

## Clarifying Questions

**Purpose:** This tool is intended to serve as a tracking document for Panel Facilitators and LSS staff in responding to clarifying questions, if applicable.

**Instructions:** The cover page indicates the section(s) with clarifying question(s). Local School Systems should include their response to clarifying questions in the space provided in that section of the document. The entire document should then be forwarded to the Panel Facilitator by November 9. The Panel will then review the responses for sufficiency and respond to the local school system with this same tool

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.A Executive Summary

<b>Notes</b>
The Executive Summary should serve as a stand-alone document that summarizes progress that the school system is making in accelerating student performance and eliminating achievement gaps, provides a budget narrative, describes the specific sections of Part 1 of the 2010 Master Plan Annual Update, and explains the school system’s planned use of funds and progress toward the reform areas in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).
<b>What the reviewers should expect to see:</b>
A summary of progress in accelerating student performance and eliminating achievement gaps
A budget narrative that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describes changes in school system demographics and/or fiscal climate, along with a discussion of the effect of these changes on the school system and Master Plan implementation. (p. 13 of the Guidance Document).</li><li>• Identifies system priorities for the coming year (p. 13 of the Guidance Document)</li><li>• If applicable, describes how fiscal resources are being redistributed or retargeted to support school system priorities (p. 13 of the Guidance Document).</li></ul>
A summary of system successes and challenges for all students and subgroups of students (p. 13 of the Guidance Document)
A summary for each specific sections of Part I of the 2010 Master Plan Annual Update
A description of the planned use for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds for 2011
A summary of progress made on the ARRA Reforms – State Fiscal Stabilization Fund
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b>
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b>
<b>Panel Action</b>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.B Finance Section

Notes
The finance section, in conjunction with the budget narrative information in the Executive Summary, includes a Current Year Variance Table, a Prior Year Variance Table with analyzing questions, and revenue, expenditure and FTE statements. Together, these documents illustrate the local school system's alignment of the annual budget with the Master Plan priorities.
The technical review of the Current Year Variance Table, Prior Year Variance Table, and Attachments 1-3 is conducted by finance specialists. A report on this review is prepared and provided to the panel for discussion.
Panel reviewers are asked to look for the alignment between budget documents and annual update priorities. Analyzing prompts designed to assess this alignment are included within each area of the annual update. Reviewers should note their findings in each particular section of this tool.
Panel reviewers are asked to look for the alignment between ARRA funds and ARRA Reform activities and/or programs

Panel Action
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> Reviewers are not finding an overt response to the analyzing questions; please see the guidance document page 15, Prior Year Variance Table—Analyzing Questions.
Local School System Action
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s): The responses are below. These will be included in the final revision.</b> <b>ARRA Financial Reporting Tables – Analyzing Questions</b>  <i>1. Please describe what the influx of flexible ARRA SFS funds has allowed the school system to accomplish this year, regardless of whether or not the SFS funds were directly used to fund an initiative. .</i>  ARRA provided Somerset County Public Schools with over \$1.2 million in funds that were used to implement the four assurances stated.  <b>Assurance 1 – Increasing Teacher Effectiveness:</b> A quick glance at the information in Table 1.1D Prior Year ARRA Variance Report, shows a variety of technology expenditures. Included in this section, was the ongoing implementation of the Technology Plan which calls for “growing” technology similar to that of the Somerset Intermediate School down through the elementary grades. ARRA allowed the technology plan for the 4 <sup>th</sup> grade (and 1 classroom at the 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade level) to become “high tech classrooms” with Promethean Boards and document cameras. Additionally, ARRA funds enable SCPS to make Greenwood Elementary (the highest poverty elementary school in the County) a high tech school; its technology mirroring that of Somerset Intermediate which was the County’s first high tech school. A consultant was also used to work with staff members in implementing the 1:1 Technology Initiative at Somerset Intermediate.

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

Training of teachers in two initiatives was implemented with ARRA funding. Autism training was conducted to make staff aware of autism, strategies in working with students with autism. A Co Teaching initiative which pairs a regular education teacher and special education teacher to work together on successful strategies to improve student performance.

**Assurance 2 – Building Data Systems:** Funds were used to continue the use of a data warehouse (Performance Matters) which houses all student performance information. The funds were also used to continue the use of the student information system (Power School) which is used to track a variety of student data not related to performance. The use of ARRA for these systems enabled the allocation of funding toward the awarding of step increases at mid year to staff.

