

I.D.i

Maryland School Assessment/High School Assessments

No Child Left Behind Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 1.1: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the state's assessment.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 1.2: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the state's assessment.

As required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Maryland has established continuous and substantial growth targets, or Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), for 100% of students to reach proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014. NCLB also requires that states test students in science at least once annually in grades 3-5, grades 6-9, and grades 10-12. Additionally, Maryland requires all students who entered ninth grade in or after 2005 to pass the High School Assessments (HSAs) or achieve a total score of 1602 across the HSAs in order to graduate.

Somerset County provides data in this Annual Update to indicate the progress of all students toward attaining academic proficiency consistent with the AMO's and HSA graduation requirements. Within the reading and Mathematics content areas, the performance of elementary and middle level students is addressed using the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) proficiency data through 2009.

Reading and Mathematics

Within the reading and mathematics content areas, Somerset addresses the performance of elementary and middle school students using Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) proficiency data through 2009. Somerset addresses the performance of high school students using AYP proficiency data for English and Algebra/Data Analysis through 2008. Additionally, Somerset addresses the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment Results for English and Algebra/Data Analysis for 2008, and local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June, 30, 2009.

Science

Under NCLB, Somerset meets the requirement to administer annual science assessments at least once at the elementary level, once at the middle school level, and once at the high school level. For the science content area Somerset addresses the performance of students in Grade 5 and students in Grade 8 using the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) data for 2008 and the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment Results for biology for 2008, as well as local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June, 30, 2009.

Government

For the government content area, Somerset addresses the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment Results for government for 2008, as well as local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June, 30, 2009.

Elementary Reading

Based upon the examination of the AYP Reading Proficiency Data for Elementary Schools (Table 2.1), Somerset County reports as follows:

Table 2.1: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Reading - Elementary													
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009			
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	
All Students	555	416	75.0%	551	403	73.1%	536	446	83.2%	563	478	84.90%	
African American	253	182	71.9%	266	170	63.9%	249	197	79.1%	267	214	80.10%	
American Indian/Alaskan Native													
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	6	100.0%	7	7	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	11	11	100%	
Hispanic	24	13	54.2%	29	17	58.6%	25	16	64.0%	36	29	80.60%	
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	271	215	79.3%	249	209	83.9%	254	225	88.6%	247	222	89.90%	
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	343	241	70.3%	334	226	67.7%	337	269	79.8%	385	319	82.90%	
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	18	9	50.0%	19	10	52.6%	16	12	75.0%	37	32	86.50%	
Special Education	85	56	65.9%	72	39	54.2%	88	61	69.3%	88	76	71%	

1. Evidence of Elementary Reading Progress

a. Elementary Reading proficiency continues to increase as a whole in the elementary band with 84.9% of the students scoring proficient or higher

Note: While this is only a 1.7 percentage point gain over the 2008 performance, it continues the positive trend of a steady increase of 16.1% more students meeting proficiency from 2005 to 2009.

Specific grade level increases in reading are seen with the 3rd grade level moving to 80.5% proficiency from 78.2% in 2008, increasing by 2.3 percentage points and 5th grade level of a 3.1 percentage point increase moving the total percent of students proficient from 87.9% to 91.0%. A smaller but definite increase is seen at the 4th grade level moving to 85.2% proficiency from 85.1%, increasing by .1 percentage

point.

b. Elementary Subgroup Reading proficiency continues to increase with all seven subgroups demonstrating gains in the percent of students proficient or higher.

- The White subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 1.3 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 89.9%.
- The Hispanic subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 16.6 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 80.6%.
- The FARMS subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 3.1 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 82.9%.
- The LEP subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 11.5 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 86.5%.
- The Special Education subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 1.7 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 71.0%.
- The Asian subgroup has maintained 100% proficiency or higher for the third year.
- The African American subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 1 percentage point moving to an aggregate of 80.1%.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed to Elementary Reading Progress

a. STRATEGY: Increased collaboration between and among site based grade level teachers.

The collaboration was targeted toward:

- Analyzing data to guide instruction
- Improving lessons
- Building student engagement
- Targeting students' needs
- Matching interventions
- Planning flexible groupings/differentiated centers

b. STRATEGY: Formalized and institutionalized site based collaboration by incorporating it into EDPD (Early Dismissal Professional Development), Faculty Meetings, SIT (School Improvement Team) Meetings, Grade Level Planning Meetings, Cross Grade Level Meetings, and Team Meetings

There were 810 total formal collaborative planning sessions held at the elementary level during 2008-2009.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	PD: Effective Collaboration Strategies	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Reading Coaches	Source: Reading First Cost: \$25,691 Source: \$197,993 Cost: Title I
Core Program	Data Warehouse: <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Local Cost: \$20,834

c. **STRATEGY: Monitored student learning through system benchmarks.**

The averages of all Reading Benchmarks (System Formative Assessments) scores at all grade levels (K-6) met or exceeded the proficiency level set at a 70% threshold with the exception of 3rd and 5th. Evidence indicates a decrease in performance from 2008 to 2009 in all grade levels with the exception of Kindergarten. While no definitive conclusion has been reached, it is possible that the annual revisions to benchmarks have raised the standard for expected performance.

Chart Title: System Reading Benchmark Analysis

Grade Level	2007-2008 Benchmark Scores	2008-2009 Benchmark Scores	Percentage Points Difference
K	95.8%	99%	+3.2%
1 st	80.3%	72%	-8.3%
2 nd	85.1%	75%	-10.1%
3 rd	65.6%	69%	-3.4%
4 th	79.8%	78%	-1.8%
5 th	82.8%	66%	-16.8%

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program	Benchmark Assessment Development and Analysis	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Benchmark Assessment (Scoring-Performance Matters/Mass Producing Staff & Student Materials): Data Specialist Associate Reading Coaches Coordinator of Special Ed-ELL Instruction & Extended Day/Year. Instructional Programs	Source: Local Cost: \$31,692 Source: Reading First Cost: \$25,691 Source: Title I: Cost: \$197,993 Source: Local Cost: \$23,997

d. STRATEGY: Diversified instructional strategies by monitoring teacher use of specific strategies and conducting follow up analysis, discussion, and planning.

These strategies included:

- Small Group Instruction
- Lesson Plan Study
- Flex Group Activities
- Differentiated Instruction
- Pacing Guides
- Cooperative Learning
- Performing Walkthroughs
- Developing Higher Order Questioning
- Modeling of Reading Strategies

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND AMOUNT</i>
Staffing	Administrator Observations and Walk Throughs	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and	Source: Staff Time
-------------	----------------------------	--------------------

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND AMOUNT</i>
Staffing	Observation	Cost: \$0
	Reading Coaches	Source: Reading First Cost: \$25,691 Source: \$197,993 Cost: Title I
Equipment	Hand Held PALMS for collecting data	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

- e. **STRATEGY: Provided explicit training and follow up monitoring on four key strategies: (1) Reading and Writing Strategies; (2) Higher Order Questioning; (3) Differentiated Instruction; and (4) Use of Vocabulary.**

Walk through observations revealed:

- **48% of observed lessons included reading and writing strategies in use**
- **40% of observed lessons included higher order questions**
- **40% of observed lessons included differentiated instruction**
- **58% of observed lessons included appropriate use of vocabulary**

Moving these four key strategies to daily habit continues as a major initiative to better meet individual students' needs within both the core program instruction and intervention. Explicit training incorporating student relevant vocabulary was provided. However, the captured walkthrough data reveals an insufficient application of strategies.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	Reading Coaches	Source: Reading First Cost: \$25,691 Source: \$197,993 Cost: Title I
	MSDE provided training	Source: Reading First Cost: \$2,794
	Consultants: Carol Tolman (LETRS), MacMillan McGraw Hill CORE consultants	Source: \$9,000 Cost: Reading First
Materials and Supplies	Explicit Training Materials	Source: Reading First Cost: \$2,700
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Equipment	Hand Held PALMS for collecting	Source: Staff Time

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
	data	Cost: \$0

f. STRATEGY: Provided intensive targeted REMEDIAL instruction .

Intensive, targeted remedial instruction included small group instruction, flexible groupings, extra supports, computer aided instruction, and targeted LEP intervention.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program Scheduling	Universal Time Slot	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Small Group Instruction with exiting Paraprofessional Aides; Special Education Staff, ELL Staff	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Training	PD: Small Group instructional strategies training by Instructional Facilitator	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Materials	LAS Links Curriculum	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

g. STRATEGY: Provided intensive targeted ENRICHMENT instruction.

Small group instruction, flexible groupings, and computer aided instruction are provided to enrich and accelerate students' reading fluency and comprehension.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program Scheduling	Universal Time Slot Flexible Grouping	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Enrichment Groups	Classroom Teachers	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

h. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Provided expert training, real time coaching, collaboration, and feedback to teachers of elementary reading and language arts.

Elementary reading teachers increased their planning, instructional, and assessment skills through on going work with site based reading coaches assigned to each elementary school. Reading coaches’ responsibilities include guiding collaborative meetings, coaching teachers, facilitating Response to Intervention plug in during flex group support and during pull out reading targeted interventions. The selected interventions are aligned with the findings from data analysis of benchmark/quarterly assessments.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY,PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Reading Coaches	Source: Reading First Cost: \$25,691 Source: Title I Cost: \$197,993

i. PRACTICES: Reinforced elementary reading and language arts teachers’ use of successful classroom practices of teaching test taking strategies, using mentors for at risk students, accessing interactive technology, and involving parents in reading.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY,PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Materials	Benchmark Assessments Parent Reading Night; Parent Collaboration Programs, Parent Involvement on SIT Teams	Source: Reading First Cost: \$400 Source: Title I Cost: \$21,157
Staffing and Volunteers	Additional Classroom Support (Volunteers, Student Mentors)	Source: Volunteer Hours Cost: \$0
Equipment (Technology)	<i>Promethean</i> Boards with ActiVotes Classroom Computers	Source: Ed Tech Grant Cost: \$57,450

j. PROGRAMS: Reinforced elementary reading student achievement through extended day and year programs.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing and Materials	Voyager Grades 3-7 Adventurers' Summer Camp Grades K-2 Migrant Program ESY: Extended School Year for Special Education Students	Source: 21 st Century Grant Cost: \$292,045 Source: Migrant Grant Cost: \$210,276 Source: Medical Assistance Cost: \$28,000

3. Evidence of Elementary Reading Challenge

a. **Elementary Reading proficiency gain from 2008 to 2009 dropped to 1.7 percentage points and threatens to plateau.**

Within the elementary band, there was an increase in the total percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher performance; however that aggregate gain was 1.7 percentage points, moving from 83.2% to 84.9%. Gains in grades 3 and 5 totaled 5.4 percentage points and a .1 percentage point increase in Grade 4 from 85.1 % of the students achieving proficiency or higher to 85.2%.

b. **One elementary subgroup missed the AMO target.**

The Special Education subgroup at the elementary level increased in percent proficient from 2008 to 2009. The specific increase of 1.7 percentage points left the Special Education subgroup (69.3% to 71.0%) short of meeting the AMO target by 5.5 percentage points.

The reading AMO target for 2009 is 76.5%. All three grade levels exceeded the AMO. However, each grade level had specific subgroups that missed the AMO. The Special Education subgroup percent proficient missed the AMO for two out of three grade levels scoring 56.7% at 3rd Grade, and 77.8% at 4th Grade. The 504 subgroup percent proficient missed the AMO for two out of three grade levels scoring 50% at 3rd Grade, and 0% at 5th Grade. The 4th Grade failed to meet the AMO in three additional subgroups scoring 69.2% proficient for ESL, 80% proficient for African American, and 75% proficient for Hispanic.

c. **Elementary teacher collaborative planning has been reduced to one half hour every other week.**

Elementary collaborative planning was directed for one hour per week in both reading and math for the first part of 2008-09. The Teachers Association of Somerset County filed a grievance citing violations of contract arguing that collaboration was not “individual preparation and planning.” Seeking to avoid conflict and pursue language changes during upcoming negotiations, Somerset County Board of Ed moved to temporarily reduce required collaborative time. The result was a loss; the time was reduced to one half hour every week for each content area.

d. Elementary Special Education Teachers do not consistently participate in Instructional Professional Development and/or Reading meetings.

Only 2 of the 10 elementary Special Education teachers attended any kind of content area in service during the Summer of 2009. The predominant topics of in service and workshops for Special Education teachers are compliance and documentation. Special Education teachers attended Reading area meetings in only 1 of 4 elementary schools. A single elementary Special Education teacher of the 10 is participating in the Co-teaching initiative for 2009-10.

e. Several key Special Education initiatives failed to be completed during 2008-09

Incomplete initiatives included:

- Expanding the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff.
- Monitoring and evaluating the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff; and establish action plans as needed.
- Developing specific “Look Fors” for administrators’ and coaches’ observations of multiple Co-teaching models; collate and analyze data; apply findings to professional development and evaluation.
- Training teachers and administrators on the Tiered Level of Interventions
 - Tier 1-Differentiated Instruction
 - Tier 2-Short Term Support
 - Tier 3-Long Term Support
- Monitoring implementation of Co-teaching strategies through observations, walk-throughs, and reflective conferences with the regular education teachers and the Special Educations teachers.
- Documenting findings.

4. Changes or Adjustments That Are Being Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

In analyzing the data and the conditions of curriculum, instruction and assessment in the elementary band during 2008-2009, the following conclusions were drawn:

- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable.
- Absenteeism interferes with reading mastery.
- Intensified intervention is needed for the subgroups which did not meet the AMO.

- Special Education teachers and ELL teachers are not available at the same time for collaborative planning.
- Special Education students appear to be lagging throughout the year with benchmark performances that are significantly low
- Walkthroughs indicate a lack of importance by teachers on students' benchmarks which may have negatively impacted student effort and performance.

These challenges have driven the following changes and adjustments.

a. ADJUSTMENT: Review and focus Reading Coach positions on differentiated planning for reading instruction, explicit reading instruction, and data driven reading decisions to assist teachers in providing high quality and effective reading instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Enable Reading Coach to increase expert training, real time coaching, facilitate collaboration, and provide feedback to teachers on student learning Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Coordinator of Special Education/ELL/Reading	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local
Monitor reading coach responsibilities as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guiding collaborative meetings • Coaching reading teachers and staff • Identifying plug in and pull out reading intervention groups (students and programs) based on data and walk throughs • Monitoring intervention programs used and their effectiveness • Training and guiding reading tutors • Coordinate testing and analysis of test scores Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Coordinator of Special Education/ELL/Reading Supervisor of Elementary Education	Staffing Cost: \$110,328 Source: Local

b. ADJUSTMENT: Move four key strategies of reading and writing, higher order thinking, differentiated instruction and vocabulary use to a state of instructional priority in all core areas with a 75% observable rate in walkthrough totals

ADJUSTMENT AND TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
<p>Reading Coaches</p> <p>MSDE provided training</p> <p>Consultants: Carol Tolman, Antonio Fierro (LETRS), MacMillan McGraw Hill CORE consultants</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010</p>	Training	<p>Professional Development</p> <p>Source: Reading First</p> <p>Cost: \$25,691</p> <p>Source: \$197,993</p> <p>Cost: Title I</p> <p>Source: Reading First</p> <p>Cost: \$2,794</p> <p>Source: \$18,000</p> <p>Cost: Reading First</p>
<p>Explicit Training Materials</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010</p>	Materials and Supplies	<p>Professional Development</p> <p>Source: Reading First</p> <p>Cost: \$4,700</p>
<p>Read Naturally Materials and trainer Sarah Schonour</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010</p>	Materials and Supplies Training	<p>Professional Development</p> <p>Source: Reading First</p> <p>Cost: \$93, 880</p>
<p>PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010</p>	Embedded PD	<p>Professional Development</p> <p>Source: Staff Time</p> <p>Cost: \$0</p>
<p>Hand Held PALMS for collecting data</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010</p>	Equipment	<p>Equipment</p> <p>Cost: Previously Purchased</p>

c. CHANGE: Increase reading collaboration time between and among site based grade level teachers.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
<p>Increase the number of Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) times to 6 per year</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Transportation	<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Cost:\$0</p> <p>Source: Staff Time</p>
<p>Move faculty meetings from one per week to one per month to provide more collaboration opportunities</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Reading Coaches Leadership	<p>Professional Development</p> <p>Cost: \$0</p> <p>Source: Staff Time</p>
<p>Schedule SIT Meetings to one per month to provide more collaboration opportunities</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Reading Coaches Leadership	<p>Professional Development</p> <p>Cost: \$0</p> <p>Source: Staff Time</p>
<p>Increase Grade Level Meetings in Reading</p>		Professional

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
to one per week Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Reading Coaches Leadership	Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Implement Peer Observations as another means for increasing collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Infrastructure	Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

d. ADJUSTMENT: Set specific targets for collaboration sessions in reading between and among site based grade level teachers.

