standard on the ASVAB examination (standard to be determined pending study) • Received The Seal of Biliteracy; or • Students obtaining a MD High School Certificate of Program Completion: Entered the world of work through gainful employment; post-secondary education and training; support employment; and/or other services that are integrated in the community	
School Quality/Student Success	Chronic Absenteeism	15%	The number of students absent 10 percent or more school days during the school year in membership at least ten days	15%
	Survey	10%	Aggregate measure of school climate survey of students, educators, and parents	10%
	Opportunities/Access to a well-rounded curriculum	10%	Percent of students graduating or exiting with a certificate of program completion: enrolled in an Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) course; participated in dual enrollment; or enrolled in an MSDE-approved Career and Technical Education program at the CTE concentrator level or higher. For students pursuing a certificate of program completion: enrollment in a general education core academic and/or elective course.	10%

Appendix E: Maryland's Family Engagement Plan

Family engagement is the shared responsibility of families, schools, and communities to support student learning and achievement, continuous from birth through the school-age years (age 21). It occurs across various settings wherever children learn--in the home, early childhood settings, schools, public libraries, out-of-school time programs, faith-based institutions, and community programs and activities. Family engagement includes building relationships with families that support the family and student's well-being; sustaining strong parent–child relationships; and providing opportunities for ongoing learning and development of both parents and children. As a shared responsibility, early childhood providers, schools, out-of-school time programs, libraries, and other community agencies and organizations are committed to engaging families in meaningful and culturally respectful ways and supporting them as they actively engage in their children's learning and development.

Within the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), five Divisions have direct responsibilities for providing training, support, technical assistance, and outreach to stakeholders as they relate to family and community engagement. Divisions include: Curriculum, Research, Assessment, and Accountability (DCRAA); Early Childhood Development (DECD); Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS); School Effectiveness/Office of School and Community Nutrition Programs (DOSE/OSCNP); and Student, Family, and School Support (DOSFSS). To support this effort, these Divisions will collaborate to work together on family engagement strategies. Additionally, this collaboration will offer coordinated, efforts and opportunities to share resources to ensure that families and educators alike have access to resources that prepare students to succeed in college, careers, and life.

Federal regulations under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) require outreach to families as it relates to the development of state, local, and school level plans. All Title I local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools, under Section 1116 (Parent and Family Engagement), must conduct outreach to all parents and family members, and implement programs, activities, and procedures to support the involvement of parents and family members in programs. Similarly, LEAs receiving Title III funds must provide parent, family, and community engagement activities that may include strategies that serve to coordinate and align related programs, such as:
- The development of parent and family engagement policies/plans addressing meaningful consultation with parents and family members;
- Coordination with federal, state, and local programs;
- Meaningful and effective outreach to parents and family members; and,
- Building capacity of teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, and family members to work together in partnership.

In addition, early childhood programs, out-of-school time programs, LEAs, and schools must be intentional about providing information, reports, and data in a format and language that parents can easily interpret and understand, as well as ensuring opportunities for the involvement of parents and family members whose first language is not English; who may have a child or they themselves may have a disability; who may be migratory; or who may be a family that is part of the foster care system, involved with children who are neglected, delinquent or at-risk; or who may be experiencing homelessness.

Strategies presented are aligned with the United States Department of Education's Dual Capacity Framework, National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Standards, Maryland's Family Engagement Frameworks for both Early Childhood and PreK-12, and Federal and State requirements for family engagement.

The collaboration across Divisions will offer an infrastructure for family engagement. Together this team can work to develop and implement a Family and Community Engagement Outreach Plan. The plan may include:

- Developing tools, resources, and information representing the continuum of a student's education -- from home to school settings, including infants and toddlers, to early care and education programs like the MD Infants and Toddlers Program, Home Visiting Programs, Head Start, Judy Centers, libraries and community-based programs to pre-kindergarten/elementary through high school. In addition, support for transitions between grade levels, new settings, and high school to post-secondary education and career will also be made available.
- Creating a parent portal on the MSDE's website that will bring together existing Division websites to provide a "one stop" area for parents and stakeholders to access information in multiple languages. These resources may include tip sheets on a variety of topics including the Early Childhood Family Engagement Framework Toolkit, Maryland Learning Links, financial literacy resources, evidence based family engagement practices, wellness policies, the School Meals Program, Ask Us Now! information, and secondary transition resources.
- Hosting meetings, conferences, and/or webinars for stakeholders by partnering with LEAs, non-profit and community-based organizations, and the early care and education community, to address equitable access to a well-rounded education.

