

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.⁹

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 funds¹⁰, including parental involvement and professional development.

⁹ Section 13A.01.04.08 of the Code of Maryland Regulations.

¹⁰ This information is included in Attachment 7 of Part II.

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. "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	
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
2002-2003	6	6	100.0	2	2	100.0	2	2	100.0			
2003-2004	6	2	33.3	2	2	100.0	2	1	50.0			
2004-2005	6	6	100.0	1	0	0.0	2	1	50.0			
2005-2006	6	6	100.0	1	0	0.0	2	0	0.0			
2006-2007	5	4	80.0	1	0	0.0	2	1	50.0			
2007-2008	5	5	100.0	1	1	100.0	2	1	50			
2008-2009	5	5	100	1	0	0	2	1	50			
2009-2010	5	5	100	1	1	100	2	0	0			
2010-2011	5	4	80	1	1	100	2	1	50			

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	
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
2002-2003	5	5	100									
2003-2004	5	1	20									
2004-2005	5	5	100									
2005-2006	5	5	100									
2006-2007	4	3	75									
2007-2008	4	4	100									
2008-2009	3	3	100									
2009-2010	4	4	100									
2010-2011	4	3	75									

1A. Challenges in Meeting AYP at All Schools Including Title 1 Schools.

- The special education subgroup continues to be a challenge in meeting AYP proficiency levels at all levels and is making it because of the confidence intervals.
- The LEP subgroup is limited in number and fluctuates from year to year in attaining AYP.
- Woodson Elementary School did not meet AYP in Reading with the African American and Special Education subgroups. Because of a change in staff, the school was without a Reading Coach for much of the 2010-2011 school year.
- Eighth grade continues to be a challenge at both Middle/High Schools, with many subgroups missing the AMO in reading and in math.
- Only one sub group met the AMO in mathematics at the eighth grade level.
- Bridge project participation was at 18% of class of 2011 versus only 10% in 2010.
- Forty four students had not completed the HSA requirement going into their senior year.

- Budget shortfalls have eliminated two reading intervention teachers at the two Middle/High schools
- The Secondary Literacy Supervisor has been transferred to a principal position
- Due to funding the *Apangea* Math software program was discontinued.
- As students move on into the upper grades, parental involvement drops
- Even though discipline numbers are falling, achievement is curtailed because of students not in class, either for office referrals or suspensions.

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

- A Curriculum and Instruction Director has been hired, replacing the Secondary Literacy Supervisor.
- Reading Intervention will be limited to two sections each at the middle/high schools. These will be taught by Regular English/LA teachers.
- *Read 180* has been purchased through the Race to the Top Grant and will be implemented at both middle/high schools.
- Reading and Math intervention teachers were maintained at Somerset Intermediate School by not replacing retiring Family and Consumer Science Teacher and reducing one Learning Support Specialist.
- Reading intervention tutors were continued at Deal Island, and Woodson Elementary Schools.
- A math intervention tutor was maintained at Greenwood Elementary School.
- Washington and Crisfield High Schools completed the Teacher Comprehensive Needs Assessment and submitted the executive report in January 2011.
- SCPS will be reorganizing its Special Education Department under new administration.
- The Director of Curriculum and Instruction will be working with high school principals to schedule special education teachers for maximum effort in providing support for student achievement.
- Individual learning plans for graduation are developed for “at risk” students at each high school.
- “Bridge Classes” at each high school will continue to be scheduled.
- Parent involvement activities similar to those in Title 1 will be provided at the two high schools and will be funded by the Race to the Top Grant.
- PBIS activities will be provided at the secondary schools and will include both professional development for teachers as well as incentives for successful students.
- In order to get a better picture of the root cause of the lingering high rate of discipline issues at the high schools, SCPS will conduct another comprehensive climate survey.