Collaboration targets include: analyzing data to guide instruction; improving lessons; strategies for engaging students; practices to target meeting students' needs including matching the intervention the student need; and planning flexible grouping.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Clarify specific targets or expected outcomes in reading collaboration in analysis, lesson planning, discussed strategies, and evidence of intervention impacts Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Reading Coaches <i>Performance Matters</i>	Staffing Cost: \$196,638 Source: Title I Core Program: Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: State Fiscal Stabilize Funds (Stimulus)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Embedded Professional Development (preceding and following collaboration sessions) Reading Coaches	Training/Team Collaboration Cost: Staff Time Source: \$0 Cost: \$196,638 Source: Title I
Add cross content collaboration opportunities to vertical collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Infrastructure	Training/Team Collaboration Cost: Staff Time Source: \$0

e. Adjustment: Increase student engagement in reading through the availability and integration of technology into reading instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY
Increase the number of elementary teachers with <i>Promethean</i> board classrooms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade GES to High Tech Elementary Site • Add <i>Promethean</i> Boards to Grade 4 Classrooms Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Promethean Boards Acti Votes Classroom Computers	Equipment Cost: \$161,242 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of <i>Promethean</i> Boards Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Tech and Instructional Staff	Training Cost: \$2,000 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Increase teacher access to students' needs through using electronic reviews implemented through Acti Votes. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Electronic Reviews	Supplies and materials (CIA) Cost: \$37,356 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

f. ADJUSTMENT: Increase individualized reading instructional opportunities for students.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Use materials from the CORE reading program, SBRR (Scientifically Based Reading Research) and/or intervention materials to identify and respond to students' needs for intervention, remediation and enrichment Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	<i>Treasures 2009</i> Differentiated Instruction (Flexible Grouping) SIPPS Reading Tutors/ Para Professionals	Core Program; Materials Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Materials Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Staffing Cost: \$222,364 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of SBRR and materials from the CORE reading program and intervention programs. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Reading Coaches	Training Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

Staff specialized teachers and	Staffing	Staffing
--------------------------------	----------	----------

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
paraprofessionals in the classrooms during reading to support at-risk students with individualized support Timeline: August 2009-June 2010		Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

g. CHANGE: Focus reading interventions for Special Education and ELL students through Co-teaching efforts.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Monitor effectiveness of Co-teaching during intervention times Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Universal Block	Scheduling Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Add oversight of Special Education Instruction as well as compliance Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Coordinator of Special Ed & ELL Instruction	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local
Maintain oversight of ELL Instruction as well as compliance Timeline: August 2009-2010	Coordinator of Special Ed & ELL Instruction	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local
Provide co-planning opportunities beyond the school day Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Extended Day Planning	Staff Stipends Cost: \$5,600 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Introduce and support a new Co-teaching model (1:6) Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development-Consultants	Training Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

h. CHANGE: Partner with outside consultants to provide expertise reading professional development in particular areas of need.

Elementary reading professional development for the last 6 years has been through the Reading First Initiative providing training, coaching, analysis, and follow up throughout the year through MSDE and LEA leadership. The impact of Reading First has been significant; however, there are specific areas of unmet need.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide Reading Fluency Training Timeline: August 3, 2009	<i>Read Naturally</i>	Training Cost: \$2,940 Source: Reading First Grant

Provide ongoing support for effective	Reading Coaches	Training
---------------------------------------	-----------------	----------

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
implementation of <i>Read Naturally</i> Timeline: September 2009-June 2010		Cost: \$196,638 Source: Title I
Provide professional development on effective comprehension strategies Timeline: September 2009-June 2010	<i>Treasures</i> Professional Development-Consultant Reading Coaches	Training Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Consultant provided gratis for purchasing materials
Provide professional development in written communication and test taking strategies in Reading Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	<i>Treasures</i> Professional Development-Consultant Reading Coaches	Training Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Consultant provided gratis for purchasing materials

i. **ADJUSTMENT: Increase regular education teachers' knowledge of and skills in effectively working with LEP students in the regular classroom through the use of ESOL teachers coaching, collaboration, and consultation on new ELL curriculum..**

ESOL teachers will continue to lead professional development sessions for regular education classroom teachers and work with them on some of the strategies that are effective within the classrooms. These strategies include special techniques to increase verbal interaction of LEP students with their teachers and peers. Teachers will continue to work to maximize opportunities within FLEX Time for students to increase their English Proficiency. ESOL teachers will provide support for classroom teachers in order to enable their success in working with LEP students through shared experiences, ideas, and collaborative data analysis. Accuracy of assessment results for LEP students will become an ongoing focus during collaborative team discussions. Accurate assessment information is critical to guide instructional planning.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Maintain monitoring of student learning through local benchmark assessments Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Formative Assessments	Supplies and Materials Cost: \$4,317 Source: Local

Review and improve Benchmark	Reading Coaches and	Staffing
------------------------------	---------------------	----------

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Coordinator of Special Ed & ELL Instruction <i>Performance Matters</i>	Cost: \$196,638 Source: Title I Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local Core Program/Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (Stimulus)

j. ADJUSTMENT: Adjust Formative Assessments to better measure student proficiency and inform instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Maintain monitoring of student learning through local benchmark assessments Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Formative Assessments	Supplies and Materials Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Review and improve Benchmark assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Reading Coaches and Coordinator of Special Ed & ELL Instruction <i>Performance Matters</i>	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Core Program/Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (Stimulus)

k. STRATEGY: Attempt to recover lost collaboration time for elementary teachers.

- Will continue to negotiate the term “individual” out of contract, leaving “teachers will receive 225 minutes of planning per week
- Revise the teacher evaluation instrument to specifically include student achievement in the overall rating as specified by law
- Will continue to bring before staff the importance of collaborative efforts of teachers in improving student achievement

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY
Negotiate Teacher contract to include collaborative planning as an expected requirement of good instruction Timeline: March-May 2010	Negotiation Process	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Form committee to revise teacher	Staff	Staffing

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY
observation and evaluation instrument Timeline: November 2009-May 2010		Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Principals will include teacher collaboration as major components of the professional development process. Timeline: September 2009-June 2010	After School Professional Development (APD) and Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD)	Professional Development Cost: \$519,512 Source: Local

I. STRATEGY: Balance the focus for Special Education Teachers between Compliance/IEP Issues and Instruction.

- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to meet regularly with the core academic teams they work with
- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to any core area professional development during Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) periods.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY
Elementary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: March-May 2010	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Elementary Special Education teachers will participate in activities with regular education teachers on early dismissal professional development days Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Early Dismissal Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

m. ADJUSTMENT: Keep key Special Education Initiatives in the forefront of instruction during 2009-10.

The duties for the Coordinator of Elementary Reading have been revised to add leadership support for Special Education to include:

- Develop the administrator “look fors” list for Special Education lessons
- Support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.

A Co-teaching initiative under the direction of Dr. Sharon Clark, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, the Special Education supervisor and the Reading Coordinator will be completed during the 09-10. Instructional professional development will become a part of every Special Education staff meeting. SANE

documentation will be collected by the Assistant Superintendent to monitor this process.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Reading Coordinator's duties have been adjusted to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative Timeline: March-May 2010	Staffing-shift in duties	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local
"Co teaching Professional Development initiative involving a partnership between University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Somerset County Public Schools Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$12,173 Source: Special Ed Grant
Sessions on Research Based instructional strategies will become a part of the Special Education staff regular monthly meetings Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staff Meetings	Professional Development Cost: \$14,844 Source: Local

Middle Level Reading

Based upon the examination of the AYP Reading Proficiency Data for Middle Schools (Table 2.5), Somerset County reports as follows:

Table 2.2: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Reading - Middle												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	726	403	55.5 %	658	358	54.4 %	635	477	75.1 %	604	457	75.70 %
African American	334	157	47.0 %	304	145	47.7 %	300	210	70.0 %	265	186	70.20 %
American Indian/Alaskan Native												
Asian/Pacific Islander										6	6	100%
Hispanic	25	10	40.0 %	20	6	30.0 %	26	18	69.2 %	27	16	59.30 %
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	367	236	64.3 %	331	204	61.6 %	307	247	80.5 %	306	249	81.40 %
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	445	216	48.5 %	398	180	45.2 %	363	348	68.3 %	357	254	71.10 %
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	11	2	18.2 %	12	2	16.7 %	12	7	58.3 %	12	5	33.30 %
Special Education	101	25	24.8 %	105	23	21.9 %	108	53	49.1 %	108	53	53%

1. Evidence of Middle Level Reading Progress

a. Middle Level Reading proficiency continues to increase as a whole in the middle level band.

- Over the last four years, aggregate reading proficiency at the sixth grade level has improved 26.7 percentage points. Sixth grade reading proficiency has risen from 49.8% in 2005, to 76.5% in 2009.
- Over the last four years, aggregate reading at the seventh grade level has improved 39.2 percentage points. Seventh grade reading proficiency has risen from 42.4% in 2005, to 81.6% in 2009.

b. Middle Level Subgroup Reading proficiency continues to increase.

- The Special Education subgroup improved in proficiency for grades 6, 7, and 8 in 2009. From 2008 to 2009, the 6th grade increased 2.5 percentage points,

the 7th increased 3.7 percentage points and the 8th increased 10 percentage points.

- The Hispanic subgroup at the 7th grade level improved by 5 percentage points from 2008.
- The 7th grade FARMS subgroup improved reading proficiency by 7.4 percentage points.
- The proficiency of 8th grade ESL subgroup improved by 25 percentage points.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed Middle Level Mathematics Progress

a. **STRATEGY: Continued implementation and support of Explicit Reading Strategies.**

- Provided professional development and instructional support on Explicit Instruction.
- Developed common assessments to measure student proficiency on the “Big Eight” reading comprehension skills.
- Coordinated reading instruction within the language arts classrooms through intermediate reading coach.

b. **STRATEGY: Increased collaboration with specific targets between and among site based grade level teachers.**

- Monitored language arts teachers use of a common scope and sequence
- Monitored sixth and seventh language arts teachers use of lesson study protocols to collaboratively analyze, plan, revise, and implement more effective lesson plans.
- Conducted collaborative data analysis and re-teaching after each administration of the Common Assessments.
- Administered reading benchmarks at the end of each nine weeks to test for long term skill acquisition.
- Used *Critical Friends* protocols to look at student work and plan differentiation strategies in sixth and seventh grade language arts classes.

c. **STRATEGY: Provided intensive targeted REMEDIAL instruction.**

- Used leveled readers as part of the Holt *Elements of Literature* series.
- Provided sixth graders on one team with reading intervention through *Reading Advantage*.
- Provided after school tutoring to students in 6th and 7th grade through the Voyager Program.

d. **STRATEGY: Increased the instructional use of technology.**

- Provided seventh graders with one to one laptops during the second semester

- Provided professional development on teaching 21st century skills as part of the one to one project.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND AMOUNT</i>
Training/Workshop/Team/Collaboration	APD: Effective Collaboration Strategies	Source: Local Cost: \$69,810
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Reading Coach	Source: Local Cost: \$58,154
Core Program	Data Warehouse: <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Local Cost: \$20,834
Intervention	Readers Advantage	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Core Program	1to1 Laptop Initiative for 7 th grade	Source: Local – Non Recurring Cost Cost: \$240,000
Training/Workshop/Team/Collaboration	1to1 Laptop Professional Development for 7 th grade teachers	Source: MD Student Technology Consortium Grant Cost: \$10,000

3. Evidence of Middle Level Reading Challenge

a. **Continuity of program is challenged by a county alignment that separates 8th grade from 6th and 7th and houses 8th grade at the high school.**

- The 8th grade staff is provided with different supports which do not always align with that of the 6th and 7th grades.
- The 8th grade proficiency rate in reading has not improved at the same rate as the other grades and brings the overall middle school reading rate down significantly

b. **All grade levels are not experiencing the same success in middle level reading.**

- Overall 8th grade proficiency was 68.1% compared to 79.8% for Somerset Intermediate which includes all 6th and 7th graders

- There are significant achievement gaps among the Hispanic, Special Education, and LEP subgroups.
- Although a very small population, the 2009 LEP subgroup proficiency dropped 25 percentage points at the 6th grade level and 26.7 percentage points at the 7th grade level.
- The LEP subgroup did not meet AYP standards in Reading at Somerset Intermediate School (grades 6&7)
- The African-American subgroup continues to perform at 5 percentage points below the aggregate in all three grades.
- A significant achievement gap exists between the Special Education subgroup and the subgroups' achievement.
- The Special Education subgroup had a 49.1% Reading Proficiency 2008 and a 53% Proficiency 2009.

c. Secondary Special Education teachers do not consistently participate in instructional professional development and/or departmental meetings.

- Only five of 10 high school Special Education teachers attended any instructional professional development during the summer of 2009.
- Two of 10 Special Education teachers attended content area in services during the summer of 2009.
- Four of 5 intermediate Special Education teachers attended a content area in service during the summer of 2009.
- Intermediate Special Education teachers regularly attend content area meetings.
- High School Special Education teachers do not regularly participate in content area meetings.
- Seven of 14 secondary Special Education teachers are participating in the Co-teaching initiative for 2009-10.
- The predominance of in service for Special Education teachers involves compliance and documentation issues.

d. Several key Special Education initiatives failed to be completed during 2008-09.

Initiatives that were planned but were not implemented were:

- Expand the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff.
- Monitor and evaluate the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff; establish action plans as needed.
- Develop specific “Look Fors” for administrators’ and coaches’ observations of multiple Co-teaching models; collate and analyze data; apply findings to professional development and evaluation.
- Train teachers and administrators on the Tiered Level of Interventions
Tier 1-Differentiated Instruction

Tier 2-Short Term Support
 Tier 3-Long Term Support.

- Monitor implementation of Co-teaching strategies through observations, walk-throughs, and reflective conferences with the regular education teachers and the Special Educations teachers; document findings.

4. Changes or Adjustments That Are Being Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

a. ADJUSTMENT: Expand support for all teachers.

- The full time reading coach at the intermediate school has been provided a 12 month position (Secondary Literacy Coach) and will now work with high school teachers as well as middle level.
- Afternoon Professional Development (APD) for the high schools has been moved to a different day than the intermediate school so that the secondary literacy coach can be on hand each week for both intermediate and high school teacher training and follow up.
- A Co-teaching initiative that includes both training of teams and stipends for co-planning will be implemented in grades 6-8. The initiative utilizes a partnership with University of Maryland Eastern Shore who will provide a consultant.
- Content Area Reading Enrichment (CARE) will be implemented at the intermediate school this year. CARE is professional development provided to content area teachers by language arts teachers to promote reading literacy.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Reading Coach becomes 12 month position titled: Secondary Literacy Coach) Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing/Embedded Professional Development	Staffing Cost: \$59,801 Source: Local
High School After School Professional Development (APD) Meeting Day adjusted Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development	Professional Development\ Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Co-teaching Professional Initiative- Training and support Timeline: April 2009-June 2010	Professional Development/Support	Professional Development\ Staffing - APD Cost: \$265,574 Source: Local

Content Area Reading Enrichment (CARE) professional development provided to intermediate content area teachers by	Professional Development for Content area teachers	Professional Development\ Staffing
---	--	---------------------------------------

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
language arts teachers to promote reading literacy. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010		Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus funding)

b. ADJUSTMENT: Increase the availability for reading intervention for middle level students.

- A shift in enrollment at Somerset Intermediate school will allow a teacher to provide reading intervention on a full time basis.
- One fulltime reading teacher has been hired to provide reading intervention for 8th and 10th graders at both high schools.
- *Reading Advantage* will be used in all three grades for intervention. Students are identified by multiple measures and attention will be focused on the ESL and Special Education subgroups.
- Middle school students will receive instruction on academic vocabulary based on Marzano's research.

c. ADJUSTMENT: Utilize technology to increase student engagement.

- The one to one laptop program will run for 7th graders for the entire year.
- Teachers will continue 1to1 and *Promethean* Board training.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Somerset Intermediate Teacher's duties will be shifted to full time Reading Intervention Teacher Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing	Staffing Cost: \$47,088 Source: Local
2 Full time reading intervention Teachers at high schools Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing	Professional Development\ Staffing Cost: \$66,338 Source: ARRA (Stimulus funding)
Reading Advantage used at all three secondary schools Timeline: April 2009-June 2010	Materials	Supplies/Materials: Cost: \$3,500 Source: ARRA (Stimulus funding)

One to One Laptop Initiative for 7 th Graders	Technology	Professional Development\ Staffing
--	------------	---------------------------------------

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Timeline: August 2009-June 2010		Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

d. ADJUSTMENT: Balance the focus for Special Education teachers between compliance/IEP issues and instruction.

- All secondary Special Education teachers will be assigned to meet regularly with the core academic teams they work with.
- All secondary Special Education teachers will be assigned to a core area professional development during regular After School (APD) periods.
- Secondary Special Education staff will be encouraged to participate in the Governor’s Academies during the summer. (Presently 6 of 10 have attended at least one).
- All Special Education staff members will receive inservice on latest research based instructional strategies for Special Education students.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: March-May 2010	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Secondary Special Education teachers will participate in activities with regular education teachers at APD (After School Professional Development) Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	After School Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$255,356 Source: Local
Sessions on Research Based instructional strategies will become a part of the Special Education staff regular monthly meetings Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staff Meetings	Professional Development Cost: \$14,844 Source: Local

e. ADJUSTMENT: Key Special Education initiatives will be kept in the forefront of instruction during 2009-10.

The duties for the Coordinator of Elementary Reading have been revised to add leadership support for Special Education to include:

- Develop the administrator “look fors” list for Special Education lessons
- Support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.