**Assurance 4 – Targeted Support:** Through the use of ARRA funds, nine positions were created or saved. Created jobs included three reading tutors (one elementary and two secondary) who were assigned to work with small groups doing intervention techniques. Also created were two math intervention tutors who were placed at the highest poverty elementary schools. Among the saved positions were a Family and Community Involvement Coordinator who works with each elementary to increase parental involvement which is a proven strategy to improve student achievement. An ELL tutor was maintained at the elementary school with the highest ELL population. and math intervention tutors. These funds were used to improve instruction primarily at the two high schools which are in corrective action. ARRA funds provided reading tutors (one at each high school) to work with groups using targeted intervention to improve scores. ARRA funds also allowed for a summer school intervention program to be implemented for students not testing proficient as well as a Home Visit program which brought students books to be read over the summer months.

At the secondary level, ARRA allowed us to provide more High School Assessment Intervention through summer classes for students. ARRA also funded a summer school makeup credit program which enabled the allocation of funding toward the salary increases indicated on Table 1.1B.

ARRA funds also provided support to the increasing population of homeless students within the county.

**Other:** Two IEP clerk positions were saved using ARRA funds. These positions provide clerical support to special education teachers with the massive amounts of paperwork and time required for the IEP process. Use of IEP clerks enables teachers to spend their time in the classroom providing support to students with special needs. Contractual services, such as physical therapy and occupational therapy were provided with the influx of ARRA funds. These services ensured compliance with the requirements of the student's IEP.

Instructional Textbooks and materials were purchased to ensure an adequate number of textbooks at all levels (as well as consumable materials used at the elementary level) were available for the students.

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

An updated point of sale system was purchased using the ARRA funds allocated to Food and Nutrition Services. This purchase would have been impossible without the ARRA funds as the Food Service Fund has not made a profit for two years.

### Panel Action

Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.i Maryland School Assessment – Reading

Notes
<p><b>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.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Indicator 1.1:</b> 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 Maryland School Assessment.</li></ul>
<p>Within the reading content area, local school systems should address the performance of elementary and middle school students using Maryland School Assessment data.</p>
What the reviewers should expect to see:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of progress in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the practices, programs, or strategies to which the school system attributes progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the challenges that are evident in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
Panel Action
<p><b>Panel commendation(s):</b> (1) The responses to the questions regarding progress and adjustments are comprehensive, extensive, and detailed throughout the plan; the corresponding tables (data and resources) further augment the plan. (2) The commitment to finding time during the school day to provide professional development for all staff is to be commended (e.g., common planning time, ADP, and EDPD).</p>
<p><b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> (1) The resource tables on pages 47, 54, 70, and 73 in the reading section are missing source funding amounts; please complete for final submission. This is evident throughout the plan. (2) Explain the significance or delete the question marks on page 56 before the first and second bullets under “j. ADJUSTMENT.”</p>
Local School System Action
<p><b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> The missing information from these tables dealt with a partnership SCPS is in with University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES). This is the second year of a joint Co-Teaching initiative SCPS and UMES have been in. It was difficult to figure an amount for the UMES contribution. This is missing in several parts of the update. It has been included throughout the document and will be included in the November revision. The question marks on page 56 have been removed.</p>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

Section I.D.i  
Maryland School Assessment – Mathematics

Notes
<b>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.</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Indicator 1.2:</b> The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the Maryland School Assessment.</li></ul>
Within the mathematics content area, local school systems should address the performance of elementary and middle school students using Maryland School Assessment data.

What the reviewers should expect to see:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A description of progress in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A description of the practices, programs, or strategies to which the school system attributes progress.</li><li>A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A description of the challenges that are evident in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A description of changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress.</li><li>A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>

Panel Action
Panel commendation(s):
Panel clarifying question(s): Please clarify the varying dollar amounts for EDPD ( see pages 82, 87, etc.).
Local School System Action
LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s): The correct amount for the 6 “Early Dismissal” professional days should be \$248,123. This has been changed on page 82 (actually page 84 with clarifying question additions)
Panel Action
Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.i Maryland School Assessment - Science

#### Notes

For the science content area, local school systems should address the performance of students in Grade 5 and students in Grade 8 using Maryland School Assessment data.

