

I.D.iii

Adequate Yearly Progress

This section requires that school systems in any phase of school system improvement update progress in specific areas. Additionally, school systems must report the percentages of all schools making Adequate Yearly Progress, the percentages of Title I schools making Adequate Yearly Progress, Schools in Improvement and Title I Schools in Improvement.

School System Improvement

This section must be completed **ONLY** by local school systems in improvement or corrective action.²

Instructions:

1. Local school systems in corrective action must provide an update on how the school system has revised the applicable components of the Master Plan to execute the corrective actions taken by the State Board of Education. In the report, school systems should describe what challenges are evident and what changes or adjustments will be made so that the school system will exit corrective action status. You may refer to other sections of this update as appropriate.

School Improvement

No Child Left Behind Indicator 1.3: The percentage of Title I schools that make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Under No Child Left Behind, local school systems must review the progress of Title I schools primarily to determine if: (1) each school has made adequate yearly progress toward meeting State standards by 2013-2014; and (2) schools have narrowed the achievement gap. In conjunction with the local school system, the State must review the effectiveness of each school's actions and activities that are supported by Title I, Part A funds³, including parental involvement and professional development.

In June 2010, MSDE submitted its Race to the Top application (RTTT) to the US Department of Education. As required in the application, school systems with persistently low-performing Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools must, as part of their master plan update, provide a plan describing district-level support for improving student performance at the identified schools. The plan must also describe the corresponding resource allocations dedicated to improved performance, aligned with the state's RTTT goals and commitments in the MOU signed by local school systems.

Maryland defines "persistently lowest-achieving Tier I schools" as those Title I schools (elementary school grade levels PreK-5, middle school grade levels 6-8, and combination schools PreK-8) that are the five lowest-achieving (or lowest 5 percent) of all Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State. "Persistently lowest-achieving Tier II schools" are those ***Title I-eligible*** secondary schools that are the lowest five percent of all secondary Title I-eligible schools in the State.

² Section 13A.01.04.08 of the Code of Maryland Regulations.

³ This information is included in Attachment 7 of Part II.

"Persistently low-achieving Tier III schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring not identified as persistently low-achieving in Tier I.

A. Based on the Examination of School-level AYP Data (Tables 5.1 and 5.2):

Table 5.1 Number and Percentage of All Schools Making Adequate Yearly Progress												
	Elementary			Middle			High			Special Placement		
	Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP		Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP		Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP		Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP	
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
2003	6	6	100.0	2	2	100.0	2	2	100.0			
2004	6	2	33.3	2	2	100.0	2	1	50.0			
2005	6	6	100.0	1	0	0.0	2	1	50.0			
2006	6	6	100.0	1	0	0.0	2	0	0.0			
2007	5	4	80.0	1	0	0.0	2	1	50.0			
2008	5	5	100.0	1	1	100.0	2	1	50			
2009	5	5	100	1	0	0	2	1	50			
2010	5	5	100	1	1	100						

Table 5.2 Number and Percentage of Title I Schools Making Adequate Yearly Progress												
	Elementary			Middle			High			Special Placement		
	Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP		Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP		Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP		Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP	
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
2003	5	5	100									
2004	5	1	20									
2005	5	5	100									
2006	5	5	100									
2007	4	3	75									
2008	4	4	100									
2009	3	3	100									
2010	4	4	100									

1A. Challenges remain in meeting AYP at the middle and secondary levels.

- The special education subgroup continues to meet AYP proficiency levels at the elementary and at the sixth and seventh grade levels because of the confidence intervals.
- The LEP subgroup is limited in number and fluctuates from year to year in attaining AYP.
- Eighth grade continues to be a challenge, as only the white subgroup met the AMO in reading.
- No sub group or the aggregate met the AMO in mathematics at the eighth grade level.

1B. Somerset County Public Schools has allocated significant resources to help meet AYP at the middle and secondary level.

