

Core Content Areas

Reading, Mathematics, Science, 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 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). Students may meet the graduation requirement by reaching a combined score of 1602 on the four (4) HSAs or by reaching a combined total of 1208 on the three (3) HSAs, which would include English, Algebra/Data Analysis and Biology.

Local school systems are asked to provide data in the Annual Updates to indicate the progress of all students toward attaining academic proficiency consistent with the AMOs and HSA graduation requirement.

Reading and Mathematics

Within the reading and mathematics content areas, local school systems should address the performance of elementary and middle school students using Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) proficiency data through 2011.

LSSs should address the performance of high school students using AYP proficiency data for English and Algebra/Data Analysis through 2010. Additionally, LSSs should address the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment Results for English and Algebra/Data Analysis for 2010, and local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June 30, 2011.

Science

Under NCLB, local school systems are required 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, LSSs should address the performance of students in Grade 5 and students in Grade 8 using the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) data for 2011. Additionally, LSSs should address the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment results for Biology for 2010, as well as local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June, 30, 2011.

Social Studies

Maryland Social Studies State Curriculum requirements serve to articulate the program criteria local public school systems must implement to produce graduates that are college, career, and citizenship ready. Graduates with these attributes are culturally and civically literate, globally aware and able to efficiently access and discriminate sources of information using 21st century technology. Social studies and its disciplines—history, economics, civics, and geography—have long been valued in American education because of their role in helping students participate meaningfully in the democratic process. Additionally, with the emergence of a postindustrial economy that emphasizes creativity, innovation, lifelong learning, and teambuilding, researchers have come to recognize the central role that social studies instruction plays in the formation of these skills (*MD Social Studies Task Force Report, 2010*). Please see page 17 for the prompts for the Social Studies content area.

Maryland School Assessment Reading Elementary Reading

Table 2.1: Maryland School Assessment Performance Results - Reading Elementary									
Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	572	487	85.1	617	527	85.4	623	539	86.5
Hispanic/Latino of any race							41	38	92.7
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							9	9	100.0
Black or African American							263	210	79.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							271	245	90.4
Two or more races							38	36	94.7
Special Education	93	66	71.0	103	81	78.6	100	82	82.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	33	28	84.8	26	24	92.3	24	22	91.7
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	389	323	83.0	444	377	84.9	442	372	84.2

Male									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	280	232	82.9	291	248	85.2	301	256	85.0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							19	16	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							4	4	100.0
Black or African American							123	96	78.0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							133	118	88.7
Two or more races							21	21	100.0
Special Education	60	42	70.0	62	51	82.3	60	49	81.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	18	13	72.2	16	14	87.5	11	9	81.8
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	186	149	80.1	217	188	86.6	216	177	81.9

Females									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	292	255	87.3	326	279	85.6	322	283	87.9
Hispanic/Latino of any race							22	22	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native							0	0	0.0
Asian							5	5	100.0
Black or African American							140	114	81.4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							138	127	92.0
Two or more races							17	15	88.2
Special Education	33	24	72.7	41	30	73.2	40	33	82.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	15	15	100.0	10	10	100.0	13	13	100.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	203	174	85.7	227	189	83.3	226	195	86.3

Based on the examination of AYP Reading proficiency data for elementary schools (Table 2.1)

1. Evidence of Elementary Reading Challenge

a. Elementary students' math proficiency continues to show a steady but minimal increase from previous years.

- Within the elementary band, there was an overall increase of 1.1 percentage points in the total percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher performance; however that aggregate has had a 17.7% points in growth since 2005 moving from 68.8% to 86.5%.
- A loss in 3rd grade of 2.3% points was responsible for only having the overall small increase.
- Fourth grade overall proficiency increased by 2.2 percentage points.
- Fifth grade overall proficiency increased by 4.9 percentage points.

b. Elementary Reading subgroup performance is not consistently moving forward.