The Department will continue to dialogue with the Superintendent's Family Engagement Council to garner input on educational topics promoting student academic achievement and to promote success for students. Along those lines, a myriad of resources will be developed to support the engagement of parents and families and to assess the training needs of staff working with parents and families. To accomplish this, family engagement staff will collaborate with LEAs to provide training, technical assistance, professional development opportunities, and resources to support early childhood providers, out-of-school time providers, LEAs, school staff, and libraries in the assessment of their family engagement outreach.

Lastly, the *Maryland's Early Childhood Family Engagement Framework* (http://earlychildhood.marylandpublicschools.org/prek-grade-2/maryland-early-learning-framework) for early learning providers and the *PreK-12 Family Engagement Framework* (http://marylandpublicschools.org/parents/Documents/MDPreK12FamilyEngagementFramework2016.pdf) demonstrate the natural progression of transitioning from early learning settings to formalized school settings. These frameworks lay the groundwork for a seamless transition across all settings and future planning in the development of a family engagement plan.

Appendix F: Maryland's Consultation and Coordination

<u>Timely and Meaningful Consultation</u>

A. **Public Notice**.

> The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has created a website for information on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) at Marylandpublicschools.org. This page includes useful documents and resources including copies of the agendas, minutes, and materials from the ESSA External Stakeholder Committee (described below). Public notice and solicitations for input were provided explaining Maryland's processes and procedures for developing and adopting its Consolidated State Plan.
>
> On October 25, 2016, the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) posted a general survey on the MSDE website to solicit and capture feedback from any interested parties. This survey asked for the publics' input on each of the categories within the plan (Consultation, Standards and Assessments, Accountability, Supporting Educators, and Supporting all Students). This information was used to incorporate the publics' ideas in the first draft of Maryland's Plan. A copy of this survey is available at
> http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/ESSA/ESSAGeneralSurvey.pdf.
>
> The first draft of the Consolidated State Plan was posted with a survey of more specific questions on December 7, 2016. This survey asked direct questions about the proposals made in the draft plan. A copy of this survey is available at
> http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/ESSA/ESSASurveyDraft1.pdf. Posted until February 14, 2017, the MSDE received 2,905 responses. The majority of the responses (1,835) were from teachers. Parents were the next largest group with 428 participating. All other categories had representation. The majority of respondents (60.45 percent) were from Anne Arundel County. However, every county was represented with at least one respondent. Of the 32 questions in the survey, 26 dealt with content pieces of the Plan (four were demographic questions, one was an overall question, and the final question was for open ended comments). Feedback for each of the content sections and questions was shared with the chair of the subcommittee overseeing that portion of the Plan (as described below) and incorporated into the final draft of the Plan. The final question asked respondents to rate their agreement with the Maryland Draft Consolidated State Plan. Eighty-three percent of respondents supported the overall Plan at some level (generally ok, mostly agree, and completely agree). This survey was also translated into Spanish; the MSDE received one response in Spanish which was translated and shared with the committee chairs.
>
> A second draft of the Maryland Consolidated State Plan was posted on June 29, 2017 with an accompanying survey to determine specific areas of concern and challenge. A draft of the plan was shared with Governor Larry Hogan, the Legislative Policy Committee, and the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education (The Kirwan Commission) with each having thirty days to review and comment. Comments were received from Maryland Governor Larry Hogan, the Legislative Policy Committee, the Kirwan Commission and 39 additional stakeholder groups. All recommendations and concerns were shared with the external, internal, and subcommittee

chairs and the State Board. Additionally, the MSDE published an overview document of the draft Consolidated Plan in both English (http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/ESSA/MDSEESSA2017OVDP.pdf) and Spanish (http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/ESSA/MSDEESSA2017Sp.pdf).