- A Secondary Literacy Supervisor has been hired.
- Reading Intervention teachers were rehired at both high schools.
- Reading and Math intervention teachers were rehired at Somerset Intermediate School.
- Reading intervention tutors were continued at Deal Island, Woodson, and Greenwood Elementary Schools.
- Somerset Intermediate completed the Teacher Comprehensive Needs Assessment and submitted the executive report in January 2010.
- Somerset County Public Schools will again partner with University of Maryland Eastern Shore in providing Co-teaching professional development.
- Individual learning plans for graduation are developed for “at risk” students at each high school.
- “Bridge Classes” at each high school will continue to schedule.
- *Apangea Mathematics* software program for high schools was purchased.

ADJUSTMENT* And TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Secondary Literacy Supervisor Timeline: August 2010	Staffing	Source: Local Cost: \$78,626
Two reading intervention teachers, one at each high school. Timeline: August 2010	Staffing	Source: ARRA (stimulus) funding Cost: 66,338
A math and a reading intervention teacher at Somerset Intermediate School Timeline: August 2010	Staffing	Source: State Fiscal Stabilization (stimulus) Cost:\$82,600
Consultants from University of Maryland Eastern Shore Timeline: September 2010	Professional Development	Source: UMES Grant Cost: \$8000
Establish Individual Learning Plans at the high schools Timeline: October 2010	Core Program	Source: Staff Time Cost: Local

Schedule Bridge classes and continued to staff a Bridge Coordinator Timeline: August 2010	Core Program	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Math intervention software program Timeline: September 2010	Intervention Program	Source: GEAR UP Grant Cost: \$12,500

Based on the Examination of School-level AYP Data (Tables 5.3 and 5.4):

Table 5.3: Number of All Schools in Improvement														
	2005-2006 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2005	2006-2007 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2006
	(based on 2005 AYP)							(based on 2006 AYP)						
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		
Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
High Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Special Placement Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total							2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	2007-2008 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2007	2008-2009 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2008
	(based on 2007 AYP)							(based on 2008 AYP)						
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs				Developing Needs			Priority Needs			
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		
Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Middle Schools	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
High Schools	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Special Placement Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	2	1	0	0	0		1	2	0	0	0	0	0	
	2009-2010 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2009	2010-2011 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2010
	(based on 2009 AYP)							(based on 2010 AYP)						
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs				Developing Needs			Priority Needs			
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		

Elementary Schools												
Middle Schools			1						1			
High Schools		2										
Special Placement Schools												
Total		2	2									

Table 5.4: Number of Title I Schools in Improvement

	2005-2006 Level of Improvement (based on 2005 AYP)						Exiting in 2005	2006-2007 Level of Improvement (based on 2006 AYP)						Exiting in 2006
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		
	Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
High Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Special Placement Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total														
	2007-2008 Level of Improvement (based on 2007 AYP)						Exiting in 2007	2008-2009 Level of Improvement (based on 2008 AYP)						Exiting in 2008
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs				Developing Needs			Priority Needs			
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		
Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
High Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Special Placement Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total														
	2009-2010 Level of Improvement (based on 2009 AYP)						Exiting in 2009	2010-2011 Level of Improvement (based on 2010 AYP)						Exiting in 2010
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs				Developing Needs			Priority Needs			
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		

Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0						
High Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Special Placement Schools												
Total												

1A. Actions that the school system took during the 2009-2010 school year to ensure that the No Child Left Behind and Title I requirements for schools identified for Developing Needs Improvement

The following actions were taken:

- Identified schools and their status in regard to Schools in Improvement.
- Completed the required parental notification requirements.
- Reviewed and approved School Improvement Plans.
- Completed the Teacher Comprehensive Needs Assessment at Somerset Intermediate School
- Revised the two year SIT plans to reflect 2009 data as well as modified strategies.
- Provided summer leadership conference for all school leadership teams.
- Continued developing the master schedule at Washington High School so Special Ed teachers are available to co-teach with more students.
- Utilized Math consultant, Joe Mills to monitor math curriculum at secondary level
- Expanded the Explicit Reading strategies professional development to the high schools by utilizing the middle level reading coach one day a week at each high school
- Identified individual students affected and possible root causes of low performance/achievement at each site.
- Required ILP (Individual Learning Plans) for each student at risk for HSA success
- Scheduled “Bridge Plan” classes within the master schedule of both high schools.
- Extended the Classroom Focused Improvement Process on into the high schools
- Continued to develop and upgrade countywide reading and math benchmark assessments.
- Developed common assessments for reading and math at Somerset Intermediate School
- Utilized the data warehouse system *Performance Matters* to store and analyze data at all schools
- Built the capacity of staff through regular professional development (APD) aligned with student achievement results.
- Contracted with Coalition of Essential Schools to provide an Instructional Coach for Crisfield High and Somerset Intermediate School for 1-2 days per week.
- Continued to fund a middle level Reading Coach