#### What the reviewers should expect to see:

- A description of results in terms of grade bands and subgroups.
- A description of the practices, programs, or strategies that are designed to ensure progress.
- A description of corresponding resources.
- A description of the challenges that are evident in terms of grade bands and subgroups.
- A description of changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress.
- A description of corresponding resources.

#### Panel Action

Panel commendation(s):

Panel clarifying question(s): (1) Please complete Table 2.8 (p. 107). (2) Explain the adjustment addressed in letter k on page 109.

#### Local School System Action

LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s): Table 2.8 has been completed for the November submission.

Washington High School schedules a one hour lunch daily for students 8-12. A half hour is designated for students to eat lunch, the other half hour is for students to catch up on work missed, participate in clubs, or attend intervention. Grades 9-12 are allowed to choose the areas they want to work in. Eighth grade students attend intervention or enrichment for their 30 minute period after lunch. These are assigned for students by individual needs which are identified through local formative assessment.

#### Panel Action

Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.i High School Assessments – English II

<b>Notes</b>
LSSs should address their 2009 AYP data English II. Based on the review of the 2009 HSA Status Model Grade 10 Report and the Grade 11 Report (for participation and status), LSSs should identify anything new they see in the data that would modify the direction they are taking to support students in meeting the HSA Graduation Requirement.
<b>What the reviewers should expect to see:</b>
<b>2009 AYP Data</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of progress in terms of subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the practices, programs, or strategies to which the school system attributes progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the challenges that are evident in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<b>2009 HSA Status Model</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description additional challenges that are evident.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the strategies the school system has in place to support students in passing the Biology HSA as well as the evidence of their effectiveness.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of what the school system will do differently than it did in past years. A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> On page 123, 2b, second bullet: define the parameters of “just missing” the 396 cut score.
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> Addition to this bullet will read “just missing (within 15 points) the 396 cut score”. This will be revised in the November submission.
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.i High School Assessments – Algebra/Data Analysis

<b>Notes</b>
LSSs should address their 2009 AYP data for Algebra/Data Analysis. Based on the review of the 2009 HSA Status Model Grade 10 Report and the Grade 11 Report (for participation and status), LSSs should identify anything new they see in the data that would modify the direction they are taking to support students in meeting the HSA Graduation Requirement.
<b>What the reviewers should expect to see:</b>
<b>2009 AYP Data</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of progress in terms of subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the practices, programs, or strategies to which the school system attributes progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the challenges that are evident in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<b>2009 HSA Status Model</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description additional challenges that are evident.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the strategies the school system has in place to support students in passing the Biology HSA as well as the evidence of their effectiveness.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of what the school system will do differently than it did in past years. A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

<b>Panel Action</b>
Panel commendation(s):
Panel clarifying question(s):
<b>Local School System Action</b>
LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):
<b>Panel Action</b>
Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.i High School Assessments – Biology

<b>Notes</b>
Based on the review of the 2009 HSA Status Model Grade 10 Report and the Grade 11 Report (for participation and status), LSSs should identify anything new they see in the data that would modify the direction they are taking to support students in meeting the HSA Graduation Requirement.
<b>What the reviewers should expect to see: 2009 HSA Status Model</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description additional challenges that are evident.</li><li>• A description of the strategies the school system has in place to support students in passing the Biology HSA as well as the evidence of their effectiveness.</li><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li><li>• A description of what the school system will do differently than it did in past years. A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<b>Panel Action</b>
Panel commendation(s):
Panel clarifying question(s):
<b>Local School System Action</b>
LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):
<b>Panel Action</b>
Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.i High School Assessments – Government

<b>Notes</b>
Based on the review of the 2009 HSA Status Model Grade 10 Report and the Grade 11 Report (for participation and status), LSSs should identify anything new they see in the data that would modify the direction they are taking to support students in meeting the HSA Graduation Requirement.
<b>What the reviewers should expect to see: 2009 HSA Status Model</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description additional challenges that are evident.</li><li>• A description that the school system has in place to support students in passing the Government HSA as well as the evidence of their effectiveness.</li><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li><li>• A description of what the school system will do differently than it did in past years. A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> The bullets under <b>1.a</b> do not appear to match the corresponding data tables (p. 141); please clarify.
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> The bullets will read (and will be changed in the Nov. 15 Revision): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 3.6% or 6 students did not take the Government Assessment during the 11<sup>th</sup> grade year.</li><li>• 66.7% of LEP students did not take the Government Assessment when in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.</li><li>• 11.1% of Special Education Students did not take the Government Assessment during the 11<sup>th</sup> grade year.</li></ul>
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.i High School Graduation Requirement