- The Special Ed sub-group increased by 3.4 percentage points this year to 82.0% proficiency but fell below the AMO.
- The limited English Proficient (LEP) sub-group decreased overall by .6 of a percentage point still scoring at 91.7% proficiency which did make AMO.
- The FARMS sub-group showed a decrease in scores by .7 of a percentage point in overall proficiency scoring under the AMO at 84.2%.
- The African American sub-group missed the AMO by 6.1% points scoring at 79.8% proficient.
- The male sub-group just missed the AMO scoring at 85.0% overall. Hispanic males (84.2%), African American (78.0%), Special Ed (81.7%), Limited English Proficient (81.8%), and FARMS (81.9%) all scored under the AMO target.

- Even though the female sub-group met the overall AMO target the African American (81.4%) and the Special Ed (82.5) female sub-groups did not.
- Third grade FARMS (76/1%), African American (69.5%), and both females (81.1%) and males (77.6%) missed the grade level AMO target.
- Fourth Grade sub-groups not meeting AMO were Special Education (86.8%) and African American (85.1%).
- The only Fifth Grade sub-group not making grade level AMO was Special Education (79.3%).

c. Elementary Special Education Teachers do not consistently participate in instructional professional development and/or reading meetings.

- While there is an increased focus on instruction and student achievement the predominant in-service for special education teachers continues to be compliance and documentation issues.
- Scheduling and limited staffing continues to be a concern with having the special education teachers participate in collaborative planning.

d. Several key Special Education initiatives continue to need focused attention and ongoing professional development

- While the Special Education staff has increased their repertoire of instructional methods and modalities, the need still exists for them to expand their knowledge base on meeting the challenges of such diverse learners.
- Professional development activities continue to be centered around documentation and compliance rather than on effective instructional strategies.
- The predominant topics of in service and workshops for Special Education teachers in the past have been compliance and documentation with a slow willingness to change.
- There is an absence of team unity and cohesiveness between the Regular and Special Ed teachers.
- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable.
- 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 are lagging throughout the year with benchmark performances that are significantly low.
- The lack of importance placed by teachers on students' benchmarks may negatively impacted student effort and performance.
- Modified lessons delivered to Special Education student have not been apparent in observations or walkthroughs
- Identified strategies to meet the varying needs of the special education students are not being used by Elementary Special Education staff.

e. **A review of data and conditions of Special Education confirms several major issues.**

- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable.
- Absenteeism of students and staff interferes with reading student achievement.
- Intensive structured/standardized 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 are lagging throughout the year with benchmark performances that are typically lower than their peers.

f. **Declining budgets and funding have limited the ability of SCPS to provide the resources necessary to move all students' achievement ahead**

- Due to budgetary issues 30 positions have been cut county wide over the last four years
- Lost reading intervention assistant at 2 of the Elementary schools and a math intervention teacher at one of the schools.

g. **The averages of all Reading Benchmarks (System Assessments) scores at several grade levels (K-5) did not met or exceed the proficiency level set at a 70% threshold. All grade levels decreased in scoring.**

Chart Title: System Reading Benchmark Analysis

Grade Level	2007-2008 Benchmark Scores	2008-2009 Benchmark Scores	2009-2010 Benchmark Scores	2010-2011 Benchmark Scores	Percentage Points Difference from 2009 to 2010	Percentage Points Difference from 2010 to 2011
K	95.8%	99%	100%	94%	+1%	-6%
1 st	80.3%	72%	90.2%	79.5%	+18.2%	-10.7%
2 nd	85.1%	75%	79.3%	69.7%	+4.3%	-9.6%
3 rd	65.6%	69%	79.7%	51.8%	+10.7%	-27.9%
4 th	79.8%	78%	75.4%	69.3%	-2.6%	-6.1%
5 th	82.8%	66%	72.6%	63.3%	+6.6%	-9.3%

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

- a. **ADJUSTMENT: Refocus the duties of the Reading Coaches to increase collaborative planning with teams, increased modeling of explicit instructional strategies, and help in making data driven decisions to assist teachers in providing high quality and effective reading instruction.**

- The Classroom Focused Improvement Process (CFIP) protocols were introduced by the Reading Coaches at each school and used to lead discussions on analyzing formative assessments and identifying successful strategies.
- By enabling the Reading coaches to use more of their time in expert training, facilitating increased collaboration, and focusing more on using CFIP protocols, teachers will use data to better guide their instruction.
- More emphasis will be placed on leading professional development, doing walk-throughs, providing teachers with feedback, and monitoring students' work that will foster engaging individualized instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Place more emphasis on CFIP process and provide feedback to teachers on student learning. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Reading Coaches Staffing and Scheduling	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
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 • Modeling of instructional strategies that target student needs. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Elementary Principals & Supervisor of Elementary Education Staffing and Scheduling	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

b. ADJUSTMENT: Providing individualized and challenging instruction by using technology and researched based strategies is the goal to meet the diverse students' needs. Increase collaboration between and among site based grade level teachers.