A Co-teaching initiative under the direction of Dr. Sharon Clark, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, the Special Education supervisor and the Reading Coordinator will be completed during the 09-10. Instructional professional development will become a part of every Special Education staff meeting. SANE documentation will be collected by the Assistant Superintendent to monitor this process.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Reading Coordinator's duties have been adjusted to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative Timeline: March-May 2010	Staffing-shift in duties	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local
Co-teaching Professional Development initiative involving a partnership between University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Somerset County Public Schools Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$10,398 Source: Special Ed Grant

Elementary Mathematics

Based upon the examination of the AYP Math Proficiency Data for Elementary Schools (Table 2.4), Somerset County reports as follows:

Table 2.4: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Math - Elementary												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	555	432	77.8%	553	423	76.5%	536	429	80.0%	562	455	81%
African American	253	176	69.6%	268	183	68.3%	248	184	74.2%	266	193	72.60%
American Indian/Alaskan Native												
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	5	83.3%	7	7	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	11	11	100%
Hispanic	24	16	66.7%	29	20	69.0%	26	20	76.9%	36	28	77.80%
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	271	234	86.3%	249	213	85.5%	254	217	85.4%	247	221	89.50%
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	343	248	72.3%	336	242	72.0%	336	259	77.1%	384	301	78.40%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	18	13	72.2%	21	12	57.1%	18	17	88.2%	37	33	89.20%
Special Education	85	57	67.1%	72	43	59.7%	88	53	60.2%	107	65	60.70%

1. Evidence of Elementary Mathematics Progress

- a. **Elementary Math proficiency continues to increase as a whole in the elementary band with 81% of the students scoring proficient or higher.**

Note: While this is only a 1 percentage point gain over the 2008 performance, it continues the positive trend of a steady increase of 13.3% more students meeting proficiency from 2005 to 2009.

Specific grade level increases in math are seen at the 3rd grade level moving to 81% proficiency from 74.9% in 2008, increasing by 6.1 percentage points. A smaller but definite increase is seen at the 5th grade level of 2.3 percentage points, moving the total percent of students who are proficient from 77.7% to 80.0%.

b. Elementary Subgroup Math proficiency continues to increase with six out of seven subgroups demonstrating gains in the percent of students proficient or higher.

- The White subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 4.1 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 89.5%.
- The Hispanic subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by less than 1 (.9) percentage point moving to an aggregate of 77.8%.
- The FARMS subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 1.3 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 78.4%.
- The LEP subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 1.0 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 89.2%.
- The Special Education subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 0.5 percentage points moving to an aggregate of 60.7%.
- The Asian subgroup has maintained 100% proficiency or higher for a 3rd year.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed to Elementary Mathematics Progress

a. STRATEGY: Increased collaboration between and among site based grade level teachers.

The collaboration was targeted toward: Analyzing data to guide instruction

- Improving lessons
- Building student engagement
- Targeting students' needs
- Matching interventions
- Planning flexible groupings

b. STRATEGY: Formalized and institutionalized site based collaboration by incorporating it into EDPD (Early Dismissal Professional Development), Faculty Meetings, SIT (School Improvement Team) Meetings, Grade Level Planning Meetings, Cross Grade Level Meetings, and Team Meetings

There were 577 total collaborative planning sessions held during 2008-2009.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	PD: Effective Collaboration Strategies	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$292,009
Core Program	Data Warehouse: <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Local Cost: \$20,834

c. **STRATEGY: Monitored student learning through system quarterly assessments.**

The averages of all Math Milestone (System Quarterly Formative Assessment) scores at all grade levels met or exceeded the proficiency level set at a 60% threshold with the exception of 3rd grade. The comparison with 2008 performance shows a maintenance or improvement at each grade level with the exception of 2nd grade by 2 percentage points and 3rd grade by 1 percentage point.

Chart Title:

Grade Level	2007-2008 Benchmark Scores	2008-2009 Benchmark Scores
K	95%	95%
1 st	79%	83%
2 nd	73%	71%
3 rd	60%	59%
4 th	56%	63%
5 th	59%	62%

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program	Quarterly Assessment Development and Analysis	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Quarterly Assessment Scoring: Coordinator of Student Assessment	Source: Local Cost: \$37,885
	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$292,009

d. **STRATEGY: Increased students' math skill and concept attainment through individualized practice and instant feedback.**

All grade levels demonstrated annual aggregate gains through individualized computer assisted instruction. These gains averaged more than one-half of a year of growth. The average growth for all elementary grades was close to a full year's growth (.91). The grade level aggregates are: Grade 2: .97; Grade 3: .8; Grade 4: .8; and Grade 5: 1.07. Ranges of individual students' gains were: .17 to 5.24 year average growth. There appears to be a correlation with time on task and total annual gain. One elementary school established SuccessMaker as a Gifted and Talented enrichment. Another elementary school included SuccessMaker as a Special Education intervention. In both schools, the additional time for each group resulted in larger aggregate gains for that group.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE, AND COST</i>
Intervention	<i>Success Maker</i>	Source: Local Cost: \$8,000
Equipment	Classroom and Lab Computers	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0

e. **STRATEGY: Monitored teacher use of specific strategies and conducted follow up analysis, discussion, and planning.**

These strategies included:

- Spiral Reviews
- Mental Math
- Problem Solving Framework
- Increased use of Manipulatives and Calculators
- Pacing Guides
- Cooperative Learning
- Small Group Instruction
- Flexible Grouping
- Differentiated Instruction

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Administrator Observations and Walk Throughs	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY,PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$292,009
Equipment	Hand Held PALMS for collecting data	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0

f. STRATEGY: Provided explicit training and follow up monitoring on three key strategies: (1) Real Life Applications; (2) Differentiated Instruction; and (3) Higher Order Questioning.

Walk through data revealed that an average of 83% of the observations of math instructions included real world examples or applications. This instruction appears to have more relevance for students. Differentiated instruction continues to be a major effort to better meet individual students' needs within both the core program instruction and intervention. Walk through data also captured higher order questioning and demonstrated that 40% of the observations included higher order questioning.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY,PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$292,009
Materials and Supplies	Explicit Training Materials	
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Equipment	Hand Held PALMS for collecting data	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0

g. STRATEGY: Provided intensive targeted REMEDIAL instruction.

Intensive, targeted remedial instruction included small group instruction, flexible groupings, extra supports; computer aided instruction, and targeted LEP intervention.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY,PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program Scheduling	Universal Time Slot	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Staffing	Small Group Instruction with Paraprofessional Aides; Special Education Staff, ELL Staff	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Training	PD: Small Group instructional strategies training by Instructional Facilitator	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

h. STRATEGY: Provided intensive targeted ENRICHMENT instruction.

Small group instruction, flexible groupings, and computer aided instruction are provided to enrich and accelerate students' math skills and concept mastery.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program Scheduling	Universal Time Slot	Source: Staff Time Cost: Local
	Flexible Grouping	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Intervention	<i>Success Maker</i>	Source: Local Cost: \$8,000
Equipment	Classroom and Lab Computers	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0

i. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Provided expert training, real time coaching, collaboration, and feedback to teachers of elementary mathematics.

Elementary math teachers increased their planning, instructional, and assessment skills through on going work with site based math facilitators assigned to each elementary school. Math facilitators' responsibilities include guiding collaborative meetings, coaching teachers, facilitating plug in and pull out math interventions, monitoring portfolio usage, and coordinating the implementations and analysis of benchmark/quarterly assessments.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------

Staffing	Instructional Facilitators	Source: Local Cost: \$292,009
----------	----------------------------	----------------------------------

- j. **PRACTICES: Reinforced elementary math teachers’ use of successful classroom practices of teaching test taking strategies, using mentors for at risk students, accessing interactive technology, maximizing students’ math portfolios for instruction, and involving parents in mathematics.**

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Materials	Benchmark Assessments	Source: Title I Cost: \$400
	Student Portfolios	Source: Title I Cost: \$1,439
	Parent Math Night; Parent Collaboration Programs, Parent Involvement on SIT Teams	Source: Title I Cost: \$21,257
Staffing and Volunteers	Additional Classroom Support (Paraprofessionals, Student Mentors)	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Equipment (Technology)	Promethean Boards with ActiVotes Classroom Computers	Source: Ed Tech grant Cost: \$57,450

- k. **PROGRAMS: Reinforced elementary math students’ achievement through extended day and year programs.**

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Voyager Grades 3-7 Adventurers’ Summer Camp	Source: 21 st Century Grant Cost: \$292,045

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
and Materials	Grades K-2 Migrant Program ESY: Extended School Year for Special Education Students	Source: Migrant Education Cost: \$147,938 Source: Medical Assistance Funds Cost: \$28,000

3. Evidence of Elementary Mathematics Challenges

a. The Elementary Math proficiency gain from 2008 to 2009 dropped to 1 percentage point and threatens to plateau.

Within the elementary band, there was an increase in the total percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher performance; however that aggregate gain was 1 percentage point, moving from 80% to 81%. Gains in grades 3 and 5 totaling 12.8 percentage points were offset by a 5.3 percentage point decrease in Grade 4 from a total of 87.4 % of the students achieving proficiency or higher to 82.1%.

b. One Elementary subgroup experienced a decrease in the percentage of students achieving proficiency from 2008 to 2009 and two subgroups missed the AMO target.

The African American subgroup at the elementary level decreased in percent proficient from 2008 to 2009. The specific decrease was 1.6 percentage points decrease for African American students from 74.2% to 72.6%.

The math AMO target for 2009 was 74.2%. Two of the three grade levels exceeded the AMO. However, the Special Education subgroup percent proficient missed the AMO at all three grade levels scoring 56.7% at 3rd grade, 63.9% at 4th grade, and 55.6% at 5th grade. The African American subgroup's performance far exceeds that of the Special Education subgroups, but also fails to meet the AMO at two of the three grade levels scoring 70.1% proficient at 3rd grade and 70.2% proficient at the 5th grade level.

c. Elementary teacher collaborative planning has been reduced to one half hour every other week.

- Elementary collaborative planning was at one hour per week in both reading and math for the first part of 2008-09.

- Teachers Association of Somerset County filed grievance citing violations of contract.
- Lacking an agreement on the interpretation of language in contract at that time, Somerset County chose to reduce required collaborative time.
- Language in negotiated contract states "individual preparation and planning" which the Uniserve MSTA representative is interpreting as isolated and/or free choice with no directives.
- Required collaboration time was reduced to one half hour per week.

d. Elementary Special Education Teachers do not consistently participate in Instructional Professional Development and/or mathematics meetings.

- Only 2 of 10 (20%) elementary Special Education teachers attended any kind of content area inservice during the summer of 2009.
- The predominant inservice for Special Education teachers involves compliance and documentation issues.
- Special Education teachers attended Reading area meetings only at 1 of 4 elementary schools.
- Only 1 of 10 elementary teachers are participating in the co teaching initiative for 2009-10.

e. Several key Special Education initiatives failed to be completed during 2008-09

Initiatives that were planned but were not implemented were:

- Expand the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff.
- Monitor and evaluate the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff; establish action plans as needed.
- Develop specific "Look Fors" for administrators' and coaches' observations of multiple Co-teaching models; collate and analyze data; apply findings to professional development and evaluation.
- Train teachers and administrators on the Tiered Level of Interventions
 - Tier 1-Differentiated Instruction
 - Tier 2-Short Term Support
 - Tier 3-Long Term Support.
- Monitor implementation of Co-teaching strategies through observations, walk-throughs, and reflective conferences with the regular education teachers and the Special Educations teachers; document findings.

4. Changes or Adjustments That Are Being Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

In analyzing the data and the conditions of curriculum, instruction and assessment in the elementary band during 2008-2009, the conclusions were drawn:

- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable,

- Students are deficient in fact fluency and number sense,
- Students are weak in conceptual understanding,
- Absenteeism interferes with mathematics mastery,
- Decreased math instructional time negatively impacted on performance,
- Intensified intervention is needed for the two subgroups which did not meet the AMO,
- Special Education teachers and ELL teachers are not available at the same time for planning,
- Special Education students appear to be lagging throughout the year with benchmark performances that are significantly low, and
- African American subgroup performance of benchmarks is weak.

These challenges have driven the following changes and adjustments.

- a. **ADJUSTMENT: Review and focus Math Facilitator positions on math planning, math instruction, and math assessment to assist teachers in providing high quality and effective math instruction.**

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Enable Math facilitator to provide expert training, real time coaching, facilitate collaboration, and provide feedback to teachers on student learning Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing and Job Assignments	Staffing Cost: \$211,257 Source: Local
Identify math facilitator responsibilities as: i. Guiding collaborative meetings ii. Coaching math teachers and staff iii. Providing plug in and pull out for math interventions iv. Monitoring portfolio usage v. Training and guiding math tutors vi. Coordinate testing and analysis of test scores Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Supervisor of Elementary Education	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Assist classroom teachers in planning and implementing explicit lessons on test taking strategies Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Math Instructional Facilitators	Staffing Cost: \$211,257 Source: Staff Time

- b. **CHANGE: Increase math collaboration time between and among site based grade level teachers.**

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Increase the number of Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) times to 6 per year Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing	Infrastructure Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Move faculty meetings from to one per month to provide more collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Instructional Facilitators and Coaches Leadership	Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Schedule SIT Meetings to one per month to provide more collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Sit Leaders Leadership	Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Increase Grade Level Meetings to one per week Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Instructional Facilitators Leadership	Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Implement Peer Observations (POP Sessions) as another means for increasing collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Infrastructure	Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

c. ADJUSTMENT: TARGET collaboration sessions in mathematics between and among site based grade level teachers.

Collaboration targets include: analyzing data to guide instruction; improving lessons; strategies for engaging students; practices to target meeting students' needs including matching the intervention the student need; and planning flexible grouping.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Clarify specific targets or expected outcomes in math collaboration in analysis, lesson planning, discussed strategies, and evidence of intervention impacts Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Math Instructional Facilitators <i>Performance Matters</i>	Staffing Cost: \$211,257 Source: Local Core Program: Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (Stimulus)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Embedded Professional Development (preceding and following collaboration sessions) Math Instructional Facilitators	Training/Team Collaboration Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Staffing

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
		Cost: \$211,257 Source: Local
Add cross content collaboration opportunities to vertical collaboration opportunities during EDPD. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Infrastructure	Training/Team Collaboration Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

d. ADJUSTMENT: Increase student engagement in mathematics through the availability and integration of technology into Math instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Increase the number of elementary teachers with <i>Promethean</i> board classrooms: vii. Upgrade GES to High Tech viii. Add Promethean Boards to Grade 4 Classrooms ix. Document Cameras x. Laptops Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Promethean Boards Acti Votes Classroom Computers	Equipment Cost: \$161,242 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of <i>Promethean</i> Boards Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Tech and Instructional Staff	Training Cost: \$2,000 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Increase teacher access to students' needs through using electronic spiral reviews implemented through Acti Votes. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Electronic Spiral Reviews	Supplies and materials (CIA) Cost: \$37,356 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Broaden the range of math portfolios to include an electronic component Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development	Training Cost: \$25,000 Source: Title I

e. ADJUSTMENT: Increase individualized math instructional opportunities for students.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Use tiered electronic instructional materials to identify and respond to students' needs for intervention, remediation and	<i>Success Maker</i>	Core Program; Materials Cost: \$8,000

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
enrichment Timeline: August 2009-June 2010 Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Differentiated Instruction (Flexible Grouping) Math Tutors	Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (Stimulus) Core Program Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Staffing Cost: \$97,125 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of Computer Aided Instruction Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Math Instructional Facilitator	Training Cost: \$211,257 Source: Local
Staff specialized teachers and paraprofessionals in the classrooms during math to support at-risk students with individualized support Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

f. CHANGE: Focus math interventions for Special Education students through Co-teaching efforts.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Monitor effectiveness of Co-teaching during intervention times Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Universal Block	Scheduling Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Add oversight of Special Education Instruction as well as compliance Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Coordinator of Special Ed Instruction	Staffing Cost: \$23,757 Source: Local
Provide co-planning opportunities beyond the school day Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Extended Day Planning	Staff Stipends Cost: \$5,600 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Introduce and support a new Co-teaching model (1:6) Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development-Consultants	Training Cost: \$17, 320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

g. CHANGE: Partner with outside consultants to provide expert math professional development in particular areas of need.

Elementary math professional development for the last 6 years has been the Focused Mathematics program providing training, coaching, analysis, and follow up throughout the year from a team of two consultants. Their impact has been significant; however, there is a need to focus on several specific competencies.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide Math Fluency Training Timeline: October 19, 2009	Mobius	Training Cost: \$1,200 Source: Title I
Provide professional development on effective reasoning and problem solving skills Timeline: October 19, 2009	Professional Development-Consultant	Training Cost: \$875 Source: Title I
Provide professional development in oral and written communication in Math Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development-Consultant	Training Cost: \$875 Source: Title I
Strengthen students' number sense and conceptual understanding Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development-Consultants	Training Cost: \$875 Source: Title I

h. ADJUSTMENT: Adjust Formative Assessments to better measure student proficiency and inform instruction.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Maintain monitoring of student learning through local quarterly assessments Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Formative Assessments	Supplies and Materials Cost: \$1,439 Source: Local
Review and improve Quarterly assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Math Facilitators and Supervisor <i>Performance Matters</i>	Staffing Cost: \$43,166 Source: Title I Cost: \$183,243 Source: Local Core Program/Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (Stimulus)
Use anchor papers to increase teacher understanding of student thinking and teacher skill in effective instruction	Professional Development-Consultant	Training Cost: \$1,300 Source: Title I

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Timeline: August 2009-June 2010		

i. ADJUSTMENT: Attempt to recover lost collaboration time for elementary teachers.