ADJUSTMENT* And TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Director of Curriculum and Instruction Timeline: August 2011	Staffing	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$92,836
Math tutor maintained at Greenwood Elementary School		Source: Restricted Title I Cost: \$41,300
Reading Intervention tutors maintained at Woodson and Deal Island Elementary Schools		Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$42,282 Source: Restricted Title I Cost: \$34,438 Source: Restricted JFE 84.410 Cost: 28,202
A math and a reading intervention teacher at Somerset Intermediate School Timeline: August 2011	Staffing	Source: Unrestricted Cost:\$86,777
Establish Individual Learning Plans at the high schools Timeline: October 2011	Core Program	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Schedule Bridge classes and continued to staff a Bridge Coordinator Timeline: August 2011	Core Program	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Purchased Read 180 for High Schools	Core Program	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$57,900
Parent Involvement Activities	Parent Involvement	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$4000
PBIS activities that provides professional development for teachers as well as incentives for students.		Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost:\$5000
Climate Survey		Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$6000
Parent Involvement Coordinator will help design activities with both high schools	Staffing	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$38,777 Restricted Title 1 Cost:\$38,777

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

	(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						2				
Special Placement Schools												
Total												
	2011-2012 Level of Improvement (based on 2011 AYP)					Exiting in 2011	2012-2013 Level of Improvement (based on 2012 AYP)					Exiting in 2012
	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							
High Schools			1	1								
Special Placement Schools												
Total												

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
	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
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
High Schools												
Special Placement Schools												
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
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
High Schools												
Special Placement Schools												
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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
High Schools												
Special Placement Schools												
Total												
	2011-2012 Level of Improvement (based on 2011 AYP)					Exiting in 2011	2012-2013 Level of Improvement (based on 2012 AYP)					Exiting in 2012
	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							
Middle Schools	0	0	0	0	0							
High Schools												
Special Placement Schools												
Total												

1A. Actions that the school system took during the 2010-2011 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 Washington and Crisfield High Schools.
- Revised the two year SIT plans to reflect 2010 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.
- Expanded the Explicit Reading strategies professional development to the high schools by utilizing the Secondary Literacy Supervisor.
- 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.
- Expanded the Classroom Focused Improvement Process at all schools.
- Continued to develop and upgrade countywide reading and math benchmark assessments.
- Continued to Develop common assessments for reading and math at Somerset Intermediate School
- Continue to utilize 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.
- Provided for an instructional coach at Crisfield High School by not replacing a retiring student dean
- Continued to fund instructional coaches at Somerset Intermediate School.
- Provided a reading intervention teacher at both high schools.
- Provide weekly professional development period of 75 minutes.
- Revised the 8th grade schedule for the second semester to include a 40 minute intervention/enrichment period of at the end of the instructional day.

CATEGORY*	CONTRIBUTING STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST**
Professional Development	Educator Effectiveness Academy	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$3,567
Staffing	Curriculum and Instructional Director	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$92,386
Professional Development	After School Professional Development-weekly 75 minutes for secondary schools	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$272,033
Staffing	A math and a reading intervention	Source: Unrestricted

CATEGORY*	CONTRIBUTING STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST**
	teacher at Somerset Intermediate School	Cost: \$86,777
Core Program	Schedule Bridge classes at both high schools, add on responsibility for staff member to be bridge coordinator	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

1B. Actions the School System Will Take Once School Improvement Status is Determined for the 2011-2012 school year.

The following actions will be taken in 2011-2012:

- Identify schools and their status in regard to Schools in Improvement.
- Complete the required parental notification requirements.
- Revise and strengthen School Improvement Plan.
- Review and approve School Improvement Plans.
- Complete Alternative Governance Plan if high schools go into Restructuring.
- 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, continue to develop common assessments at all levels.
- Provide Central Office support to address specific issues underlying the school's continued inability to make AYP.
- Complete reorganization of the Special Education Division.
- Revise SIT plans.
- Continue after school professional development (APD) at the secondary schools.
- 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**
Implement the Read 180 reading intervention program Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Core Program	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$57,900
Extend the 1 to 1 laptop initiative into	Technology	Source: Unrestricted

CATEGORY*	CONTRIBUTING STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST**
10 th grade/HSA courses Timeline: August 2010		Cost: \$125,776
Educator Effectiveness Academy Timeline: July 12-13, 2011	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$3,567
Continue to fund Instructional Coaches/facilitators Timeline:	Staffing	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$569,981 Source: Restricted Title I Cost: \$20,675
Continue to hire a math and a reading intervention teacher at Somerset Intermediate School Timeline:	Staffing	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$86,777
Schedule Bridge classes at both high schools, add on responsibility for staff member to be bridge coordinator Timeline:	Core Program	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$14,190
Continue After School Professional Development, 75 minutes per week Timeline:	Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost \$272,033
Hired Instructional Technology Facilitator to be shared by both high schools Timeline:	Staffing:	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$85,507