Observed active engagement was seen in: Small Group Instruction, Flex Group Activities, Differentiated Instruction, Cooperative Learning Practices, Skills Based Centers, Intervention groups, and various instructional practices.

- All grade levels have common planning time for 60 minutes a day.

- Team collaboration meetings occur weekly during common planning.
- As part of the Special Ed instructional initiative, schools assigned special education teachers to attend the team collaboration meetings when possible in order to modify and help differentiate instruction.
- Research based strategies of reading and writing
- Differentiated instruction, Incorporating technology, Building background knowledge and Vocabulary use

1. PRACTICE: Set specific collaboration targets which include:

- Classroom Focused Improvement Process (CFIP)
- Analyzing data to guide instructional decision making
- Improving teachers’ lessons
- Building student engagement
- Targeting students’ needs
- Matching interventions to identified needs
- Planning flexible groupings and differentiated centers
- Developing Higher Order Questioning
- Modeling of Reading Strategies
- Reading Intervention
- Technology Embedded Lessons
- Lesson Plan Study
- Using Pacing Guides

ADJUSTMENT AND TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Reading Coaches	Professional Development Reading Comprehension, Intervention Strategies, Writing, Grading, Using Technology	Source: Restricted - Title I Cost: \$179,572 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$19,132
Read Naturally Materials and Training Workshop Timeline: September 2011	Professional Development Materials and Supplies Training	Source: Restricted - Title I Cost: \$450
PD: Classroom Coaching and Observation Timeline: Aug. 2011– June 2012	Embedded PD	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing	Administrator Observations and Walk “Throughs”	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Early Dismissal Professional Development	Professional Development on 4 early dismissal days	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$55,391
Training	PD: Small Group Instructional Strategies Training	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Equipment	Promethean Boards Document Cameras Laptops -Audio Enhancements- Activotes	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$24,000

c. **ADJUSTMENT: Formalized and institutionalized site based collaboration into EDPD (Early Dismissal Professional Development), Faculty Meetings, SIT (School Improvement Team) Meetings, Cross Grade Level Meetings, LST (Learning Support Team Meetings), IEP (Individualized Educational Program) and Leadership Team Meetings.**

- Examining existing CFIPS procedures revealed elementary staffs were missing a very important step of making sure the intervention provided to students after a common assessment or benchmark was effective in meeting the student weakness.
- Although data analysis was being done and students who didn't get the instruction were identified and modifications were suggested, no follow up assessment was conducted to determine if the intervention was successful. This step was inserted into team CFIP sessions at the end of the 10-11 school year and will be continued and monitored through the 2011-2012 school year.
- School leadership teams met at least monthly to determine what staff professional development was needed and on how to embed professional development. Feedback forms, evaluations, observations, and walk-through documents were all used as part of the planning process.
- The collaborative work is monitored through collected SANE (sign-ins, agendas, notes, and evaluations), walk-through data, and formal/informal observations.
- EDPD sessions increased from two in 2008-2009 to four in 2011-2012.
- SIT Meetings were increased to one per month in order to provide more collaboration opportunities. All staff participates as members of their schools SIP team.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Clarify specific targets or expected outcomes in reading collaboration in	Reading Coaches Staffing	Source: Restricted - Title I,

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
analysis, lesson planning, discussed strategies, and evidence of intervention impacts. Follow CFIP process monthly. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Core Program: Data Warehouse <i>Performance Matters</i>	Cost: \$179,572 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$19,132
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Embedded Professional Development (preceding and following collaboration sessions) Training/Team Collaboration Reading Coaches	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source: Restricted - Title I, Cost: \$179,572 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$19,132

d. Adjustment: Increase student engagement through the integration of technology into reading instruction.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY
Increase teachers' quality use of Promethean boards, ActiVotes, and Classroom Computers in instruction. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Equipment Promethean Boards Acti Votes Classroom Computers	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0
Provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of <i>Promethean</i> Boards. Improve the quality of staffs' skills in technology. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Training Tech and Instructional Staff	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Increase teacher access to students' needs through using electronic reviews implemented through Acti Votes.	Electronic Reviews Supplies and materials (CIA)	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0