- Continue to negotiate the term “individual” out of contract, leaving “teachers will receive 225 minutes of planning per week.
- Revise the teacher evaluation instrument to specifically include student achievement in the overall rating as specified by law.
- Continue to demonstrate the importance and results of collaborative efforts of teachers in improving student achievement.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Negotiate Teacher contract to include collaborative planning as an expected requirement of good instruction Timeline: March-May 2010	Negotiation Process	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Form committee to revise teacher observation and evaluation instrument Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staff	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Include teacher collaboration as major component of the professional development process at the site level. Timeline: September 2009-June 2010	After School Professional Development (APD) and Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD)	Professional Development Cost: \$519,512 Source: Local

j. ADJUSTMENT: Balance the focus for Special Education Teachers between Compliance/IEP Issues and Instruction

- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to meet regularly with the core academic teams of their assigned case loads.
- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to a core area professional development during Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) periods.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Elementary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Cost: \$0

Timeline: March-May 2010		Source: Staff Time
Elementary Special Education teachers will participate in activities with regular education teachers on early dismissal professional development days	Early Dismissal Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: Staff Time Source: Local
Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010		

k. ADJUSTMENT: Keep key Special Education Initiatives in the forefront of instruction during 2009-10

The duties for the Coordinator of Elementary Reading have been revised to add leadership support for Special Education to include:

- Develop the administrator “look fors” list for Special Education lessons
- Support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.

A Co-teaching initiative under the direction of Dr. Sharon Clark, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, the Special Education supervisor and the Reading Coordinator will be completed during the 09-10. Instructional professional development will become a part of every Special Education staff meeting. SANE documentation will be collected by the Assistant Superintendent to monitor this process.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Reading Coordinator’s duties have been adjusted to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative Timeline: March-May 2010	Staffing-shift in duties	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local
Co teaching Professional Development initiative involving a partnership between University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Somerset County Public Schools Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$10398 Source: Grant LAFF
Sessions on Research Based instructional strategies will become a part of the Special Education staff regular monthly meetings Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staff Meetings	Professional Development Cost: \$14844 Source: Local

Middle Level Mathematics

Based upon the examination of the AYP Math Proficiency Data for Middle Schools (Table 2.5), Somerset County reports as follows:

Table 2.5: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Math - Middle												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	726	368	50.7%	663	328	49.5%	635	369	58.1%	602	384	63.80%
African American	334	149	44.6%	307	131	42.7%	300	153	51.0%	265	143	54%
American Indian/Alaskan Native												
Asian/Pacific Islander										6	6	100%
Hispanic	25	7	28.0%	20	8	40.0%	26	14	53.8%	26	17	63%
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	367	212	57.8%	333	187	56.2%	307	200	65.1%	304	218	71.70%
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	445	188	42.2%	402	162	40.3%	363	190	52.3%	355	198	55.80%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	11	1	9.1%	12	6	50.0%	12	4	33.3%	16	10	62.50%
Special Education	101	20	19.8%	107	26	24.3%	108	38	35.2%	99	43	43.40%

1. Evidence of Middle School Mathematics Progress

Specific data includes:

a. Middle level Math proficiency continues to increase as a whole in the middle level band.

- The aggregate proficiency rate for 6th grade math increased by 7.4 percentage points; moving from 70.2% proficiency in 2008 to 77.6% in 2009.
- The aggregate proficiency rate for 7th grade math improved by 15 percentage points from 2008 to 2009.
- The aggregate proficiency rate for 8th grade math decreased by 4.8 percentage points from 2008 to 2009.

b. Middle Level Subgroup Math proficiency continues to increase.

- 7th grade Special Education students improved 12.4 percentage points.

- The FARMS subgroups increased proficiency at the 6th grade to 72.4% and the 7th grade to 58.5% in 2009.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed Middle Level Mathematics Progress

a. STRATEGY: Increased collaboration between and among site based grade level teachers.

The collaboration was targeted toward:

- Analyzing data to guide instruction (6 & 7 grades)
- Range finding constructed responses and using the MSDE rubric.
- Building Student Engagement
- Targeting student needs

b. STRATEGY: Formalized and institutionalized site based collaboration by incorporating it into APD (After School Professional Development), Faculty Meetings, SIT (School Improvement Team) Meetings, Grade Level Planning Meetings, Cross Grade Level Meetings, and Team Meetings.

- Professional development was provided in developing activities that promoted application rather than only algorithm.
- Professional Development was provided on Co-teaching to Special Education and regular education teachers.
- A retired teacher of 38 years was hired as a consultant/mentor for a first year math teacher at Somerset Intermediate School.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	PD: Effective Collaboration Strategies - APD	Source: Local Cost: \$69,810
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation - APD	Source: Local Cost: \$69,810
Staffing	Intermediate School Assistant Principal/Math Instructional Facilitator (20%)	Source: Local Cost: \$13,606
Core Program	Data Warehouse: <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Local Cost: \$20,834

c. **STRATEGY: Monitored student learning through system quarterly assessments.**

- All middle school math teachers administered quarterly benchmarks.
- All 6th and 7th grade math teachers administered Common Assessments which focused on particular critical math skills.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE, AND COST</i>
Core Program	Quarterly Assessment Development and Analysis/6 & 7 Grade also used Common Assessments	Source: Staff Time Cost:\$0
Staffing	Quarterly Assessment Scoring: Coordinator of Student Assessment	Source: Local Cost: \$37,885
	Math Instructional Facilitator/Assistant Principal	Source: Local Cost: \$13,606

d. **STRATEGY: Monitored teacher use of specific strategies and conducted follow up analysis, discussion, and planning.**

These strategies included:

- Spiral Reviews
- Mental Math
- Problem Solving Framework
- Increased use of manipulatives and calculators
- Pacing Guides
- Cooperative Learning

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Administrator Observations and Walk Throughs	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Math Instructional	

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
	Facilitator/Assistant Principal	
Equipment	Hand Held PALMS for collecting data	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

e. **STRATEGY: Provided intensive targeted REMEDIAL instruction.**

- Selected students were provided targeted intervention outside of their regular math class.
- Students on one team received targeted intervention with *Math Navigator* materials.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program Scheduling	Within the Regular Math Period/Flexible Grouping	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Small Group Instruction with Paraprofessional Aides; Special Education Staff, ELL Staff	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Training	PD: Small Group instructional strategies training by Instructional Facilitator - APD	Source: Local Cost: \$69,810
Materials	<i>Math Navigator</i> - purchased in 2008 – staff time to implement	Source: Local Cost: \$69,810

f. **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Provided expert training, real time coaching, collaboration, and feedback to teachers of middle mathematics.**

Middle level math teachers increased their planning, instructional, and assessment skills through on going work with site based math facilitators assigned to Washington High School and the assistant principal (former math facilitator at Somerset Intermediate School. Crisfield High School was staffed with a half time facilitator who primarily coordinated the testing program. Math facilitators' responsibilities include guiding collaborative meetings, coaching teachers, facilitating plug in and pull out math interventions, monitoring portfolio usage, and coordinating the implementations and analysis of benchmark/quarterly assessments.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE, AND COST</i>
Staffing	Instructional Facilitators/Assistant Principal/Joe Mills-Math Consultant	Instructional Facilitator Source: Local Cost: \$51,491 Consultant Source: Local Cost: \$3,900 Timeline: August, 2008 – June, 2009

g. PRACTICES: Reinforced middle math teachers' use of successful classroom practices of teaching test taking strategies, using mentors for at risk students, accessing interactive technology, maximizing students' math portfolios for instruction, involving parents in mathematics.

- All 6th, 7th, and 8th grade math classrooms have been provided *Promethean* boards.
- 7th grade students were provided One to One laptops.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Materials	Test Taking Workbooks	Source: Local Cost: \$620
	Benchmark Assessments	Source: Local Cost: \$400
	Student Portfolios	Source: Local Cost: \$650
Equipment (Technology)	Promethean Boards with ActiVotes Classroom Computers	Source: Ed Tech Grant Cost: \$132,000

h. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Provided Somerset Intermediate teachers with one to one laptop training.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Director of Technology Technology Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$168,580
Training	One to One Laptop Training	Source: Local Cost: \$1,411

3. Evidence of Middle Level Mathematics Challenge

a. **Several grades aggregates and subgroups will not meet 2010 AMO if 2009 percentage is maintained.**

- The 7th grade level scored 67.0% proficiency overall in 2009. The AMO for 2010 will increase to 71.9%, so increases with all groups are needed.
- The African American subgroup scored 62% in Mathematics in 2009. This must be increased in order to meet AYP in 2010.
- The Special Education subgroup scored 54.0% in 2009. This must be increased in order to meet AYP.
- The FARM subgroup scored 67.1% in 2009. This must be increased in order to meet AYP.

b. **Secondary Special Education Teachers do not consistently participate in Instructional Professional Development and/or Departmental meetings.**

- Only five of 10 high school Special Education teachers attended Instructional Inservices during the summer of 2009.
- Only two of the 10 Special Education teachers attended content area inservices during the summer of 2009.
- Four of 5 intermediate Special Education teachers attended a content area inservice during the summer of 2009.
- Intermediate Special Education teachers regularly attend content area meetings.
- High School Special Education teachers do not regularly participate in content area meetings.
- Seven of 14 secondary teachers are participating in the co teaching initiative for 2009-10.

- The predominant inservice for Special Education teachers involves compliance and documentation issues.

c. Several key Special Education initiatives failed to be completed during 2008-09

These included the intent to:

- Expand the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff.
- Monitor and evaluate the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff; establish action plans as needed.
- Develop specific “Look Fors” for administrators’ and coaches’ observations of multiple Co-teaching models; collate and analyze data; apply findings to professional development and evaluation.
- Train teachers and administrators on the Tiered Level of Interventions
 - Tier 1-Differentiated Instruction
 - Tier 2-Short Term Support
 - Tier 3-Long Term Support.
- Monitor implementation of Co-teaching strategies through observations, walk-throughs, and reflective conferences with the regular education teachers and the Special Educations teachers; document findings.

4. Changes or Adjustments That Are Being Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

In analyzing the data and the conditions of curriculum, instruction and assessment in the middle level band during 2008-2009, the conclusions were drawn:

- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable.
- Students are deficient in fact fluency and number sense.
- Students are weak in conceptual understanding.
- Absenteeism interferes with mathematics mastery.

These challenges have driven the following changes and adjustments.

a. ADJUSTMENT: Hire a mathematics facilitator at Somerset Intermediate School to work with teachers in the planning and implementation of their instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Hire Math facilitator at Somerset Intermediate to provide expert training, real time coaching, facilitate collaboration, and provide feedback to teachers on student learning Timeline: August, 2009	Staffing and Job Assignments	Staffing Cost:\$71,719 Source: Local

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Identify math facilitator responsibilities as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guiding collaborative meetings 2. Coaching math teachers and staff 3. Providing plug in and pull out for math interventions 4. Monitoring portfolio usage 5. Training and guiding math tutors 6. Coordinate testing and analysis of test scores Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Math Instructional Facilitator	Staffing Cost: Staff Time Source: \$0
Assist classroom teachers in planning and implementing explicit lessons on test taking strategies Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Math Instructional Facilitator – APD	Staffing Cost:\$71,179 Source: Local

b. CHANGE: Increase math collaboration time between and among site based grade level teachers.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Increase the number of Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) times to 6 per year for elementary teachers to work with Middle School teachers Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Staff Time	Staff Time Cost:\$0

c. ADJUSTMENT: TARGET collaboration sessions in mathematics between and among site based grade level teachers.

Collaboration targets include: analyzing data to guide instruction; improving lessons; strategies for engaging students; practices to target meeting students’ needs including matching the intervention the student need; and planning flexible grouping.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Clarify specific targets or expected outcomes in math collaboration in analysis, lesson planning, discussed strategies, and evidence of intervention impacts Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Math Instructional Facilitator <i>Performance Matters</i>	Staffing Cost: \$71,179 Source: Local Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: Local

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of collaboration opportunities Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Embedded Professional Development (preceding and following collaboration sessions)	Training/Team Collaboration Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

d. ADJUSTMENT: Increase student engagement in mathematics through the availability and integration of technology into Math instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of <i>Promethean</i> Boards Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Tech and Instructional Staff	Training-APD Cost: \$71,179 Source: Local
Increase teacher access to students' needs through using electronic spiral reviews implemented through Acti Votes. Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Electronic Spiral Reviews	Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Broaden the range of math portfolios to include an electronic component Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Professional Development	Training – APD Cost: \$71,179 Source: Local
Provide 7 th grade students with a student laptop for daily use throughout the school year. Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010		Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of Computer Aided Instruction Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Math Instructional Facilitator	Training – APD Cost: \$71,179 Source: Local

e. ADJUSTMENT: Increase individualized math instructional opportunities for students.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Offer a scheduled mathematics intervention class as a quarter-long special subject at Somerset Intermediate. (This class will use America's Choice <i>Navigator</i> to improve basic skills and will also provide supplemental instruction to the students' current math class. SPED, African American and FARM students will be specifically targeted along with other students demonstrating evidence of need.) Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Differentiated Instruction (Flexible Grouping) Math Tutors	Core Program Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Staffing Cost: \$41,300 Source: Local

f. CHANGE: Focus math interventions for Special Education students through Co-teaching efforts.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Monitor effectiveness of Co-teaching during intervention times Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Universal Block	Scheduling Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Add oversight of Special Education Instruction as well as compliance Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Coordinator of Special Ed Instruction	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Provide co-planning opportunities beyond the school day Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Extended Day Planning	Staff Stipends Cost: \$5,600 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Introduce and support a new Co-teaching model (1:6) Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Professional Development-	Training Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

g. ADJUSTMENT: Partner with outside consultants to provide math professional development in particular areas of need with expertise.

Middle level math professional development for the last 6 years has been the Focused Mathematics program providing training, coaching, analysis, and follow up throughout the year from a team of two consultants. Their impact has been significant; however, there is a need to focus on several specific competencies.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Focus the math facilitator work with teachers on lesson plan design, stressing concept and application over algorithms. (This initiative is called <i>Concept over Computation</i> .) Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Professional Development Math Facilitators	Training- APD Cost: \$71,179 Source: Local
Provide professional development on effective reasoning and problem solving skills Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Professional Development-Consultant	Training- APD Cost: \$1,300 Source: Local
Integrate statistics will be integrated throughout other content areas at Somerset Intermediate School. Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Professional Development Math Facilitator Math Department	Training- APD Cost: \$71,179 Source: Local

h. ADJUSTMENT: Adjust Formative Assessments to better measure student proficiency and inform instruction.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Maintain monitoring of student learning through local quarterly assessments Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Formative Assessments	Staff Time: Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Review and improve Quarterly assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools. Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Math Facilitator and Supervisor <i>Performance Matters</i>	Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Core Program/Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: Local
Use anchor papers to increase teacher understanding of student thinking and teacher skill in effective instruction Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Professional Development-Consultant	Training Cost: \$1,300 Source: Local

i. ADJUSTMENT: Balance the focus for Special Education Teachers between Compliance/IEP Issues and Instruction.

- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to meet regularly with the core academic teams of their assigned case loads.

- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to a core area professional development during Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) periods.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Compare secondary Special Education teachers with core academic teams on a regular basis. Timeline: March-May 2010	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Cost: No Extra Cost Source: Local
Require secondary Special Education teachers' participation in activities with regular education teachers at APD (After School Professional Development). Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	After School Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$255,356 Source: Local
Provide sessions on Research Based instructional strategies as a part of the Special Education staff regular monthly meetings. Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staff Meetings	Professional Development Cost: \$14,844 Source: Local

j. ADJUSTMENT: Keep key Special Education initiatives in the forefront of instruction during 2009-10.

The duties for the Coordinator of Elementary Reading have been revised to add leadership support for Special Education to include:

- Develop the administrator “look fors” list for Special Education lessons
- Support the Co-teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.

A Co-teaching initiative under the direction of Dr. Sharon Clark, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, the Special Education supervisor and the Reading Coordinator will be completed during the 09-10. Instructional professional development will become a part of every Special Education staff meeting. SANE documentation will be collected by the Assistant Superintendent to monitor this process.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Adjust Reading Coordinator's duties to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative. Timeline: March-May 2010	Staffing-shift in duties	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Implement Co teaching Professional Development initiative involving a partnership between University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Somerset County Public Schools. Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$10,398 Source: Grant LAFF

Elementary Science

Based upon the examination of 2008 Maryland School Assessment Science Data for Grade 5 (Table 2.7) and Grade 8 (Table 2.8):

Table 2.7: Maryland School Assessment - Science - Elementary (Grade 5)						
Subgroup	2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	183	108	59	165	103	62.4
African American	74	29	39.2	83	43	51.8
American Indian/Alaskan Native						
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	4	80	3	1	33.3
Hispanic	9	4	44.4	4	3	75
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	95	71	74.7	75	56	74.7
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	108	54	50	113	66	58.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	5	1	20	2	2	100
Special Education	23	9	39.1	26	13	50

1. Evidence of Elementary Science Progress

- a. **Elementary Science proficiency increased as a whole in the 5th grade elementary band with 62.4% of the students scoring proficient or higher by 3.4% points.**

The 5th grade increase of 3.4 percentage points seen in Science is a small but definite increase over the 2008 59% proficient.