 A copy of the survey that accompanied the second draft of the Consolidated State Plan is available at http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/ESSA/ESSASurveyDraft2.pdf. Posted for 30 days, until August 10, 2017, the MSDE received 447 responses. The largest group of respondents were teachers (25.95 percent) followed by parents (19.91 percent) and students (17 percent). Other constituents included local superintendents, State or local school board members, principals, school staff, advocates for special education and English learners, representatives of higher education, the business community, nonpublic schools, and community engagement groups and an "other" category. Other included individuals such as, but not limited to, assistant local superintendents, assistance principals, concerned citizens, child care providers, and civil right/community activists. Respondents came from every local school system in Maryland with the largest share from Prince George's County (13.7 percent), followed by Charles County (9.59 percent), Anne Arundel (8.9 percent) and Montgomery County (8.22 percent). Many of the content questions reinforced the decisions that the State Board had made about the plan including, annually checking progress goals, the high need for teacher professional development and State approved online teacher preparation programs, including recently exited English learners for two years in the State accountability system, and the prioritization of Title IV, Part A funds for teacher professional development and compensation. Significantly, the majority (67.92 percent) of respondents reported that they highly supported (21.93 percent) or supported (45.99 percent) Maryland ESSA Consolidated State Plan.

The MSDE hosted, and will continue to host, bimonthly ESSA External Stakeholder Committee Meetings (described below). These meetings are subject to the Maryland Open Meetings Act. Specifically, "effective October 1, 2016, all public bodies will be required to make an agenda "available" to the public before each meeting. The agenda must contain 'known items of business or topics to be discussed at the portion of the meeting that is open' and must indicate 'whether the public body expects to close any portion of the meeting' under General Provisions Article ("GP") § 3-305." MSDE staff posted an announcement of the meeting and an agenda before all meetings of this committee on its website (www.marylandpublicschools.org)/. The Act states that "also effective October 1, 2016, 'to the extent practicable, a public body shall post online the minutes or recordings' that it has kept in order to comply with the Act's requirements on minutes. GP § 3- 306(e)(2)." In compliance with this regulation, all minutes from the ESSA External Committee meetings are also posted online at MSDE's website.

The MSDE held five Regional Public Listening Tours in January 2017 which were public forums for discussion of the draft Consolidated State Plan (Draft 1). These forums took place in five regions of the State. The purpose of the forums was to provide an opportunity for members of the public, regardless of affiliation, and specifically parents, to learn about ESSA and provide input to Maryland's Consolidated State Plan. Sessions included a general overview of ESSA and breakout sessions around the specific topics identified in the Plan with an opportunity for participants to provide feedback. This feedback was then brought back to the External Committee and subcommittees for inclusion to the plan. Almost 500 individuals from across the

State attended these meetings.
Finally, the MSDE will post this plan on its website once it has been submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, revising the posting as changes are made.

B. **Outreach and Input**.

Maryland is committed to ensuring stakeholders have a voice in education policy within Maryland. After ESSA was signed by President Barack Obama on December 10, 2015, Maryland immediately began making plans to develop a strong Consolidated State Application. The MSDE formed an ESSA Internal Committee in January 2016 to begin the work of transitioning from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver to ESSA. This Internal Committee is comprised of members of each Division within the MSDE and includes the Directors of each federal program under ESSA (Titles I, II, III, and IV). The charge of the ESSA Internal Committee is to provide guidance on the transition from the ESEA to ESSA, provide recommendations to the ESSA External Stakeholder Committee, the State Superintendent, and the State Board on Maryland's ESSA Plan, and create a draft of the State Plan Components. This committee meets monthly. Membership of this committee can be found at:
http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DAPI/ESEA/ESSAMembershipInternal.pdf.

The MSDE solicited nominations and input from external stakeholders to form the ESSA External Stakeholder Engagement Committee. This committee consists of representatives from the following: the Governor's Office, the Maryland Department of Legislative Services, the Maryland State Board of Education, the Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM), the Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs, the Maryland State Educators Association (MSEA), the Baltimore Teachers Union (BTU), Maryland teachers of the year, local principals representing the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP) and the Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP), (additionally, one State Board member is also currently a private school principal), the Maryland Alliance of Public Charter Schools, the Maryland Parent Teacher Association, the Maryland National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Maryland Business Roundtable, the International Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL), the Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE), the Gifted and Talented Education Department at Notre Dame of Maryland University, the Special Education State Advisory Council, the Disability Rights Maryland, the University System of Maryland, the Maryland Higher Education Commission, and the Greater Baltimore Urban League. This ESSA External Stakeholder Committee is led by the State Superintendent of Schools and the Assistant State Superintendent of the Division of Student, Family, and School Support/Academic Policy, began meeting on March 24, 2016, and meets bimonthly. This committee will continue to meet after the submission of Maryland's Plan to ensure a smooth implementation. Membership for the External Stakeholder Engagement Committee can be found here:
http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DAPI/ESEA/ESSAMembership.pdf.