Timeline: August 2011-June 2012		
Use of <i>EdLine</i> to communicate with parents the strategies that are being taught and allow students access to current skills and work through website information.	Website Assignments Supplies and materials	Source: Local Cost: \$4,812
Timeline: September 2011-June 2012		

e. **ADJUSTMENT: Increase individualized reading instructional opportunities for students. Monitor student learning through system, formative benchmarks assessments adjusted to better measure student proficiency and inform instruction. Revise CFIPS procedures for collaboration sessions in reading between and among site based grade level teachers Focused emphasis on:**

- Use of successful classroom practices of teaching test taking strategies,
- Use of mentors for at risk students,
- Use of and access to interactive technology,
- Continual reviews and revisions to benchmarks have raised the standard for expected performance and changes in instruction.
- Introductory training in designing grade level mod assessments as part of a special education & regular education initiative was initiated.
- Benchmark analysis was lead by the Reading Coaches at each school and then collaboratively conducted at the county level where needed changes were made.
- Reviewing and improving benchmark assessments throughout the year was needed to check for appropriate alignments, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools.

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 2011-June 2012	<i>Treasures 2009</i> Core Program; Materials Differentiated Instruction (Flexible Grouping) Staffing Reading Tutors/ Para Professionals	Source: Infrastructure/Current Inventory Cost: \$0 Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$3,204,341 Source: Restricted

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
		Title I Cost: \$514,283 Source: Restricted JFE 84.410 Cost: \$28,802
Provide training to ensure staff can make full use of instructional strategies and materials from the core series and intervention programs to have more consistency between classrooms. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Specialized teachers and paraprofessionals in the classrooms during reading for more individualized support for at-risk students. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Additional Read Naturally Intervention Materials (Extra Levels) Timeline: September 2011	Read Naturally Materials	Source: Unrestricted Cost:\$636
SIPPS Materials Timeline: September 2011	SIPPS Intervention materials	Source: Infrastructure Cost:\$0
Implement Peer Observations as another means for increasing collaboration opportunities Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Professional Development	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Core Program	Benchmark Assessment Development and Analysis	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Equipment	Benchmark Assessment (Scoring-Performance Matters/Mass Producing Staff & Student Materials)	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$1,000
Staffing	Data Specialist & Associate Reading Coaches	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$93,157
Supplies and Materials	Formative Assessments Maintain monitoring of student learning through local benchmark assessments	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Data Warehouse	Core Program <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,824
Staffing	Stipends (Reading Coaches, Special Ed & ELL Instruction, Regular Ed) for summer work	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$16,800

f. **ADJUSTMENT: 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 they work with when possible
- All elementary Special Education teachers will be assigned to core area professional development during Early Dismissal Professional Development (EDPD) periods.
- Special education and content area professional development sessions will utilize simulations and inquiry-based learning in co-planning, lesson modification, and application of learning profile to instructional planning to provide a repertoire of targeted intervention strategies.
- Teachers will document accommodations provided on a daily basis in an electronic format. Individual student data will be reviewed at IEP and data meetings to improve individual student achievement. Aggregate data will be utilized to select needed professional development.