- b. **Elementary Science Sub-groups showed increases over 2008.**

- The FARMS subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 8.4% moving to an aggregate of 58.4%.
- The Special Education subgroup increased the percent proficient or higher by 10.9% moving to an aggregate of 50%.
- The Male subgroup increased the percent proficient or higher by 7.3% moving to an aggregate of 68.3%.
- The Hispanic subgroup increased percent proficient or higher by 30.6% moving to an aggregate of 75%.
- The African American subgroup has increased the percent of students proficient or higher by 12.6% moving to an aggregate of 51.8%.
- The White Male subgroup is scoring at 83.8% proficient of higher.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed to Elementary Science Progress

- a. **STRATEGY: Increased collaboration between and among site based grade level teachers.**

The collaboration was targeted toward:

- Analyzing data to guide instruction
- Hands-On lessons (using performance based instruction)
- Building student engagement
- Targeting students' needs
- Critical Skills
- Real World Connections
- Understanding Process Skills
- Following Content Standards

b. STRATEGY: Formalized and institutionalized site based collaboration by incorporating it into EDPD (Early Dismissal Professional Development), Faculty Meetings, SIT (School Improvement Team) Meetings, Grade Level Planning Meetings, Cross Grade Level Meetings, and Team Meetings

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	PD: Effective Collaboration Strategies	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$260,294
Core Program	Data Warehouse: <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Local Cost: \$20,834

c. STRATEGY: Monitored student learning through system quarterly assessments.

The averages of all Science Benchmark (System Quarterly Formative Assessment) scores at all grade levels met or exceeded the proficiency level set at a 50% threshold except 4th grade. This was the baseline year for benchmarking in Science.

Chart Title: Elementary Science Benchmarks

Grade Level	2008-2009 Benchmark Scores
K	94%
1 st	60%
2 nd	69%
3 rd	56%
4 th	64.9%
5 th	65.3%

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Core Program	Quarterly Assessment Development and Analysis	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Quarterly Assessment Scoring: Coordinator of Student Assessment	Source: Local Cost: \$37,885
	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$260,294

d. STRATEGY: Monitored teacher use of specific strategies and conducted follow up analysis, discussion, and planning.

These strategies included:

- Hands-On Experiments
- Problem Solving Framework
- Increased use of Manipulatives
- Pacing Guides
- Cooperative Learning
- Performance Based Instruction
- Using the Scientific Method
- Standards Based Instruction
- Performing Walk-Throughs

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Administrator Observations and Walk Throughs by Principals and Instructional Facilitators	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$260,294
Equipment	Hand Held PALMS for collecting data	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0
Lesson Planning	Collection of Hands-On Lessons weekly, bi-weekly, and monthly	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

e. **STRATEGY: Provided explicit training and follow up monitoring on two key strategies: (1) Real World Connections and (2) Higher Order Questioning.**

Walk through data revealed that an average of 83% of the observations of science instructions included real world examples or applications. This instruction appears to have more relevance for students. Walk through data also captured higher order questioning and demonstrated that 40% of the observations included higher order questioning.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	Instructional Facilitator	Source: Local Cost: \$260,294
Materials and Supplies	Explicit Training Materials	Source: Local Cost: \$20,001
Embedded PD	PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation	Source: Staff time Cost: Local
Equipment	Hand Held PALMS for collecting data	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0

f. **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Provided expert training, real time coaching, collaboration, and feedback to teachers of elementary science.**

Elementary science teachers increased their planning, instructional, and assessment skills through on going work with site based science facilitators assigned to each elementary school. Science facilitators' responsibilities include guiding data driven collaborative meetings, coaching teachers, monitoring experiments and hands-on (performance based learning), and coordinating the implementations and analysis of benchmark/quarterly assessments.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND AMOUNT</i>
Staffing	Instructional Facilitators	Source: Local Cost: \$260,294

g. **PRACTICES: Reinforced elementary science teachers' use of successful classroom practices of teaching test taking strategies, using mentors for at risk students, accessing interactive technology, involving parents in science.**

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE, AND COST</i>
Materials	Test Taking Workbooks such as: Coach and Finish Line	Source: Local Cost: \$1,580
	Benchmark Assessments	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
	MSA Science Release Tasks	Source: Local Cost: \$100
	Parent Collaboration Programs, Parent Involvement on SIT Teams	Source: Title I Cost: \$21,157
Staffing and Volunteers	Additional Classroom Support (Paraprofessionals, Student Mentors)	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Equipment (Technology)	Promethean Boards with ActiVotes Classroom Computers	Source: Ed Tech Grant Cost: \$57,450

3. Evidence of Elementary Science Challenge

a. **Elementary students' science proficiency had minimal gains from 2008 to 2009.**

Within the elementary band, there was an increase in the total percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher performance; however that aggregate gain was 3.4 percentage points, moving from 59% to 62.4%

b. **Elementary subgroups experienced a decrease in the percentage of students proficient from 2008 to 2009.**

- The Non-FARMS subgroup decreased percent proficient or higher by less than 1 (.9) percentage point moving to an aggregate of 71.1%.
- There is a 12.8 percentage point gap between FARMS students at 58.4% proficient or higher compared to NON-FARMS students at 71.2%.
- The White subgroup performance was stagnant with the percent of students proficient or higher at the aggregate of 74.7%.
- The Female subgroup performance was stagnant with the percent of students proficient or higher at the aggregate of 56.6%.
- The Special Ed subgroup is only at 50% proficient or higher even though this group did show a 10.9 percentage point increase.
- There is an 11.7 percentage point gap between the male subgroup at 68.3% and the female subgroup at 56.6% proficient or higher. The White Male subgroup is scoring at 83.8%, an 18 percentage point difference over the White Female subgroup at 65.8%.

- There is a 22% point gap between the African American subgroup scoring at 51.8% points and the White subgroup scoring at 74.7%.

However, the Special Education subgroup percent proficient missed the AMO at all three grade levels scoring 56.7% at 3rd Grade, 63.9% at 4th Grade, and 55.6% at 5th Grade. The African American subgroup's performance far exceeds that of the Special Education subgroups, but also fails to meet the AMO at two of the three grade levels scoring 70.1% proficient at 3rd Grade and 70.2% proficient at the 5th Grade level.

4. Changes or Adjustments That Are Being Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

In analyzing the data and the conditions of curriculum, instruction and assessment in the elementary band during 2008-2009, the conclusions were drawn:

- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable,
- Students are weak in background knowledge and vocabulary,
- Absenteeism interferes with science mastery,
- Decreased science instructional time negatively impacted on performance,
- Special Education teachers and ELL teachers are not available at the same time for planning or Co-teaching in Science,
- Special Education students appear to be lagging throughout the year with benchmark performances that are significantly low, and
- African American subgroup performance on benchmarks and MSA is weak.

These challenges have driven the following changes and adjustments.

a. CHANGE: Increase science collaboration time between and among site based grade level teachers.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Increase the number of Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) times to 6 per year Timeline: August 2009-June 2010		Infrastructure Cost: \$34,250 Source: Local
Schedule SIT Meetings to one per month to provide more collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Instructional Facilitators Leadership	Professional Development Cost: \$245,253 Source: Local
Increase Grade Level Meetings in Science from monthly to bi-weekly Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Instructional Facilitators Leadership	Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Implement Peer Observations as another means for increasing collaboration	Infrastructure	Professional Development -

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
opportunities Timeline: August 2009-June 2010		Substitute Cost Cost: \$1,500 Source: Local

b. ADJUSTMENT: Target collaboration sessions in science between and among site based grade level teachers.

Collaboration targets include: analyzing data to guide instruction; improving lessons; strategies for engaging students; practices to target meeting students' needs including matching the intervention the student need; and planning flexible grouping.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Clarify specific targets or expected outcomes in science collaboration in analysis, lesson planning, discussed strategies, and evidence of intervention impacts Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Instructional Facilitators <i>Performance Matters</i>	Staffing Cost: \$261,916 Source: Local Core Program: Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (Stimulus)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of collaboration opportunities during EDPD Increase the number of EDPD days for implementing the professional development plan that is meeting the needs of teachers and students. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Embedded Professional Development (preceding and following collaboration sessions) Science Instructional Facilitators	Training/Team Collaboration Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Cost: \$38,406 Source: Local
Add cross content collaboration opportunities to vertical collaboration opportunities during EDPD Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Infrastructure	Training/Team Collaboration Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

c. Adjustment: Increase student engagement in science through the availability and integration of technology into science instruction.

ADJUSTMENT	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND
-------------------	-----------------	---------------------

and TIMELINE		FUNDING
Increase the number of elementary teachers with <i>Promethean</i> board classrooms: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Upgrade GES to High Tech ii. Add <i>Promethean</i> Boards to Grade 4 Classrooms iii. Document Cameras iv. Laptops Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	<i>Promethean</i> Boards Acti Votes Classroom Computers	Equipment Cost: \$161,242 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of <i>promethean</i> Boards Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Tech and Instructional Staff	Training Cost: \$2,000 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

d. ADJUSTMENT: Increase science instructional opportunities for students.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Use instructional materials to identify and respond to students' needs for hands-on learning and enrichment Focus on experiments, investigations, the scientific method, and performance based tasks. Increase use of Virtual Field Trips. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Materials Technology	Core Program; Materials Cost: \$20,000 Source: Local
Increase scheduled science instructional time to a minimum of 45 minutes daily. Realignment of quarterly curriculum, instruction, and assessment assess what standards/skills are being taught quarterly. Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Core Program Scheduling	Core Program Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Core Program Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

e. CHANGE: Use Facilitators to provide science professional development in particular areas of need with expertise.

Elementary science professional development has been deferred for reading and math professional training. However, data shows a need to provide explicit training, coaching, analysis, and follow up throughout the year, focusing on several specific competencies.

CHANGE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND
---------------	-----------------	---------------------

and TIMELINE		FUNDING
Provide professional development in oral and written communication in Science Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development-Consultant	Training Cost: \$2,075 Source: Title I
Strengthen students' problem solving, build background knowledge, and develop vocabulary Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development-Consultants	Training Cost: \$2,075 Source: Title I

f. ADJUSTMENT: Adjust science curriculum and formative assessments to better measure student proficiency and inform instruction.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Maintain monitoring of student learning through local quarterly assessments Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Formative Assessments	Supplies and Materials Cost: \$1,439 Source: Local
Review and improve Quarterly assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools. Realign curriculum and instruction matching to Maryland Science Standards. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Instructional Facilitators and Supervisor <i>Performance Matters</i> Instructional Facilitators and Supervisor	Staffing Cost: Absorbed Source: Staff Time Core Program/Data Warehouse Cost: \$20,834 Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (Stimulus)
Use anchor papers to increase teacher understanding of student thinking and teacher skill in effective instruction Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development-Consultant Instructional Facilitators and Supervisor	Training Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time

Maryland School Assessment

Middle Level Science

Based on the Examination of 2008 Maryland School Assessment Science Data for Grade 5 (Table 2.7) and Grade 8 (Table 2.8):

Table 2.8 Maryland School Assessment - Science - Middle (Grade 8)						
Subgroup	2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.			
All Students	209	115	55	223	124	55.6
African American	98	46	46.9	101	48	47.5
American Indian/Alaskan Native						
Asian/Pacific Islander				2	1	50
Hispanic	6	4	66.7	7	4	57.1
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	105	65	61.9	113	71	62.8
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	111	52	46.8	126	55	43.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	1	100	5	1	20
Special Education	28	3	10.7	34	8	23.5

1. Evidence of Middle Level Science Progress

Middle level science remained stationary with very little movement by either the aggregate or any of the subgroups. The aggregate group scored at 55.6% with the White subgroup and Hispanic subgroup as the only groups exceeding the aggregate. The Special Education subgroup made the most significant change, raising proficiency to 23.5% from 10.7%.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed to Elementary Science Progress

a. PROFESIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Increased regular collaboration among science teachers on instruction, curriculum and assessment.

- Somerset County held three system wide content meetings and a four day workshop.
- Teachers analyzed data and adjusted scope and sequences and modified benchmarks.
- All science teachers used a common scope and sequence.
- All Grade 8 science teachers administered four benchmarks based on scope and sequences following the format of the MSA.
- All teachers evaluated benchmark and MSA data and revised lesson plans in areas of weakness.
- Grade 8 teachers completed Focused Improvement Process (FIP) Sheets which required a structured data analysis of the MSA and benchmark data,

identified areas of weakness for all students, areas of weakness for individual and small groups of students and asked teachers to formulate strategies for correcting the weaknesses.

- Teachers used completed FIP sheets to complete a collaborative Critical Concept Analysis of a strand or weakness that was common to all students.
- Grade 8 science teachers completed training on range finding for benchmark constructed response.
- Grade 8 science teachers collected anchor papers for benchmark constructed responses questions.
- All teachers attended Afternoon Professional Development on methodologies that engage students.
- Grade 8 science teachers received training on Bridge Project monitoring and scoring. Teachers were encouraged to construct assignments and activities that paralleled the Bridge projects.
- The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) provided professional development for teachers to plan activities using higher level thinking skills.
- CES provided professional development on teaching methodologies that promote student engagement.
- Antioch College provided a week long summer professional development session on Critical Skills.
- Grade 6 and 7 teachers received professional development on teaching 21st century skills as part of the one to one project.

b. STRATEGY: Provided several student pathways for success.

- Middle level science classes are yearlong and 70 minutes.
- Inclusion with Co-teaching was used as the service model for Special Education students for science classes.
- After School Tutoring was provided for 6th and 7th grade students through the Voyager program.
- Seventh graders received one to one laptops during the second semester.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Training	PD: Curriculum, instruction and Assessment Summer workshop	Cost: \$,5550 Source: Local
APD	Weekly 75 Minute professional development	Cost: \$69,013 Source: Local
Core Program	Data Warehouse: <i>Performance Matters</i>	Cost: \$20,384 Source: Local
Training	Coalition of Essential Schools provided professional development for all secondary schools	Cost: \$75,838 Source: State School Improvement FY09 Grant

CATEGORY	STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST
Training	Critical Skills Professional Development provided by Antioch University	Cost: \$13,500 Source: Local
Training	1 to 1 Laptop training for all 7 th grade teachers	Cost: \$34,506 Source: Local
Tutoring	After School Voyager Program for 6 th and 7 th Graders	Cost: \$245,744 Source: 21 st Century Grant
Equipment	All 7 th Graders were assigned Laptop computers	Cost: \$240,000 Source: Local Non Recurring Costs

3. Evidence of Elementary Science Challenge

a. The 2009 Science scores for 8th grade saw no increase.

- The aggregate proficiency rate for the 8th grade remained stable at a very low percentage for 2009.
- The aggregate proficiency score was 55% proficient in 2008, and 55.6% in 2009.

b. Subgroup scores remained low with little or no increase .

- The Asian Pacific subgroup only earned a proficiency of 50%.
- The proficiency rate of the Hispanic subgroup decreased by 9.6 percentage points.
- The proficiency rate of the FARMS subgroup decreased by 3.1 percentage points.

4. Changes or Adjustments That Are Being Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

a. ADJUSTMENTS: Adjust staff duties with the explicit purpose to improve student academic performance.

- More sections of Co-teaching will be offered at the secondary level this year.
- A Co-teaching program that includes both training of teams and stipends for co-planning will be implemented in grades 6-8.
- A fulltime reading teacher has been hired to provide reading intervention for 8th through 10th graders at each high school.
- The *Performance Matters* Liaison position has been extended to a 12 month position.

b. STRATEGY: Provide professional development for staff.

- Professional development on content area reading strategies will be provided during APD.
- Science teachers attended a 4- day summer workshop in August of 2009 and are expected to apply learnings to instruction.
- Content Area Reading Enrichment (CARE) will be implemented at the intermediate school this year. CARE is professional development provided to content area teachers by language arts teachers to promote reading literacy.
- Coalition of Essential Schools will again provide professional development facilitators during the APD periods.

c. STRATEGY: Promote collaboration among teachers of science.

- Principals will hold at least one data meeting per nine weeks to monitor re-teaching progress and facilitate teachers' collaborative sharing of successful strategies.
- Science teachers will continue the benchmarking process.
- Teachers will maintain a record of re-teaching following benchmarks.
- APD (After School Professional Development) will continue.

d. STRATEGY: Promote a variety of strategies to assure student success in science.