#### Notes

LSSs should report on the success of the implementation of the 2009 Bridge Plans for Academic Validation (e.g., number of projects, number of projects that passed), and identify any plan adjustments that will be made. LSSs should use local data in reporting the status of juniors (rising seniors) as of June 30, 2010, and describe the strategies, adjustments, and the resources allocated to support these students in meeting the HSA Graduation Requirement.

#### What the reviewers should expect to see:

##### Class of 2010

- A description of the implementation of the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation.
- A description of the strategies to which the LSS attributes the results.
- A description of the corresponding resources.
- A description of the challenges that are evident.

##### Class of 2011

- Identification of additional challenges.
- A description of the changes or adjustments that will be made to support those juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement.
- A description of the corresponding resources.

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> (1) Table 3.9 is incomplete (page 145). (2) On page 147, 3.a, the numbers are missing from the percentages. (3) Table 3.11 the figure 84.3 should be 83.4 for 2009-2010; some data from 2010-2011 are missing.
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> Table 3.9 was completed adding 0 students had not met. On page 147, 3.a. should read: c. <u>A high number of students continue to not pass the HSA assessment by the end of their 12<sup>th</sup> grade year.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 16.6% of 2010 graduates did not pass the Algebra/Data Analysis Assessment</li><li>• 21.3% of 2010 graduates did not pass the Biology Assessment</li><li>• 23.2% of 2010 graduates did not pass the English II Assessment</li><li>• 6.5% of 2010 graduates did not pass the Government Assessment</li></ul> This will be revised for the Nov. 15 submission. Table 3.11 was changed to read 83.4 and Table 3.11 has been completed with the percentages for each category. These are 7.4%, 7.4%, 5.8% and 2.4%.
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.ii Limited English Proficient Students

Notes
<p><b>No Child Left Behind Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Indicator 2.1:</b> The percentage of limited English Proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.</li></ul>
<p>School systems are asked to provide information on Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ A description of where <b>progress</b> is evident.</li><li>▪ A description of programs, practices, and strategies to which progress of Limited English Proficient students toward attaining English proficiency is attributed.</li><li>▪ A description of where <b>challenges</b> are evident in the progress of Limited English Proficient students toward attaining English proficiency by each domain in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.</li><li>▪ A description of the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure progress of Limited English Proficient students toward attaining English proficiency, including a discussion of corresponding resource allocations and timelines where appropriate.</li><li>▪ A two-year <b>corrective action plan</b> of how the LEA will address not meeting AMAO 1, 2, and/or 3.</li></ul>
Panel Action
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> pg 152, please add a row for the 2010 AYP data.
Local School System Action
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> A row has been added to Table 4.3 for 2010 Data. The data for the table reads 85.7% proficiency/Met for reading and 91.1% proficiency/Met for Math.
Panel Action
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

**APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report**

**Section I.D.iii  
Adequate Yearly Progress**

**School System Improvement<sup>8</sup>**

**Notes**

Only School Systems designated as **Systems in Improvement** are required to complete this section.

**What the reviewers should expect to see:**

- A status report on the corrective actions.
- 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.

**Panel Action**

Panel commendation(s):

Panel clarifying question(s):

**Local School System Action**

LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):

**Panel Action**

Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):

<sup>8</sup> Section 13A.01.04.08 of the Code of Maryland Regulations.