- Teachers will document accommodations provided in an electronic format. Individual student data will be reviewed at IEP and data meetings to improve individual student achievement. Aggregate data will be utilized to select needed professional development.
- Supervisors will research ways to streamline paperwork to allow for Special Educators to be in more classrooms more often.
- Teachers did not consistently participate in instructional professional development and/or reading meetings during 2010-2011.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Monitor effectiveness of Co-teaching during intervention times. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Scheduling Universal Block	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Add oversight of Special Education Instruction as well as compliance Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing: Supervisor	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Provide co-planning opportunities beyond the school day. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Co-Planning Opportunities	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Continue to support the Co-teaching model (1:6) Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Professional Development- Consultants	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Elementary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams using CFIP strategies. Timeline: August 2011-May 2012	Meeting to analyze data to differentiation instruction Intervention	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Elementary Special Education teachers will participate in activities with regular education teachers on early dismissal professional development days and during grade level team meetings where possible. Timeline: September 2011 – June 2012	Early Dismissal Professional Development & Team Meetings	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$55,391
Maintain monitoring of student learning through local benchmark assessments	Formative Assessments Supplies and Materials	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Timeline: August 2011-June 2012		
Review and improve Benchmark assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools.	Reading Coaches and Coordinator of Special Ed & ELL Instruction	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Core Program/Data Warehouse <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,824

g. 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 providing training, coaching, analysis, and monitoring. Revamping of program and intervention needs is currently taking place.
- Supervisors will assure follow up throughout the year through MSDE and LEA leadership.
- Unmet learning needs of students served in Reading will be addressed through increasing reading fluency and comprehension.

CHANGE and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide additional Reading Fluency Training Timeline: September 2011	<i>Read Naturally</i> Consultant	Source: Restricted Title I Cost: \$1,200
Provide ongoing support for effective implementation of <i>Read Naturally</i> Timeline: September 2011-June 2012	Reading Coaches	Source: Restricted - Title I, Cost: \$179,572 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$19,132
Provide professional development in written communication and test taking strategies in Reading Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Reading Coaches & Supervisors	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

h. ADJUSTMENT: Keep key Special Education Initiatives in the forefront of instruction during 2011-12.

- 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.
- Expanding the repertoire of instructional methods and modalities being used in classes by both regular and Special Education staff.
- Using the “Look-Fors” identified for administrators’ and coaches’ to apply findings to professional development and evaluation.
- Monitoring implementation of Co-teaching strategies through mentoring, observations, walk-throughs, and reflective conferences with the regular education teachers and the Special Educations teachers.
- Increasing the attendance of Special Ed teachers at collaborative team planning meetings.
- Somerset will support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and ELL Staff.
- Supervisors and principals will observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.
- Instructional professional development will continue to become a part of every Special Education staff meeting. SANE documentation will be collected by the Assistant Superintendent to monitor this process. There will be a continuation of professional development activities in core meetings and early dismissal sessions and follow-up with special education teachers being observed on look-fors. Data from these observations will be collected, analyzed, and used

for setting professional development priorities and individual staff interventions throughout the upcoming year.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Staffing shift in duties have been adjusted to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative. Timeline: September 2011 –May 2012	Administrative Duties Staffing & Scheduling	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
“Co-teaching” Professional Development initiative involving a partnership between University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Somerset County Public Schools. Timeline: August 2011 – June 2012	Professional Development	Source: UMES Special Ed Grant Cost: \$0
Sessions on Research Based instructional strategies will become a part of the Special Education staff regular monthly meetings Timeline: September 2011-June 2012	Professional Development Central Office & Staff Meetings	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

i. **ADJUSTMENT: Increase community and parent partnerships helping to build stronger School Improvement Teams.**

- Somerset County Schools have successful School Improvement Planning Teams (SIP Teams) in which all staff are key participants.
- Title 1 SIP Teams are making extra efforts to include outside agencies in SCPS professional development for staffs, events and activities for the students, and their families, and applying transition plans that are currently being set in place.
- Communication with parents and community members will improve by increasing collaboration between home and school on ways to move forward in the future.
- The Family/Parent Coordinator lead for the county and for each of the school are actively increasing volunteers which consist of family and community connections.

- SIP teams and parent coordinators will be working with staffs on outreach strategies and strengthening partnerships by incorporating students, parents, and community as part of their process of community involvement.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Family/Parent/Community Coordinator Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing	Source: Restricted - Title I Cost: \$38,777
Coordinate with community organizations that provide school care and instruction. Include community as part of SIT Teams in planning, programs, events, and activities. Build Parent Involvement through Title 1 Strategies. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Parent & Community Involvement	Source: Restricted - Title I Cost: \$14,083
Conduct site level staff faculty meetings, trainings and team meetings on the value of parental involvement in the schools as promoted in the Family and Community Involvement Policy Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Parent & Community Involvement	Source: Restricted - Title I Cost: \$14,083
Use Connect Ed as a communication tool for both students and parents. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Parent & Community Involvement	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$6,964

j. Adjustment: Increase regular education teachers’ knowledge of and skills in effectively working with LEP students. Improve reading interventions to be used in Co-Teaching for Special Education and ELL students.