- The Voyager program will continue to offer after school tutoring for students.
- Middle school students will receive instruction on academic vocabulary based on Marzano's research.
- The ELL staff members created an alignment of the LAS curriculum to the VSC.
- The one to one laptop program will run for 7th graders for the entire year.
- 21st skills will be emphasized.
- At the intermediate school, a grant has been written to purchase MP3 players to use podcasts and other audio files with our ELL, SPED, and other struggling readers to build fluency and background knowledge. The research shows that teachers are able to use these players to differentiate instruction through audio files of lessons, tutorials, reading selections, etc.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
After School Professional Development will continue at the secondary level Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	APD-Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$69,013 Source: Local

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Teams of Co-teaching partners will receive training and coaching through a Co-teaching initiative Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Coalition of Essential Schools will continue to service Somerset County Schools Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$43,000 Source: SSIG 09 Grant
Summer 4 day Workshop on instruction, curriculum and assessment Timeline: June 2009	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$2,480_ Source: Local_
One to one laptop initiative will begin the year for 7 th graders Timeline: August 2009-June 2010		Professional Development Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Local Benchmark assessment program will continue Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing: Assessment Coordinator	Staffing Cost: \$38,264 Source: Local
Voyager program will continue to offer after school tutoring for students Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing	Staffing Cost: \$300,000 Source: 21 st Century Grant
Two Reading Intervention teachers have been hired to help struggling readers at the 8 th grade Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing	Staffing Cost: \$66,338 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

High School Assessments (HSA)

English

Based on the Examination of AYP Proficiency Data for English (Table 2.3):

Table 2.3: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Reading - High (English II)												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	172	75	43.6	201	128	63.7	167	118	70.7			
African American	78	23	29.5	87	38	43.7	73	46	59.2			
American Indian/Alaskan Native												
Asian/Pacific Islander												
Hispanic				6	2	33.3	4	1	25			
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	90	49	54.4	107	87	81.3	92	75	81.5			
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	91	36	39.6	104	58	55.8	80	52	65			
Limited English Proficient (LEP)							3	2	67			
Special Education	15	2	13.3	26	5	19.2	14	3	25			

1. Evidence of Progress with AYP Proficiency for English

a. AYP proficiency for English is improving in Somerset County.

- Aggregate proficiency percentage for English HSA improved 27.1 percentage points from 2006 to 2008. Scores rose from 43.6% in 2006, to 63.7% in 07 to 70.7% in 2008.
- All seniors in the cohort of 2009 met the graduation requirement for English. 76.4% passed the English assessment; the others met the requirement through making the composite or completing bridge projects.

b. All subgroups increased in AYP proficiency from 2006 to 2008.

- The African American subgroup increased from 29.5% in 2006 to 59.2% in 2008.
- The White subgroup increased from 54.4% in 2006 to 81.5% in 2008.
- The FARMS subgroup increased from 39.6% in 2006 to 65% in 2008.

- The Special Education subgroup increased from 13.3% in 2006 to 25% in 2008.
- All subgroups increased proficiency from 2007 to 2008.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed to AYP Proficiency for English Progress

a. STRATEGY: Promoted Secondary English and other MSA English teachers participation in many Professional Development opportunities.

- Somerset County held three system wide content meetings and a four day workshop that provided collaboration on data analysis, curriculum revision, and professional development on effective methodologies.
- All teachers attended Afternoon Professional Development on methodologies that engage students.
- English teachers received training on Bridge Project Monitoring and scoring.
- Teachers were encouraged to construct assignments and activities that paralleled the Bridge projects.
- English teachers completed training on range finding for benchmark constructed response questions.
- Profession Development on Co-teaching was provided for Special Education teachers.
- The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) provided professional development for teachers to plan activities using higher level thinking skills.
- CES provided professional development on teaching methodologies that promote student engagement.
- Antioch College provided a week long summer professional development session on Critical Skills.
- Job embedded professional development was delivered through an instructional coach at Washington High and a contractual instructional coach at Crisfield High School.

b. STRATEGY: Provided students with a variety of pathways to be successful on the English HSA.

- English I and English II are year long courses first time students.
- Students who were not meeting success on both benchmarks and course requirements were placed in fundamentals classes and were given a third semester of small group instruction to grasp HSA material.
- A free HSA prep class was provided during the summer before the Summer HSA Administration.
- A free HSA Bridge program was held during the summer.
- After School Tutoring was provided for high school students.

c. **STRATEGY: Promoted teacher use of a variety of strategies to help students be successful on the English HSA.**

- A part time Assessment Coordinator to manage local benchmark testing was continued.
- Teachers analyzed data and adjusted scope and sequences and modified benchmarks.
- All English teachers used a common scope and sequence.
- All teachers evaluated benchmark and HSA data and revised lesson plans in areas of weakness.
- Teachers used commercial test preparation notebooks to review.
- English teachers completed Focused Improvement Process (FIP) Sheets which (1) required a structured data analysis of HSA and benchmark data, (2) identified areas of weakness for all students, areas of weakness for individual and small groups of students and (3) asked teachers to formulate strategies for correcting the weaknesses.
- Teachers used completed FIP sheets to conduct a collaborative Critical Concept Analysis of a strand or weakness that was common to all students.
- Released items from the HSA test were used by teachers in class.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Professional Development/Training Stipends	Four Day Workshop for English Teachers	Source: Local Cost: \$5,100
Professional Development/Training Consultant	Four Day Workshop for English Teachers	Source: Gear Up and Local Cost: \$1,100
Professional Development/Training Materials and Expenses	Four Day Workshop for Math Teachers	Source: Local Cost: \$710
Professional Development/Training Consultant	Critical Skills Training by Antioch University	Source: Local Cost: \$13,500
Professional Development/Training Stipends/Materials	Critical Skills Training by Antioch University	Source: Local Cost: \$13,500
Professional Development/Training Extended Teacher Day	After School Professional Development includes collaboration, Coalition of Essential Schools, engaging instruction- 75 minutes per week for all secondary teachers	Source: Local Cost: \$8,876

Professional	Coalition of Essential Schools	Source: State School
--------------	--------------------------------	----------------------

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Development/Training Consultant	Consultants for APD Training and 3 per week consultant at Crisfield High	Improvement Grant 09 Cost: \$75,000
Staffing	Additional Course added to Summer School for HSA Intervention and Bridge	Source: Local Cost: \$5,600
Staffing	Extended Contract for Bridge Coordinator	Source: Local Cost: 11,357
Staffing	Instructional Facilitator at Washington High	Source: Local Cost: \$75,770
Staffing	Part Time Assessment Coordinator	Source: Local Cost: \$37,885

3. Evidence of Challenges for English

a. **All students who are not meeting with success on English HSA have not received effective intervention.**

b. **AYP for English in 2008 was not achieved.**

- The Special Education subgroup did not meet the AYP at the secondary level and continues to be a challenge.
- The LEP and Hispanic subgroups may cause a challenge to meet AYP if the cohort groups increase to reach the measured group size.
- Other subgroups with performance gaps include the African American and FARMS.

c. **Secondary Special Education teachers do not consistently participate in Instructional Professional Development and/or Departmental meetings.**

- Only 5 of 10 high school Special Education teachers attended instructional professional development during the summer of 2009.
- Only 2 of 10 Special Education teachers attended content area inservices during the summer of 2009.
- Four of 5 intermediate Special Education teachers attended a content area inservice during the summer of 2009.
- Intermediate Special Education teachers regularly attend content area meetings.

- High School Special Education teachers do not regularly participate in content area meetings.
- Seven of 14 secondary teachers are participating in the Co-teaching initiative for 2009-10.
- The predominant of inservice for Special Education teachers involves compliance and documentation issues.

d. Several key Special Education initiatives failed to be completed during 2008-09.

Initiatives that were planned but were not implemented were:

- Expand the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff.
- Monitor and evaluate the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff; establish action plans as needed.
- Develop specific “Look Fors” for administrators’ and coaches’ observations of multiple Co-teaching models; collate and analyze data; apply findings to professional development and evaluation.
- Train teachers and administrators on the Tiered Level of Interventions
 - Tier 1-Differentiated Instruction
 - Tier 2-Short Term Support
 - Tier 3-Long Term Support.
- Monitor implementation of Co-teaching strategies through observations, walk-throughs, and reflective conferences with the regular education teachers and the Special Educations teachers; document findings.

4. Changes and Adjustments Made to Ensure Progress

a. ADJUSTMENT: Increase staff collaboration, analysis of data, and modification of instruction.

- Administrators, facilitators, and teachers will participate in data analysis meetings in each school during each nine weeks.
- Teachers will work during Afternoon Professional Development (APD) to create common assessments which will focus on particular skill sets so that intervention can be timelier and on target.
- Vertical teaming meetings will be held during APD to analyze benchmark and common assessment data and formulate intervention strategies.

b. CHANGE: Provide English teachers with embedded Professional Development facilitated by the Literacy Coach.

- Somerset County has added a half time Literacy Coach position at the high schools who will work with Language Arts teachers on the *Big 8 Explicit Reading Strategies*.

- Embedded professional development for Language Arts Teachers will be provided by the Literacy Coach.
- Vertical teaming meetings will be held during APD to analyze benchmark and common assessment data and formulate intervention strategies.

c. ADJUSTMENT: Improve the Effectiveness of Co-teaching.

- Twenty one Special Education and regular education teachers are participating in a co-teaching initiative through a partnership with University of Maryland Eastern Shore
- Washington High School has doubled teacher pairs for co-teaching going from 8 teachers working together to 16 in 2009.

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Adjusted Somerset Intermediate Reading Coach's duties to allow working with all secondary Language Arts Teachers	Staffing-	Staffing Cost \$0 Source: Staff Time
Professional Development on the <i>Big 8 Explicit Reading Strategies</i> Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	APD (After School Professional Development) and pullout and inservices	Professional Development Cost: \$250,298 Source: Local
Professional Development with Critical Skills from Antioch University. Instructional strategies aimed at problem solving and collaboration Timeline: August 2009	5 Day workshop provided by Antioch Consultant fees/expenses and stipends for teachers	Professional Development Cost \$1,478 Source: Local
Professional Development-secondary teachers will continue to attend APD a 75 minute professional development period every week Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Extended Contract for Professional Development	Core Program Cost: \$250,298 Source: Local
The Co-teaching initiative involves two parts, professional development and setting up the high school schedules to better accommodate it. Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Co-teaching Professional Development/Developing a high school schedule	Professional Development Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

d. ADJUSTMENT: Balance the focus for Special Education Teachers between Compliance/IEP Issues and Instruction.

- All high school Special Education teachers will be assigned to meet regularly with the core academic teams of their assigned case loads.
- All high school Special Education teachers will be assigned to a core area professional development during After School Professional Development (APD) periods.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: March-May 2010	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Secondary Special Education teachers will participate in activities with regular education teachers at APD (After School Professional Development) Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	After School Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$255,356__ Source: Local__
Sessions on research based instructional strategies will become a part of the Special Education staff regular monthly meetings Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staff Meetings	Professional Development Cost: \$14,844_ Source: Local

e. **STRATEGY: Key Special Education Initiatives will be kept in the forefront of instruction during 2009-10**

The duties for the Coordinator of Elementary Reading have been revised to add leadership support for Special Education to include:

- Develop the administrator “look fors” list for Special Education lessons
- Support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.

A Co-teaching initiative under the direction of Dr. Sharon Clark, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, the Special Education supervisor and the Reading Coordinator will be completed during the 09-10. Instructional professional development will become a part of every Special Education staff meeting. SANE documentation will be collected by the Assistant Superintendent to monitor this process.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Reading Coordinator’s duties have been adjusted to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staffing-shift in duties	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local
Co teaching Professional Development initiative involving a partnership between University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Somerset County Public Schools Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$10,398 Source: Grant LAFF

Based on the Examination of 2008 High School Assessment (HSA) Results for English (Tables 3.1 and 3.2):

Table 3.1: HSA Test Participation and Status - English 2008							
Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	148	74.3	110	25.7	38	15.9	28
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	78	69.2	54	30.8	24	15.2	14
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	68	79.4	54	20.6	14	15	12
Hispanic	2	100	2	0	0	50	2
Special Education	10	20	2	80	8	37.5	6
Limited English Proficient (LEP)							
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	64	75	48	25	16	19	15

Table 3.2: HSA Test Participation and Status - English 2008							
Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	140	76.4	107	23.6	33	0	0
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	56	64.3	36	35.7	20	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	80	87.5	70	12.5	10	0	0
Hispanic	4	25	1	75	3	0	0
Special Education	5	40	2	60	3	0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	50	1	50	1	0	0
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	50	66	33	34	17	0	0

1. Challenges Related to English Test Participation and Status

A significant number of 10th grade students (15.9%) are not taking the English HSA exam at the end of their 10th grade year.

- The English HSA assessment is typically taken by students in the 10th grade.

- The highest rates for non participation at the 10th grade are with the African American, White, Special Education and Free and Reduced subgroups.
- The number and percentage of students achieving proficiency in English does not appear to improve from 10th to 11th grades.
- The highest rates for not reaching proficiency are with the African American, White, Special Education and Free and Reduced subgroups.
- Although the percentage not taken drops to 0% by the end of the 11th grade year, the passing rate improves only 1.4%.

2. HSA Interventions Used by Somerset County

a. All students take a full year of English I and a full year of English II.

- All HSA courses in Somerset County are year long and in 70 minute blocks.
- Students take English I in the 9th grade both semesters or year long.

b. Several intervention pathways are offered in order to best serve students' needs.

- Students, failing either the course or the HSA assessment, re-take a one semester English II the next year.
- Students, passing the course and just missing the 396 cut score on the assessment, are allowed to go on to English III. Teachers work with these students individually.
- Somerset offers summer school for English credit recovery.
- A two week HSA tutoring class is offered during the summer for those students who passed the class but failed the HSA.
- A two week Bridge class is offered during Summer School.
- Bridge classes are offered during the school year.
- After school tutoring has been used in the past. The GEAR UP grant has paid for tutors as well as transportation for students.

c. No single type of intervention has been found to be exceptionally effective.

- Data from the cohort of 2009 shows a passing rate of 76.4%.
- All students from the cohort qualified for graduation through scoring the composite or completing Bridge projects.
- According to the data, repeating the course does not produce a high percentage of students passing.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Secondary Summer School for English Credit Recovery	Source: Local Cost: \$38,000
Staffing	HSA/Bridge Teacher for English	Source: Local Cost: \$5,600
Staffing	4 Teacher Periods at the 2 High Schools for Semester long English Courses	Source: Local Cost: \$29,404
Staffing	Extended Contract for Bridge Coordinator	Source: Local Cost: \$11,357

3. Changes or Adjustments to Address the Challenges of All Students Passing the English Assessment

a. AJUSTMENT: Realign support staff responsibilities and add ARRA funded staff for intervention.

Realignments include:

- Reassigning the Reading Coach at Somerset Intermediate to work with all secondary Language Arts Teachers.
- Hiring two reading intervention teachers, one at each high school.
- Reassigning a full time teacher to provide reading intervention for all 6th and 7th graders in need.
- Rescheduling Special Education teachers with regular education teachers to provide more co-teaching sections for students. Washington High School has doubled the number of teachers involved in Co-teaching.

b. CHANGE: Provide reading, Co-teaching, and critical strategies professional development opportunities to secondary English teachers.

In this change

- Language Arts teachers in grades 8 through 10 will receive professional development in the *Big 8 Explicit Reading Strategies*;
- Twenty one Special Education and regular education teachers are participating in a co-teaching initiative through a partnership with University of Maryland Eastern Shore; and
- Secondary Language Arts teachers will participate in the Critical Strategies initiative at both high schools.

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
<p>Reassigned the Reading Coach at Somerset Intermediate to work with all secondary language Arts Teachers</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Staffing	<p>Staffing Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time</p>
<p>Hired two reading intervention teachers, one at each high school</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Staffing	<p>Staffing Cost: \$66,338 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funding)</p>
<p>Reassigned a full time teacher to provide reading intervention for all 6th and 7th graders in need with the intent that earlier skills will impact later HSA performance and progress.</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Staffing	<p>Staffing Cost: \$0 Source Staff time</p>
<p>Professional Development: Language Arts teachers in grades 8 through 10 will receive professional development in the <i>Big 8 Explicit Reading Strategies</i></p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Professional Development during APD/Pullout Sessions	<p>Professional Development Cost: \$250,298 Source: Local</p>
<p>Professional Development: Co-teaching- twenty one special and regular education teachers are participating in the Co-teaching initiative.</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	Professional Development-partnership with UMES	<p>Professional Development Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funding)</p>

High School Assessments (HSA)

Algebra/Data Analysis

Based on the Examination of AYP Proficiency Data for Algebra/Data Analysis (Table 2.6):

Table 2.6: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Math - High (Algebra/Data Analysis)												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	202	132	65.3	204	135	66.2	161	129	80.1			
African American	84	48	57.1	100	64	64.0	71	53	74.6			
American Indian/Alaskan Native												
Asian/Pacific Islander												
Hispanic				8	3	37.5	Na	Na	Na			
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	111	79	71.2	96	68	70.8	86	73	84.9			
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	92	56	60.9	109	65	59.6	77	59	76.6			
Limited English Proficient (LEP)							Na	Na	Na			
Special Education	15	4	26.7	19	7	36.8	15	7	46.7			

1. Evidence of Progress with AYP Proficiency for Algebra/Data Analysis

a. AYP proficiency for Algebra/Data Analysis is improving in Somerset County.

- Aggregate proficiency percentage for Algebra HSA improved 14.8 percentage points from 2006 to 2008. Scores rose from 65.3% in 2006, to 66.2% in 07 to 80.1% in 2008.
- All seniors in the cohort of 2009 met the graduation requirement for Algebra. 85.4% passed the Algebra assessment; the others met the requirement through making the composite or completing Bridge projects.

b. All subgroups increased in AYP proficiency from 2006 to 2008.

- The African American subgroup increased from 57.1% in 2006 to 74.6% in 2008.

- The FARMS subgroup increased from 60.9% in 2006 to 76.6% in 2008.
- The Special Education subgroup increased from 26.7% in 2006 to 46.7% in 2008.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development which Contributed to AYP Progress for Algebra/Data Analysis

a. STRATEGY: Algebra and other MSA math teachers participated in many opportunities for Professional Development.