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### School Improvement

<b>Notes</b>
<b>NCLB Indicator 1.3:</b> Percentage of Title I schools making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Under No Child Left Behind, local school systems must review the progress of all schools to determine if each school has made adequate progress toward all students meeting or exceeding the standards by 2013-2014, and if a school has narrowed the achievement gap.
<b>What the reviewers should expect to see:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the challenges, including those specific to Title I schools, in ensuring that schools make AYP.</li><li>• A description of the changes or adjustments, which will be made to ensure sufficient progress.</li><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li><li>• A description of the actions that the school system is taking to ensure that the No Child Left Behind and Title I requirements for schools identified for Improvement:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <b>Developing Needs:</b> (Year 1), Improvement (Year 2), Corrective Action,</li><li>○ <b>Priority Needs:</b> Restructuring (Planning), and Restructuring (Implementation) are being addressed.</li></ul></li></ul>
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> (1) Complete Table 5.3 on page 159-160; Table 5.4 is missing—please include. (2) Apangea Mathematics is included in 1B, final bullet, p. 158; does it warrant inclusion under Algebra/Data Analysis since it was purchased for high schools? Please clarify.
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> Table 5.3 has been totaled in the document, 5.4 has been included. The bullet citing the Apangea Mathematics program has been included in the Algebra HSA section also.
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.iv Attendance Rates

<b>Notes</b>
Attendance rates are an additional measure used in Maryland's Adequate Yearly Progress calculations.
<b>What the reviewers should expect to see:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of progress in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li><li>• A description of practices, programs, or strategies to which the school systems attributes the progress.</li><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li><li>• A description of the challenges that are evident.</li><li>• A description of the changes or adjustments that will be made.</li><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b> Page 166 4.c, first bullet – please clarify.
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> the first bullet will read “utilize data analysis of the attendance rates for each subgroup to help determine areas of need as well as possible interventions.
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

Section I.D.v  
Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

<b>Notes</b>
<b>No Child Left Behind Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Indicator 5.1:</b> The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.</li><li>• <b>Indicator 5.2:</b> The percentage of students who drop out of school.</li></ul>
Graduation rate is an additional measure used in Maryland’s Adequate Yearly Progress calculations.

<b>What the reviewers should expect to see:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of progress in terms of grade bands and subgroups.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of practices, programs, or strategies to which the school systems attributes the progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the challenges that are evident.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the changes or adjustments that will be made.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>

<b>Panel Action</b>
Panel commendation(s):
Panel clarifying question(s):
<b>Local School System Action</b>
LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):
<b>Panel Action</b>
Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.vi Highly Qualified Staff

#### Notes

**No Child Left Behind Goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**

- **Indicator 3.1:** The percentage of CAS classes being taught by highly qualified teachers (as defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA).
- **Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high quality professional development.**
- **Indicator 3.3:** The percentage of paraprofessionals working in Title I schools (excluding those whose sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

#### Program Review

The staff from the Division of Certification and Accreditation will conduct a specialized review of this section and provide a report to the panel for discussion during the caucus meeting.

#### Panel Action

**No panel action is required.**

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.D.vii Safe Schools

Notes
<b>No Child Left Behind Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Indicator 4.1:</b> The number of persistently dangerous schools as defined by the State.</li></ul>
<b>Information associated with Safe Schools is also included in Part II, Additional Federal and State Reporting Requirements and Attachment 11: Title IV Part A, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities. This section address LSS plans regarding persistently dangerous schools, suspensions and expulsions, in- and out-of-school suspensions, and progress toward establishing and maintaining a safe learning environment.</b>
What the reviewers should expect to see:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Steps the school system has taken to school(s) from moving into probationary status.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the actions that the local school system has implemented to prevent/reduce the number of incidents of sexual harassment, harassment, and bullying.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the methods the school system uses to make staff, parents, and students aware of the Bullying, Harassment, and Intimidation form.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of system-wide strategies that are being used to prevent/reduce suspensions for Bullying, Harassment, and Intimidation.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of system-wide strategies that are being used to prevent/reduce suspensions. Where applicable, responses should include strategies that are being used to address the disproportionate suspensions among the race/ethnicity subgroups and between genders.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of how the school system coordinates programs and services with community health providers and agencies.</li></ul>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s)</b> (1) Table 7.7: check and revise totals across for 2008-2009 data. (2) The narrative for the first bullet under 1.a does not match the data chart; please correct.
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b> The total is changed from 22 to 24. The first bullet will read “there was a decrease from 8 to 6” The second bullet in that section referred to a graph that was not included in the document, so that bullet will be removed.
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.E, I.F.

#### Addressing Specific Student Groups and Cross Cutting Themes: Career and Technology Education, Early Learning, Gifted and Talented Programs, Special Education, Education Technology, and Education that is Multicultural

##### Notes

These areas are included in the Program Review. Specific information on each area is included in the Notes section and a summary report will be forwarded to each review panel.