- Provided funds and support for the partnership of Washington High School, Somerset Intermediate, Crisfield High School and the Coalition of Essential Schools. (School reform organization).
- Continued a .5 staff member to assist in the development and implementation of local benchmark assessments.

CATEGORY*	CONTRIBUTING STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST**
Professional Development	Summer Leadership Conference	Source: Local and School Improvement Grant Cost: \$9,908
Staffing	Increased salary and contract of middle level reading coordinator to extend into high schools	Source: Local Cost: \$61,147
Professional Development	Consultant Joe Mills	Source: Local and GEAR UP Grant Cost: \$37,004
Professional Development	Coalition of Essential Schools	Source: Local and State School Improvement Grant Cost: \$54,600
Professional Development	After School Professional Development-weekly 75 minutes for secondary schools	Source: Local Cost: \$270,454
Staffing	Two reading intervention tutors, one at each high school.	Source: ARRA (stimulus) Cost: \$66,338
Staffing	A math and a reading intervention teacher at Somerset Intermediate School	Source: Local Cost: \$88,857
Core Program	Schedule Bridge classes at both high schools, add on responsibility for staff member to be bridge coordinator	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Continued the .5 staff member to assist in the development of local benchmark assessments	Source: Local Cost: \$43,297

1B. Actions the School System Will Take Once School Improvement Status is Determined for the 2010-2011 school year.

The following actions will be taken in 2010-2011:

- Identify schools and their status in regard to Schools in Improvement.
- Complete the required parental notification requirements.
- Review and approve School Improvement Plans.
- Revise and strengthen School Improvement Plan.
- Complete Teacher Comprehensive Needs Assessment if high schools go into Corrective Action.
- Provide research based professional development to improve the performance of special education and LEP students.
- Continue to improve and implement the Classroom Focused Improvement process at all levels.
- Maintain the present benchmarking process, move to developing common assessments at all levels.
- Provide Central Office support to address specific issues underlying the school's continued inability to make AYP.
- Revise SIT plans.
- Conduct Leadership Conference. Leadership teams will develop achievement plans. These plans will be presented for Central office, university partners and peer review on October 26, 2010.
- Conduct final reports of achievement plan on June 16, 2011.
- Work with MSDE's Alternative Governance division to complete all NCLB requirements for schools in improvement.
- Continue instructional interventions.

CATEGORY*	CONTRIBUTING STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST**
Summer Leadership Conference Timeline: August 4,5, 2010	Professional Development	Source: State Fiscal Stabilization Cost: \$4,138
Hired Full Time Secondary Literacy Supervisor Timeline: August 2010	Staffing	Source: Local Cost: \$78,626
Continue work with Joe Mills Timeline: September 2010	Professional Development	Source: GEAR UP Cost: \$16,200
Continue to hire two reading intervention tutors, one at each high school Timeline:	Staffing	Source: ARRA (stimulus) Cost: \$66,338
Continue to hire a math and a reading intervention teacher at Somerset Intermediate School Timeline:	Staffing	Source: State Fiscal Stabilization (Stimulus) Cost: \$82,600

Schedule Bridge classes at both high schools, add on responsibility for staff member to be bridge coordinator Timeline:	Core Program	Source: Local Cost: \$14,190
Continue After School Professional Development, 75 minutes per week Timeline:	Professional Development	Source: Local Cost \$281,195