- Somerset County held three system wide content meetings and a four day workshop that provided collaboration on data analysis, curriculum revision, and professional development on effective methodologies.
- All teachers attended Afternoon Professional Development on methodologies that engage students.
- Algebra teachers received training on Bridge Project Monitoring and scoring. Teachers were encouraged to construct assignments and activities that paralleled the Bridge projects.
- Algebra teachers completed training on range finding for benchmark constructed response questions.
- Profession Development on Co-teaching was provided for Special Education Teachers.
- The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) provided professional development for teachers to plan activities using higher level thinking skills.
- CES provided professional development on teaching methodologies that promote student engagement.
- Antioch College provided a week long summer professional development session on Critical Skills.
- Job embedded professional development through a Math instructional coach at Washington High and a contractual instructional coach at Crisfield High School.
- Math consultant, Dr. Joe Mills, follows up with activities at both high schools three times a school year.
- Two TI-Nspire Calculator Inservices were provided to teachers to assure effective instructional use.

b. STRATEGY: Students were provided a variety of pathways to success on the Algebra HSA.

- Algebra I is a two year sequence for first time students.
- Students who were not meeting success on both benchmarks and course requirements were placed in Fundamentals classes and were given a third semester of small group instruction to master HSA assessed concepts.
- A free HSA prep class was provided during the summer in preparation for the Summer HSA Administration.
- A free HSA Bridge program was held during the summer.

- After School Tutoring was provided for high school students.

c. **STRATEGY: Teachers used a variety of strategies to help students be successful on the Algebra HSA.**

- A part time Assessment Coordinator to manage local benchmark testing was funded.
- Teachers analyzed data and adjusted scope and sequences and modified benchmarks.
- All algebra teachers used a common scope and sequence.
- All teachers evaluated benchmark and HSA data and revised lesson plans in areas of weakness.
- Teachers used commercial test preparation notebooks to review.
- Algebra teachers completed Focused Improvement Process (FIP) Sheets which required (1) a structured data analysis of HSA and benchmark data, (2) identified areas of weakness for all students, areas of weakness for individual and small groups of students, and (3) asked teachers to formulate strategies for correcting the weaknesses.
- Teachers used completed FIP sheets to conduct a collaborative Critical Concept Analysis of a strand or weakness that was common to all students.
- Three algebra teachers were provided *Promethean* Boards for their classrooms.
- Released items from the HSA test were used by teachers in class.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Professional Development/Training Stipends	Four Day Workshop for Math Teachers	Source: GEAR UP and Local Funding Cost: \$5,290
Professional Development/Training Consultant	Four Day Workshop for Math Teachers	Source: GEAR UP Cost: \$5,200
Professional Development/Training Consultant	Follow up Activities to workshop provided by Joe Mills	Source: GEAR UP Cost: \$10,400
Professional Development/Training Materials and Expenses	Four Day Workshop for Math Teachers	Source: GEAR UP Cost: \$1,210
Professional Development/Training Consultant	Critical Skills Training by Antioch University	Source: Local Cost: \$13,500
Professional Development/Training Stipends/Materials	Critical Skills Training by Antioch University	Source: Local Cost: \$13,500

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Professional Development/Training Extended Teacher Day	After School Professional Development includes collaboration, Coalition of Essential Schools, engaging instruction- 75 minutes per week for all secondary teachers	Source: Local Cost: \$8,876
Professional Development/Training Consultant	Coalition of Essential Schools Consultants for APD Training and 3 per week consultant at Crisfield High	Source: State School Improvement Grant 09 Cost: \$75,000
Professional Development/Training Stipends	TI-Nspire Calculator workshop	Source: GEAR UP Cost: \$500
Staffing	Additional Course added to Summer School for HSA Intervention and Bridge	Source: Local Cost: \$5,600
Staffing	Extended Contract for Bridge Coordinator	Source: Local Cost: \$11,357
Staffing	Math Facilitator at Washington High	Source: Local Cost: \$38,264
Staffing	Part Time Assessment Coordinator	Source: Local Cost: \$38,264

3. Evidence of Challenges for Algebra/Data Analysis

- a. **All students who are not meeting with success on the Algebra/Data Analysis HSA have not received effective intervention.**
- b. **Although all subgroups made AYP in Algebra/Data Analysis in 2008, achievement gaps exist that threaten continued success.**
 - In 2008, the proficiency percentage for the Special Education subgroup is at 46.7 %. The AMO for 2009 is 56.1% which is 9.4% below present performance.
 - If the testing group size remains the same, Somerset would need to increase proficiency of 2 more students than made proficient in 08.
 - Although the African American, and Free and Reduced subgroups made AYP in 2008, achievement gaps do exist with both the aggregate and White subgroups.

c. Secondary Special Education Teachers do not consistently participate in Instructional Professional Development and/or Departmental meetings.

- Only 5 of 10 high school Special Education teachers attended instructional professional development during the summer of 2009.
- Only 2 of 10 Special Education teachers attended content area inservices during the summer of 2009.
- Four of 5 intermediate Special Education teachers attended a content area inservice during the summer of 2009.
- Intermediate Special Education teachers regularly attend content area meetings.
- High School Special Education teachers do not regularly participate in content area meetings.
- Seven of 14 secondary teachers are participating in the Co-teaching initiative for 2009-10.
- The predominant of inservice for Special Education teachers involves compliance and documentation issues.

d. Several key Special Education initiatives failed to be completed during 2008-09.

Initiatives that were planned but were not implemented were:

- Expand the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff.
- Monitor and evaluate the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff; establish action plans as needed.
- Develop specific “Look Fors” for administrators’ and coaches’ observations of multiple Co-teaching models; collate and analyze data; apply findings to professional development and evaluation.
- Train teachers and administrators on the Tiered Level of Interventions
 - Tier 1-Differentiated Instruction
 - Tier 2-Short Term Support
 - Tier 3-Long Term Support.
- Monitor implementation of Co-teaching strategies through observations, walk-throughs, and reflective conferences with the regular education teachers and the Special Educations teachers; document findings.

4. Changes and Adjustments Made to Ensure Progress

a. CHANGE: Increase the use of technology to enhance instruction and improve effectiveness.

- Math teachers will keep electronic portfolios after each benchmark to document student proficiency after intervention.
- GEAR UP will purchase on-line algebra software, *APANGEA*, with live on-line tutoring.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
<p><i>Apangea</i> math, a math software program will be used with high school students struggling with math concepts</p> <p>Timeline: August 2009-June 2010</p>	<p><i>Apangea Math</i></p>	<p>Intervention Cost: \$12,500 Source: GEAR UP Grant</p>

b. ADJUSTMENT: Increase staff collaboration, analysis of data, and modification of instruction according to findings.

- Administrators, facilitators, and teachers will participate in data analysis meetings in each school during each nine weeks.
- Teachers will work during Afternoon Professional Development (APD) to create common assessments which will focus on particular skill sets so that intervention can be timelier and on target.
- Vertical teaming meetings will be held during APD to analyze benchmark and common assessment data and formulate intervention strategies.

c. ADJUSTMENT: Embed continuing Professional Development in math teachers' collaboration, observation, and workshop experiences.

- Math consultant, Dr. Joe Mills, will continue to work with high school math teachers. This will involve 3 visits to both schools during the year for coaching, observing, and providing feedback.
- A Four Day Workshop with math teachers on using electronic portfolios, using a problem frame to teach students to see patterns in problems and apply appropriate solution strategies, and revising and refining benchmark assessments will be held.
- All secondary math teachers will receive professional development on research based intervention strategies as identified in the *Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics* distributed through the *What Works Clearinghouse*.
- Teachers will work during Afternoon Professional Development (APD) to create common assessments which will focus on particular skill sets so that intervention can be timelier and on target.
- Vertical teaming meetings will be held during APD to analyze benchmark and common assessment data and formulate intervention strategies.
- Job duties of an intermediate Literacy Coach have been realigned to include at the high schools in order to support content area teachers to use reading strategies in their instruction.

d. ADJUSTMENT: Focus regular education and Special Education teachers' attention on Improving the Effectiveness of Co-teaching

- Twenty one Special Education and regular education teachers are participating in a co-teaching initiative through a partnership with University of Maryland Eastern Shore.
- Washington High School has doubled teacher pairs for Co-teaching going from 8 teachers working together to 16 in 2009.

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Professional Development on What works with Math, electronic portfolios, using a problem frame and revising assessments. Timeline: August 2009	4 Day workshop with consultant Joe Mills and Teacher Stipends	Professional Development Cost: \$12,261 Source: GEAR UP
Professional Development with Critical Skills from Antioch University. Instructional strategies aimed at problem solving and collaboration Timeline: August 2009	5 Day workshop provided by Antioch Consultant fees/expenses and stipends for teachers	Professional Development Cost \$1,478 Source: Local
Professional Development-secondary teachers will continue to attend APD a 75 minute professional development period every week Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Extended Contract for Professional Development	Core Program Cost: \$250,298 Source: Local
The Co-teaching initiative involves two parts, professional development and setting up the high school schedules to better accommodate it. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Co-teaching Professional Development/Developing a high school schedule	PD/Core Program Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)

e. CHANGE: Balance the focus for Special Education Teacher between Compliance/IEP Issues and Instruction

- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to meet regularly with the core academic teams of their assigned case loads.
- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to a core area professional development during Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) periods.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: September 2009 -May 2010	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Secondary Special Education teachers will participate in activities with regular education teachers at APD (After School Professional Development) Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	After School Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$255,356 Source: Local
Sessions on Research Based instructional strategies will become a part of the Special Education staff regular monthly meetings Timeline: November 2009-May 2010	Staff Meetings	Professional Development Cost: \$14,844 Source: Local

f. ADJUSTMENT: Keep key Special Education Initiatives will be kept in the forefront of instruction during 2009-10.

The duties for the Coordinator of Elementary Reading have been revised to add leadership support for Special Education to include:

- Develop the administrator “look fors” list for Special Education lessons
- Support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.

A Co-teaching initiative under the direction of Dr. Sharon Clark, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, the Special Education supervisor and the Reading Coordinator will be completed during the 09-10. Instructional professional development will become a part of every Special Education staff meeting. SANE documentation will be collected by the Assistant Superintendent to monitor this process.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Reading Coordinator’s duties have been adjusted to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative Timeline: March-May 2010	Staffing-shift in duties	Staffing Cost: \$23,997 Source: Local

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Co teaching Professional Development initiative involving a partnership between University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Somerset County Public Schools Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$10,398 Source: Special Ed Grant LAFF

Table 3.3: HSA Test Participation and Status - Algebra/Data Analysis 2008							
Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	156	83.3	130	16.7	26	8.8	15
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	75	81.3	61	18.7	14	14.8	13
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	77	84.4	65	15.6	12	2.5	2
Hispanic	4	100	4	0	0	0	0
Special Education	10	30	3	70	7	37.5	6
Limited English Proficient (LEP)							
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	64	78.1	50	21.9	14	13.5	10

Table 3.4: HSA Test Participation and Status - Algebra/Data Analysis 2008							
Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	136	85.3	116	14.7	20	0	0
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	56	82.1	46	17.9	10	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	76	88.2	67	11.8	9	0	0
Hispanic	4	75	3	25	1	0	0
Special Education	5	80	4	20	1	0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	50	1	50	1	0	0
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	48	85.4	41	14.6	7	0	0

1. Challenges Related to Algebra/Data Analysis Test Participation and Status

A percentage of 10th graders do not take their HSA assessment until 11th Grade.

- Even though Algebra IB, which is the end of the year course, is a 9th grade course, 8.85% of students have not taken the Algebra HSA assessment by the end of the 10th grade.
- The highest rates for non participation are with the African American, White, Special Education and Free and Reduced subgroups.
- The number and percentage of students achieving proficiency in Algebra/Data analysis does not appear to improve from 10th to 11th grades.
- The highest rates for not meeting proficiency are with the African American, White, Special Education and Free and Reduced subgroups.
- Although the percentage not taken drops to 0% by the end of the 11th grade year, the passing rate improves only 2%.

2. HSA Interventions Used by Somerset County

a. **All students take Algebra/Data Analysis for 2 Years.**

- All HSA courses in Somerset County are year long and in 70 minute blocks.
- Students normally take Algebra in the 8th and 9th grades, with HSA testing at the end of the 9th grade. A small portion of students take Algebra in the 7th and 8th and test in 8th.

b. **Multiple intervention pathways are offered to meet students' needs.**

- Students failing either the course or the HSA assessment, re-take a one semester Algebra the next year.
- Students, passing the course and just missing the 412 cut score on the assessment, are allowed to go on to the next math course. Teachers work with these students individually.
- Somerset also offers summer school for Algebra credit recovery.
- A two week HSA tutoring class is offered during the summer for those students who passed the class but failed the HSA.
- A two week Bridge class is offered during Summer school.
- Bridge classes are offered during the school year.
- Students have utilized the MSDE online Algebra course.
- After school tutoring has been used through the GEAR UP grant paying for tutors as well as transportation for students.

c. **No single intervention for Algebra/Data Analysis HSA has been found to be more effective than others.**

- Data from the cohort of 2009 shows a passing rate of 84.5%, second only to Government.

- All students from the cohort qualified for graduation through scoring the composite or completing Bridge projects.
- According to the data, repeating the course does not produce a high percentage of students passing.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE, AND COST</i>
Staffing	Secondary Summer School for Algebra Credit Recovery	Source: Local Cost: \$38,000
Staffing	HSA/Bridge Teacher for Algebra	Source: Local Cost: \$5,600
Staffing	4 Teacher Periods at the 2 High Schools for Semester long Algebra Course	Source: Local Cost: \$29,404

3. Changes or Adjustments to Address the Challenges of All Students Passing the Algebra/Data Analysis Assessment

a. ADJUSTMENT: Dedicate a full time teacher at the 6th and 7th grade level for math intervention.

- Students who have fallen behind will receive additional interaction in mastering math concepts so they will be ready to begin the Pre-Algebra/Algebra courses.

b. CHANGE: Use the *Apangea* Mathematics software program will be used for those students needing 1 to 1 tutoring.

CHANGES and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
<i>Apangea</i> math, a math software program will be used with high school students struggling with math concepts Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	<i>Apangea Math</i>	Intervention Cost: \$12,500 Source: GEAR UP Grant

c. ADJUSTMENT: Increase math teachers' awareness of Special Education as well as regular education students' needs.

- Revising and refining the curriculum, instructional strategies, local performance assessments and the process of analyzing data to make instructional modifications will be the focus of the secondary mathematics program.

- Twenty one Special Education and regular education teachers are participating in a co-teaching initiative through a partnership with University of Maryland Eastern Shore.
- Secondary Math teachers will participate in the Critical Strategies initiative at both high schools.

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Professional Development on “What Works with Math”, electronic portfolios, using a problem frame and revising assessments. Timeline: August 2009	4 Day workshop with consultant Joe Mills and Teacher Stipends	Professional Development Cost: \$12,261 Source: GEAR UP
Professional Development with Critical Skills from Antioch University. Instructional strategies aimed at problem solving and collaboration Timeline: August 2009	5 Day workshop provided by Antioch Consultant fees/expenses and stipends for teachers	Professional Development Cost \$1,478 Source: Local
Staffing: A full time Mathematics teacher will be assigned to Math intervention at the 6 th and 7 th grade level Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staff	Staffing Cost: \$41,600 Source: Local

High School Assessments (HSA)

Biology

Based on the Examination of 2008 High School Assessment Results for Biology (Tables 3.5 and 3.6):

Table 3.5: HSA Test Participation and Status - Biology 2008 Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	149	79.9	119	20.1	30	14.4	25
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	73	84.9	62	15.1	11	19.8	18
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	73	75.3	55	24.7	18	7.6	6
Hispanic	3	66.7	2	33.3	1	25	1
Special Education	9	33.3	3	66.7	6	43.8	7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)							
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	62	79	49	21	13	19.5	15

Table 3.6: HSA Test Participation and Status - Biology 2008 Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	139	73.4	102	26.6	37	0	0
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	56	62.5	35	37.5	21	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	79	83.5	66	16.5	13	0	0
Hispanic	4	25	1	75	3	0	0
Special Education	5	60	3	40	2	0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	50	1	50	1	0	0
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	49	67.3	33	32.7	16	0	0

1. Challenges Related to Biology Test Participation and Status

A percentage of 10th grade students do not take their Biology HSA until 11th Grade.

- The Biology HSA assessment is typically taken by students in the 10th grade.
- For various reasons 14.4% of 10th graders did not take the Biology HSA exam at the end of the 10th grade year. These could be students took a science out of sequence, scheduling problems, transfers, etc.
- The highest rates for non participation are with the African American, Special Education and Free and Reduced subgroups.
- The number and percentage of students achieving proficiency in Biology does not appear to improve significantly from 10th to 11th grades.
- The highest rates for not reaching proficiency by the end of 11th grade are with the African American, White, Special Education and Free and Reduced subgroups.
- Although the percentage not taken drops to 0% by the end of the 11th grade year, the passing rate decreases by 6.5%.
- An increasing failure rate from 10 to 11 grades indicates a very poor success rate for intervention done in Biology.

2. HSA Interventions Used by Somerset County

a. All students take Biology for 2 semesters.