The State Superintendent of Schools also met monthly with PSSAM, updating them and soliciting their input on the Plan as it was developed. Furthermore, the ESSA Internal Committee continues to meet on a monthly basis to provide updates to the State Board and the External Committee. Additionally, there are seven subcommittees (standards and assessments, accountability,

supporting low performing schools, supporting all educators- certification, supporting all educators- professional development, equity, and supporting all students), each chaired/co-chaired by a member(s) of the Internal Committee, but includes external stakeholders. The work of these subcommittees is shared with the Internal Committee, the External Committee, and the State Board. In total, these subcommittees held over 80 meetings. All input from stakeholder groups was shared with these subcommittees and the subcommittees were responsible for gathering more input as well as including all input in the draft State Plan.

As the committees and subcommittees dove into the details of the work, the State Superintendent and the Assistant State Superintendent of the Division of Division of Student, Family, and School Support/Academic Policy, and other members of the Internal Committee, traveled around the State to present to and gather input from individual focus groups. These groups were often preexisting committees that had an interest in ESSA, but some were also formed as ad hoc committees to partake in this work. From February 23, 2016 to August 11, 2017, the MSDE team presented and discussed ESSA, specifically gathering feedback, at over 90 distinct meetings around the State. A list of these meetings can be found at http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DAPI/ESEA/ESSAStakeholderMasterChart.pdf. At each of these meetings held between February 2016 and February 2017 a comment sheet was distributed to collect and gather feedback from each group on the first draft of the Consolidated State Plan. The comment sheets were collected and synthesized and given to the appropriate subcommittee to incorporate the feedback into the second draft of the plan. The meetings mainly focused on accountability, as that was the most requested topic, and the comment sheet reflected the specific components within accountability.

The State Board had monthly discussions about ESSA and Maryland's Consolidated State Plan and gathered input. From March 2016 through August 2017, the MSDE staff presented developments for the Consolidated State Plan and solicited the Board's guidance and direction. Besides the monthly State Board meetings, the State Board held five work sessions which were days dedicated to working on the Consolidated State Plan with the MSDE staff. In addition to the ESSA Internal team working with the board monthly on components of the Plan, the Board invited individual organization stakeholders to speak to them about ESSA and the State's Plan. Dialogue ensued with the Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM) (August 2016 and July 2017), the Maryland State Education Association (MSEA) (September 2016), the Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE) (October 2016 and July 2017), and the Governor's Office (December 2016 or January 2017). The State Board have been intricate partners in this work and their strong commitment and leadership were critical in developing, providing guidance to, and approving Maryland's Plan on August 22, 2017.

Finally, as aforementioned, Maryland conducted three surveys, five ESSA listening tours, townhall style meetings, over 90 focus groups, over 80 subcommittee meetings, for a total of 209 total meetings engaging stakeholders about the Plan. Additionally, the MSDE consistently solicited feedback, shared with the Internal (including subcommittees) and the External Committees and made all feedback available on the marylandpublicschools.org website. Maryland is proud to report that many of the letters commenting on the final draft of the Plan commended the MSDE for its commitment to stakeholder engagement. The Maryland Education Equity Coalition, which is comprised of the ACLU of Maryland, Advocates for Children and Youth, Attendance Works,

Baltimore Education Research Consortium, CASA, Disability Rights Maryland, Family League, Greater Baltimore Urban League, League of Women Voters of Maryland, Maryland Education Coalition, Maryland PTA, MOST Network, Parent Advocacy Consortium, Public Justice Center, and Ready at Five, specifically stated "We want to thank MSDE for including stakeholders in this process. We appreciate the work of MSDE staff in compiling this Plan and for allowing stakeholders to participate in workgroups, arrange meetings with staff, and submit written comments." In addition, Governor Larry Hogan sent a letter to the MSDE after reviewing the second draft of the plan. He specifically stated, "I thank the members of the State Board and the MSDE for their hard work to create the best plan possible." Maryland will continue to include stakeholders through the implementation of the plan.