- Monitoring reading interventions will increase in Special Ed and ELL instruction.

- “Look-For’s” were put in place and an overall monitoring for effectiveness to be implemented.
- During intervention times both regular and special education staff will participate.
- Extended Day Planning provided co-planning opportunities beyond the school day should increase.
- ELL teachers’ collaboration and consultation on new ELL curriculum.
- ESOL teachers will 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.

CATEGORY	STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST
Formative Assessments	Monitored student learning through local benchmark assessments	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Scheduling	Universal Time	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing (1:6)	Monitoring of Special Ed and ELL Initiatives	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Staffing Reading Coaches and Coordinator of Special Ed & ELL Instruction Core Program/Data Warehouse <i>Performance Matters</i>	Collaborative Reviewing and improving Benchmark assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers, and improving scoring tools.	Source: Restricted - Title I Cost: \$11,654 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,824

CATEGORY	STRATEGY,PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST

k. Provide intensive targeted REMEDIAL and ENRICHMENT instruction.

Programs were selected according to DIBELS testing results, data analysis of benchmark assessments, and CFIP Data Analysis collaborations. Targeted instruction provided enrichment and acceleration students' reading fluency and comprehension. Thirty minutes daily was available for additional reading intervention during a Universal Access time. Students' needs were matched to the appropriate intervention and enrichment program. Intervention takes the form of:

- Small group instruction
- Flexible groupings
- Classroom centers
- Extra support from classroom teacher, classroom aide, or parent
- Computer aided instruction
- Activities with the Promethean Board and other technologies
- LAS links curriculum
- *Read Naturally* to target fluency
- *Word Warm-Ups* to target vocabulary
- Targeted SPED and LEP intervention.

CATEGORY	STRATEGY,PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST
Core Program Scheduling	Universal Time Slot for Intervention Flexible Grouping	Source: Staff Time/Scheduling Cost: \$0
Intervention Staffing	Small Group Instruction with Classroom Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Special Education Staff, ELL Staff, and Intervention Teachers	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Training	PD: Small Group instructional strategies training by Reading Coaches	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Materials	Access for ELLs by Metri Tech	Source: Infrastructure Cost: \$0

Intervention Programs	SIPPS-Systematic Instruction in Phonemic Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words SOAR To Success Read Naturally ERI-Early Reading Intervention	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$1,049
-----------------------	--	---------------------------------------

I. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT and PRACTICES: Provided expert training, real time coaching, collaboration, and feedback to teachers of elementary reading and language arts. Reinforced best practices with elementary reading and language arts teachers.

- Increased elementary reading teachers their planning, instructional, and assessment skills through on-going work with site based reading coaches assigned to each elementary school.
- Clarified reading coaches' responsibilities to include guiding collaborative meetings through CFIP during team time, coaching teachers, facilitating Response to Intervention, plug in during flex group support, and during pull out reading targeted interventions
- Used coaches to complete training with staff on the selected interventions as well as targeted strategies.
- Provided site based professional development activities for all elementary special education and ELL teachers in conjunction with core subject regular education teachers on the six early dismissal professional development afternoons in 2009-2010.

CATEGORY	STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	FUNDING SOURCE AND COST
Staffing	Reading Coaches	Source: Restricted - Title I, Cost: \$179,572 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$19,132
Scheduling	EDPD Team Planning	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Materials	Benchmark Assessments Parent Reading Night; Parent Collaboration Programs, Parent Involvement on SIT Teams	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$1,000 Source: Source: Restricted Title I Cost: \$14,083

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: Unrestricted Cost: \$13,732

*Further explanation and clarification of the Elementary Reading section can be found on pages 296.