- All HSA courses in Somerset County are year long and in 70 minute blocks.
- Students take Biology in the 10th grade both semesters or year long.

b. Multiple intervention pathways are offered to meet students' needs.

- Students failing either the course or the HSA assessment re-take a one semester Biology the next year.
- Students, passing the course and just missing the 400 cut score on the assessment are allowed to go on to the next science class. Teachers work with these students individually.
- Somerset also offers summer school for Biology credit recovery.
- A two week HSA tutoring class is offered during the summer for those students who passed the class but failed the HSA.
- A two week Bridge class is offered during Summer school.
- Bridge classes are offered during the school year.
- After school tutoring has been used through the GEAR UP grant has paving tutors as well as transportation for students.

c. No single type of intervention has been found that is more effective than others.

- Data from the cohort of 2009 shows a passing rate of 73.3%.
- All students from the cohort qualified for graduation through scoring the composite or completing Bridge projects.

- According to the data, repeating the course does not produce a high percentage of students passing.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE, AND COST</i>
Staffing	Secondary Summer School for Biology Credit Recovery	Source: Local Cost: \$38,000
Staffing	HSA/Bridge Teacher for Biology	Source: Local Cost: \$5,600
Staffing	4 Teacher Periods at the 2 High Schools for Semester long Biology Courses	Source: Local Cost: \$29,404
Staffing	Extended Contract for Bridge Coordinator	Source: Local Cost: \$11.357

3. Changes or Adjustments to Address the Challenges of All Students Passing the Biology Assessment

a. ADJUSTMENT: Require Biology teachers to modify some procedures and strategies.

- Teachers will maintain a record of re-teaching following benchmarks.
- Principals will hold at least one data meeting per nine weeks to monitor re-teaching progress and collaboratively share successful strategies.
- Time will be set aside in APD for creation and support of challenges and other engaging activities for biology students.

b. CHANGE: Provide Biology teachers with several professional development opportunities including Reading in the content areas.

- Professional Development on Content Reading strategies will take place during APD.
- Twenty one Special Education and regular education teachers are participating in a co-teaching initiative through a partnership with University of Maryland Eastern Shore.
- Secondary Biology teachers will participate in the Critical Strategies initiative at both high schools

c. CHANGE: Provide students with more pathways for intervention and tutoring.

- A reading intervention tutor has been hired for each high school to work with students who have reading difficulties. This program will use *Reading Advantage*.
- Juniors and seniors will be encouraged to participate in multiple re-takes before pursuing the Bridge Program.
- The Access Lunch Program at Washington High and the Advisory Program will provide opportunities for students to make up work and receive help in problem areas.

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Professional Development: Utilizing Reading strategies in the content areas Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	APD	Staffing Cost: \$250,298 Source: Local
Hire two reading intervention teachers, one at each high school Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	Staffing	Staffing Cost: \$66,338 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funding)
Professional Development with Critical Skills from Antioch University. Instructional strategies aimed at problem solving and collaboration Timeline: August 2009	5 Day workshop provided by Antioch Consultant fees/expenses and stipends for teachers	Professional Development Cost \$1,478 Source: Local
Professional Development: Co-teaching- twenty one special and regular education teachers are participating in the Co-teaching initiative. Timeline: August 2009-May 2010	Professional Development- partnership with UMES	Professional Development Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funding)
Summer 4 day Workshop on instruction, curriculum and assessment Timeline: June 2009	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$2480 Source: Local

High School Assessments (HSA)

Government

Based on the Examination of 2008 High School Assessment Results for Government (Tables 3.4 – 3.8):

Table 3.7: HSA Test Participation and Status - Government 2008							
Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	139	93.5	130	6.5	9	20.6	36
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	71	93	66	7	5	22.8	21
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	66	93.9	62	6.1	4	16.5	13
Hispanic	2	100	2	0	0	50	2
Special Education	8	62.5	5	37.5	3	50	8
Limited English Proficient (LEP)							
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	59	91.5	54	8.5	5	24.4	19

Table 3.8: HSA Test Participation and Status -Government 2008							
Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	140	87.9	123	12.1	17	0.7	1
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
African American	57	78.9	45	21.1	12	1.7	1
Asian/Pacific Islander							
White (non-Hispanic)	79	94.9	75	5.1	4	0	0
Hispanic	4	75	3	25	1	0	0
Special Education	5	60	3	40	2	0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	50	1	50	1	0	0
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	50	86	43	14	7	2	1

1. Challenges Related to Government Test Participation and Status

a. **A percentage of 10th graders do not take their Government HSA until 11th Grade.**

- The Government HSA assessment is typically taken by students in the 10th grade.
- For various reasons 20.6% of 10th graders did not take the Government HSA exam at the end of the 10th grade year. These could be students who took a social studies or history course out of sequence, scheduling problems, transfers, etc.
- The highest rates for non participation are with the African American and Free and Reduced subgroups.

b. **The number and percentage of students achieving proficiency in Government improves significantly from 10th to 11th grades.**

- Government re-take scores are better than the other three HSA subjects.
- The highest rates for not reaching proficiency by the end of 11th grade are the African American and Special Education subgroup.
- Government classes in Somerset have the best overall first time passing rate as well as the best re-take passing percentage of any of the HSA areas.

2. **HSA Interventions Used by Somerset County**

a. **All students take Government for 2 semesters**

- All HSA courses in Somerset County are year long and in 70 minute blocks.
- Students take Government in the 10th grade both semesters or year long.

b. **Somerset offers several intervention pathways for Government HSA.**

- Students failing either the course or the HSA assessment re-take a one semester Government the next year.
- Students, passing the course and just missing the 394 cut score on the assessment are allowed to go on to U.S. History. Teachers work with these students individually.
- Somerset also offers summer school for Government credit recovery.
- A two week HSA tutoring class is offered during the summer for those students who passed the class but failed the HSA.
- A two week Bridge class is offered during Summer school,
- Bridge classes are offered during the school year.
- After school tutoring has been used through the GEAR UP grant paying tutors as well as transportation for students.

c. **Government intervention appears to be more effective than other areas.**

- Data from the cohort of 2009 shows a passing rate of 88.2%.

- All students from the cohort qualified for graduation through scoring the composite or completing Bridge projects.
- According to the data, repeating the course does produce a good percentage of students passing.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Secondary Summer School for Government Credit Recovery	Source: Local Cost: \$38,000
Staffing	HSA/Bridge Teacher for Government	Source: Local Cost: \$5,600
Staffing	4 Teacher Periods at the 2 High Schools for Semester long Government Courses	Source: Local Cost: \$29,404
Staffing	Extended Contract for Bridge Coordinator	Source: Local Cost: \$11,357

3. Changes or Adjustments to Address the Challenges of All Students Passing the Government Assessment

a. **ADJUSTMENT: Require Government teachers to modify some procedures and strategies.**

- Teachers will maintain a record of re-teaching following benchmarks.
- Principals will hold at least one data meeting per nine weeks to monitor re-teaching progress and collaboratively share successful strategies.
- Time will be set aside in APD for creation and support of challenges and other engaging activities for biology students.

b. **CHANGE: Prepare Government teachers with several professional development opportunities including Content Reading.**

- Professional Development on Content Reading strategies will take place during APD.
- Twenty one Special Education and regular education teachers are participating in a co-teaching initiative through a partnership with University of Maryland Eastern Shore.
- Secondary Government teachers will participate in the Critical Strategies initiative at both high schools.

c. **CHANGE: Provide students with more pathways for intervention and tutoring.**

- A reading intervention tutor has been hired for each high school to work with students who have reading difficulties. This program will use *Reading Advantage*.
- Juniors and seniors will be encouraged to participate in multiple re-takes before pursuing the Bridge Program.
- The Access Lunch Program at Washington High and the Advisory Program will provide opportunities for students to make up work and receive help in problem areas.

ADJUSTMENTS/CHANGES and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Professional Development: Utilizing Reading strategies in the content areas Timeline: August 2009-June 2010	APD	Staffing Cost: \$250,298 Source: Local
Hire two reading intervention teachers, one at each high school Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Staffing	Staffing Cost: \$66,338 Source: ARRA
Professional Development with Critical Skills from Antioch University. Instructional strategies aimed at problem solving and collaboration Timeline: August 2009	5 Day workshop provided by Antioch Consultant fees/expenses and stipends for teachers	Professional Development Cost \$1,478 Source: Local
Professional Development: Co-teaching- twenty one special and regular education teachers are participating in the Co-teaching initiative. Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010	Professional Development- partnership with UMES	Professional Development Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funding)
Summer 4 day Workshop on instruction, curriculum and assessment Timeline: June 2009	Professional Development	Professional Development Cost: \$4520 Source: Local

High School Assessments (HSA)

HSA Graduation Requirement

Class of 2009

Based on the Examination of Data for 2009 Graduates Who Met the High School Assessment Graduation Requirement by Option and Bridge Projects Passed (Tables 3.9 and 3.10):

Table 3.9 2009 Graduates Who Met the High School Assessment (HSA) Graduation Requirement by Option													
	Enrolled	HSA Graduation Requirement Options								Total			
		Passing Scores on Four HSAs		1602 Option		Bridge Projects		Waivers		Met		Not Met	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008-2009	161	92	57.1	51	31.7	18	11.2	0		161	100	0	0

Table 3.10 Bridge Projects Passed					
	Algebra/Data Analysis	Biology	English	Government	Total
	#	#	#	#	#
2008-2009	13	18	16	10	57

1. Somerset County's Results for the Class of 2009 Meeting the High School Assessment Requirement for Graduation

a. All students met the HSA Graduation Requirement in the Class of 2009.

- 161 Students completed the required HSA graduation requirements.
- 92 passed all 4 HSA assessments.
- 51 completed through scoring the 1602 composite.
- 18 completed by completing the required number of bridge projects.
- Students completed 57 total Bridge Projects. They included 13 Algebra, 18 Biology, 16 English, and 10 Government.

b. Multiple versions of completing the Bridge Project for Academic Validation were implemented.

- During the summer of 2008, SCPS implemented a two week Bridge/HSA Prep to enable students to complete projects and prepare for re-testing in August. Only 5 projects were completed, none were accepted.
- During the first semester of 2008-09, Washington High School scheduled a “Bridge” class with a full time monitor.
- During the first semester Crisfield High School scheduled Bridge students in their content subject area classes.
- The results of the first semester were more successful in the Bridge class at Washington. Both schools assigned Bridge classes during the second semester.

c. As issues arose with Bridge Projects, many were successfully addressed.

- Scoring consistency developed among different groups of teachers
- The roles of monitors evolved over the year.
- Scoring times presented problems. At first, teachers were pulled from classes during the day. This evolved into teachers scoring projects after school and being paid a stipend.
- Early in this process, students failed to reach the level of rigor required. Later this was not as big a problem.
- As students approached the end of the second semester with incomplete projects, they rushed and projects were not of high quality.

d. The Bridge process became very successful second semester 2008-09.

- Both high schools utilized one primary monitor along with “content” staff to work with students.
- Quality of student projects improved second semester until several “last minute” projects came in late May.
- Scoring consistency improved with teacher groups during second semester.
- Monitoring teachers became better at maintaining the level of rigor required for projects during the second semester.

2. Strategies That Contributed to Somerset County’s Results

a. STRATEGY: Students participated in a variety of instructional models to complete the HSA Requirement.

- All HSA courses are double block and carry 2 credits.
- Students failing an HSA course or test will re-take the course for a single block or 1 credit offering.
- HSA tutoring is provided before and after school.
- All students enrolled in the Bridge class re-take HSA tests during the October and April (Senior) testing weeks.

b. STRATEGY: Dedicated Staff were assigned specifically to work with Bridge.

- A Bridge Coordinator position was created. Duties were assumed by a teacher with an extended contract.
- Each school dedicated a “Monitor” teacher.
- Some class sections assigned to monitor teachers were assumed by other staff to allow the additional Bridge class.
- Instructional coaches at each high school assumed more responsibilities in regard to Bridge. Each helped identify students and organize content area teachers to help with instruction.
- The Secondary Supervisor assumed oversight of the Bridge Program.

c. STRATEGY: The need for additional services and costs was recognized by the county.

- Extra staff were hired during the summer school for the HSA/Bridge classes.
- Stipends for scoring were paid to teachers working after contract day.
- Materials were provided for some projects.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i>
Staffing	Extended Contract for Bridge Coordinator	Cost: \$11,357 Source: Local
Staffing	5 Teachers for 2 week summer session	Source: Local Cost: \$7,000
Staffing	Substitute Costs for Scoring during the School Day	Cost: \$2,450 Source: Local
Staffing	Stipends paid for after school scoring sessions	Cost: \$1,840 Source: Local

d. STRATEGY: Extra costs were absorbed by schools and staff.

- Four extra class periods for Bridge were needed by the high school staff.
- Counselors met with all Bridge students and parents.
- Instructional Coaches added organizing content staff and counseling students to their duties.

- The Secondary Supervisor added organizing scoring sessions as well as scoring and training teachers for scoring.
- The Pupil Services Supervisor added directing assessments and information to staff as well as providing an end of month report to MSDE for the beginning in February 2009.

3. Evidence of Challenge in Graduation Requirement

a. A high number of students continue to not pass the HSA course or assessment at the end of their initial course.

- Algebra/Data Analysis had approximately 16.9% of students retaking the course.
- Biology had approximately 12.8% of students retaking the course.
- English II had approximately 24.5% of students retaking the course.
- Government had approximately 21.7% of students retaking the course.

b. Providing effective intervention strategies remains a problem.

- The primary intervention for HSA is retaking the course for a semester.
- Targeted intervention has not been successfully implemented at the high school level.
- Twenty-eight of 160 students or 17.5% of the 2009 cohort had not met the HSA graduation requirement at the beginning in August of 2008.

c. Bridge Plan implementation offered significant organizational and resource challenges.

- Defining parameters for monitoring teachers was difficult initially.
- Building consistency with both monitors and scoring teachers was difficult.
- Building student confidence to meet the rigor of projects was a challenge.
- Monitoring the program required additional staffing assignments.

Class of 2010

Based on the Examination of Data for Juniors (Rising Seniors) Who Have Not Yet Met the High School Graduation Requirement as of June 30, 2009 (Table 3.11):

Table 3.11 Rising Seniors Who Have Not Yet Met the Graduation Requirement													
	Enrolled #	Met # %		Not Yet Met								Total # %	
				Needing to Pass 4		Needing to Pass 3		Needing to Pass 2		Needing to Pass 1			
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
2009 - 2010	169	141	84.3	8	4.7	11	6.5	7	4.1	2	1.2	28	16.6

1. Challenges That Persist for Students Meeting the HSA Graduation Requirement

a. Intensive efforts by highly effective staff will be needed for students to complete the HSA Graduation Requirement.

- Monitoring teachers must be carefully selected and possess high expectations and the ability to connect with students.
- Funding will be needed to pay for scoring sessions.
- Funding will be needed for extra materials.
- Funding may be needed for after school sessions for those students whose schedule will not allow Bridge to be taken during the school day.
- High school staffs must become better at analyzing data and identifying root causes for student weaknesses in order to provide earlier instructional attention.

b. Providing effective intervention remains a challenge at the high school level.

- High School staffs struggle with providing effective targeted intervention for second time test takers.
- Scheduling for intervention becomes a problem as students needing intervention also need credit earning opportunities in order to graduate on time.
- Before and/or after school intervention does not meet the needs of all students because of transportation.
- Scoring issues of a small staff which requires all certificated personnel to participate remain the same. Content area teachers feel obligated to work extra hours.

2. Changes or Adjustments that Will Be Made to Support Juniors (Rising Seniors)

a. ADJUSTMENT: Provide students with multiple opportunities to complete Bridge Projects and be counseled on their best option.

- The 2009 summer session was better organized, more students attended and more projects completed than 2008. Twenty six projects were completed in 2009 as compared with 5 in 2008.
- Bridge class sections will be offered both semesters at Crisfield High School. Last year the section was offered only during the spring semester.
- Washington High School has added a 30 minute “Access” period for all students. Students needing tutoring or time to complete Bridge projects will utilize this period. This period is the result of restructuring the school day to include a “One Hour” lunch period.
- Washington High has assigned the Bridge monitor to work with students individually. Washington High has only 8 of the 27 students needing to complete the HSA Graduation requirement this year.

b. ADJUSTMENT: Establish secondary supervisor, high school principals, and assessment supervisor collaboration for planning and scheduling in service and sessions for high school teachers on analyzing data to help focus instruction for HSA success.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Utilize “methods learned” over the 2008-09 school year in summer school for Bridge and HSA Intervention Timeline: July 2009	5 staff members X 6 hours per day X 2 weeks	Salaries – Summer School Cost: \$7,500 Source: ARRA (Stimulus Funds)
Bridge sections offered both semesters at high schools Timeline: August, 2009 – May, 2010	Staff Time	Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time
Increased opportunities for both HSA Intervention and Bridge completion at Washington High School through restructured day and “Access” period Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Staff Time	Cost: \$0 Source: Staff
Professional Development on Data Analysis and Root Causes during APD (After School Professional Development) Timeline: August, 2009 – June, 2010	Assessment Coordinator APD Time	Salaries Cost: \$219,170 Source: Local
Bridge Scoring will be done after school Timeline: August, 2009 – May, 2010	Stipends for Extra Duty	Intervention Staffing Cost:\$2,760 Source: Local