#### Career and Technology Education

##### Notes

###### Program Review

The staff from the Division of Career Technology will conduct a specialized review of this section and provide a report to the Office of Comprehensive Planning and School Support.

#### Early Learning

##### Notes

###### Program Review

The staff from the Division of Early Childhood Education will conduct a specialized review of this section and provide a report to the Office of Comprehensive Planning and School Support.

#### Gifted and Talented Programs

##### Notes

###### Program Review

The staff from the Division of Instruction will conduct a specialized review of this section and provide a report to the Office of Comprehensive Planning and School Support.

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Educational Technology

#### Notes

##### Program Review

The staff from the Division of Instruction will conduct a specialized review of this section and provide a report to the Office of Comprehensive Planning and School Support.

### Education That is Multicultural

#### Notes

##### Program Review

The staff from the Equity Assurance Office will conduct a specialized review of this section and provide a report to the Office of Comprehensive Planning and School Support.

#### Panel Action

**No panel action is required for Career Technology, Early Learning, Gifted and Talented, Educational Technology, and Education That is Multicultural.**

**APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report**

**Section I.G**

**Local Goals and Indicators**

<b>Notes</b>
This section is intended to provide school systems with an opportunity to discuss the progress that they are making toward local goals that have not been addressed in the preceding sections.

<b>What the MSDE Program Reviewers should expect to see:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A description of progress that was made in 2009-2010 toward local goals.</li><li>• A description of programs, practices, or strategies to which the school system attributes the progress.</li><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li><li>• A description of the adjustments or changes that will be made.</li><li>• A description of corresponding resources.</li></ul>

<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel commendation(s):</b>
<b>Panel clarifying question(s):</b>
<b>Local School System Action</b>
<b>LSS Response to Clarifying Question(s):</b>
<b>Panel Action</b>
<b>Panel Review of Clarifying Question(s):</b>

**APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report**  
**Highly Qualified Staff**

Based on data in the table:	If your system does not meet the criteria:	Respond to the prompts:
<p><b>6.1:</b> Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</p> <p><b>6.2:</b> Percentage of Core Academic Subjects Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teacher in Title I Schools</p> <p><b>6.3:</b> Number of Classes <u>Not</u> Taught by Highly Qualified (NHQ) Teachers by Reason</p>	<p>The percentage of CAS is 90% HQT or higher.</p> <p>The percentage of CAS in Title I schools is 100% HQT.</p> <p>The percentage (total) of NHQT is less than 10%.</p>	<p><b>1.</b> Describe where progress is evident. <b>Progress continues to be evident when compared to 2003-2004. However, the percentage of CAS taught by Highly Qualified teachers fell by 6% from 100% to 99.4% in Title I schools. Two class sections in Art were taught by a teacher who was not HQ in that subject.</b></p> <p><b>2.</b> Identify the practices, programs, or strategies and the corresponding resource allocations to which you attribute the progress. <b>The strategies include more rigorous recruiting, screening and hiring procedures. (\$8,000)The HR Division only recommends Highly Qualified potential hires to the Board for consideration. Individuals who do not maintain proper certification are recommended for termination. Other strategies include regular communication with incumbent staff as to the status of their certification. In addition, the Human Resources Division offers classes that incumbent teacher can take to assist with recertification. Tuition reimbursement is provided. (\$3,000 per employee) Reimbursement for successful completion of Praxis Tests is provided (\$3,000) New teachers are provided with a teacher mentor. (\$61,000) New teacher orientation is provided (\$20,000). What evidence does the school system have that the strategies in place are having the intended effect? <b>The CAS taught by NHQ teachers has declined from 46.6% in the 2003-2004 school year to 2.8% for the 2009-2010 school year.</b></b></p> <p><b>3.</b> Describe where challenges are evident.  <b>The main challenges in Title I Schools at this time would be</b></p>

**APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report**

		<p><b>a teacher placed in a class or classes different from their appropriate area of endorsement.</b></p> <p>4. Describe the changes or adjustments and the corresponding resource allocations that were made to ensure sufficient progress. Include timelines where appropriate. <b>A fully certificated art teacher, already an employee of the system, now teaches those two aforementioned art classes described in question 1.</b></p>
--	--	--

The difference in the number of classes in the count compared with the past years had to do with the method of class counting throughout the year as opposed to the December snapshot. The state report indicated that classes counted.

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### High Quality Professional Development

Program Area Review Results
<p>Program Area Reviewer commendation(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Somerset County is commended for using RTI for developing Teacher Outcomes.</li><li>• There is a thorough discussion of this process as a work-in-progress, including changes made during the process.</li><li>• Commendations for candid reflections on what worked well and what didn't.</li></ul>
<p>Program Area Reviewer clarifying question(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Who are the district (review) staff that participated in the review process and to what degree did they participate in the “limited” formal training?</li></ul> <p>Somerset County Public Schools uses the instructional central office staff to formally review School Improvement plans. This group includes the Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Supervisor and Elementary Supervisor. No specialized training was provided for this group. Basically the group met in an attempt to develop procedures for integrating the Maryland Professional Development plan rubric into the system's School Improvement Review process. All had been involved in the previous training and were very familiar with MSDE's <i>Maryland Teacher Professional Development Planning Guide</i> and the <i>Maryland Teacher Professional Development Evaluation Guide</i>. The group used the rubric to work through scoring how well each plan met the requirements. Basically, the first review was “hands on” training.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Please provide any further information regarding the preparation of district staff for reviewing the plans, such as the length of the sessions, topics covered, and any materials developed specifically for this task.</li></ul> <p>The timeline for finalizing SCPS school improvement plans is normally near the middle of November. The elementary schools must comply with Title 1 requirements and all three of the secondary schools use the Title 1 template as it complies with Alternative Governance requirements. SCPS has revised the Title 1 template to include the Maryland Professional Development Plan, as well as alter the Peer and formal review process to include rating the Professional Development plans with the Maryland Rubric. Only the planning session for the review and the review itself could be considered training sessions. The revised Title 1 School Improvement template is an attempt to bring together all the compliance requirements for School Improvement Plans.</p>

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

### Section I.E Addressing Specific Student Groups: Career and Technology Education

#### What the MSDE Program Reviewers should expect to see:

- A description of the school system's progress on the implementation and expansion of the Career and Technology Education (CTE) Programs of Study within Career Clusters and the strategies for increasing CTE enrollees to become completers. Data points should include the number of enrollees, the number of concentrators, and completers.
- A description of the actions included in the master plan to ensure access to CTE programs and success for every student in CTE Programs of Study, including students who are members of special populations.

#### Program Area Review Results

Program Area Reviewer commendation(s): None

Program Area Reviewer clarifying question(s): Please clarify what is meant by the first part of question 4b, second bullet, and describe what Somerset is doing to increase student interest in non-traditional CTE programs of study.

***Responses to the clarifying questions have been answered on 10/27/10.***

**PLEASE INCLUDE THE REVISIONS BELOW IN THE FINAL SUBMISSION OF THE MASTER PLAN UPDATE.**

Program Area Reviewer clarifying question(s): Please clarify what is meant by the first part of question 4b, second bullet, and describe what Somerset is doing to increase student interest in non-traditional CTE programs of study.

We offer ten CTE programs of study at JM Tawes Technology and Career Center. They include Automotive, Business, Computer Networking, Construction, Fire & Rescue, Food Service, Health Occupations, HVAC, Protective Services and Teacher Academy. Of these only four, Business, Computer Networking, Food Service and Protective Services tend to draw both male and female students. The Automotive, Construction and HVAC programs have been almost 100% male, except for one or two students. The Health Occupations and Teacher Academy programs have been 100% female for the last four years. The Automotive, Construction and HVAC programs are not popular with our female students and the Health Occupations and Teacher Academy programs are not popular with our male students.

Our LPAR data shows we only have 14% participation (15/107) and 2% completion(2/61) so it is difficult to analyze performance gaps between categories or performance of all students because of the small number of students in nontraditional programs.

## APPENDIX A. Panel Consensus Report

To increase student interest nontraditional programs we have done the following:

- Started an 8<sup>th</sup> grade survey class in 2008-2009 to introduce all students to every CTE program offered. We won't see the full effect of this program until 2011-2012.
- We are exposing our high school guidance counselors to more information about the programs and post-secondary opportunities that are available to all students.
- We make sure non-traditional students are aware of the opportunities in all of the programs
- We make every effort to have non-traditional role models meet with students who might be interested in a non-traditional program.