Middle Level Reading

Based on the examination of AYP Reading proficiency data for middle schools (Table 2.2):

Table 2.2: Maryland School Assessment Performance Results - Reading - Middle									
Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	617	463	75.0	569	459	80.7	563	476	84.5
Hispanic/Latino of any race							25	15	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							6	5	83.3
Black or African American							237	187	78.9
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							269	247	91.8
Two or more races							25	21	84.0
Special Education	99	51	51.5	89	59	66.3	89	73	82.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	11	2	18.2	4	1	25.0	3	0	0.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	363	256	70.5	376	290	77.1	380	312	82.1

1. Evidence of Middle Level Reading Challenge

a. Subgroup Performance Remains Below Aggregate

- The Black or African American subgroup scored 5.6 percentage points below the aggregate proficiency level.
- The special education subgroup scored 2.5 percentage points below the aggregate proficiency level.
- All three LEP students who took MSA reading did not pass.

- The FARMS subgroup scored 2.4 percentage points below the aggregate proficiency level.

b. Staffing Changes For 2011-2012

- The Secondary Literacy Supervisor position was lost due to administrative reorganization.
- The two full time reading intervention teachers at the academies were lost with the end of ARRA funding. Two English teachers at each high school will only be able to allot a portion of their teaching day to intervention.

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

a. SCPS Will Continue Proven Strategies

- Reading intervention in grades 6 and 7 will continue with use of *The Reader's Advantage* reading intervention.
- Language Arts teachers will meet collaboratively seventeen times during Afternoon Professional Development (APD) to review and analyze data from common and benchmark assessments, make appropriate instructional decisions, and work on instructional strategies that will promote student achievement.
- The Alternative School has been re-organized to improve the offering to students who are assigned there.
- The common assessments have been revised to accurately assess key skills.
- Collaboration continues to be stressed for reading teachers and opportunities are provided through Afternoon Professional Development (APD)
- Classroom teachers will continue to use the Classroom Focused Improvement Process (CFIP) to analyze common assessment and benchmark data to adjust curriculum and make relevant instructional decisions
- All staff will receive professional development on Assessment for Learning.
- Additional professional development on integrating technology and utilizing laptops in particular will be provided on six different occasions during the 2011-12 session. A new reading intervention program, *READ 180*

b. SCPS is Participating in the Maryland Race To The Top

- English teachers will uncover and use the Capacities of a Literate Individual within English instruction
- English teachers will develop strategies to provide student practice with argumentative writing
- School teams will attend the Education Effectiveness Academies and implement strategies for transition to the Maryland Common Core.
- Professional Development on writing and literacy strategies will be provided to all content areas during the 2011-12 school session.

- *Read180*, has been purchased for intervention with struggling students at the 8th grade level
- An additional Technology facilitator has been hired to be shared between the two academies and high schools to assist teacher with incorporation the most effective instructional strategies utilizing technology.
- A cadre of secondary teachers has been trained as Data Leaders to maximize the effectiveness of data meetings

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Secondary will continue to participate in activities at APD (After School Professional Development) Timeline: August 2011 – June 2012	After School Professional Development	Professional Development Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$272,033
Special Education Division will be reorganized. Successful strategies will be identified and transferred to previously unsuccessful sites/levels Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing	Supervision Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Purchased <i>Read 180</i> Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Core Program	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$57,900
Hired Instructional/Technology Facilitator Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$85,507
School Teams Attended Educator Effectiveness Academy Timeline: July 13-15, 2011	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$3,567
Data Leader Training Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$560

Elementary Mathematics

(Table 2.4), Somerset County reports as follows:

Based upon the examination of the AYP Math Proficiency Data for Elementary Schools

Table 2.4 Elementary Mathematics Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	571	463	81.1	617	524	84.9	621	549	88.4
Hispanic/Latino of any race							41	40	97.6
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							9	9	100.0
Black or African American							262	219	83.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							270	245	90.7
Two or more races							38	35	92.1
Special Education	93	55	59.1	103	73	70.9	100	79	79.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	33	29	87.9	26	25	96.2	24	24	100.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	388	305	78.6	444	361	81.3	441	382	86.6

All Students	Male								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	279	224	80.3	291	251	86.3	300	273	91.0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							19	19	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							4	4	100.0
Black or African American							122	106	86.9
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							133	123	92.5
Two or more races							21	20	95.2
Special Education	60	37	61.7	62	48	77.4	60	52	86.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	18	16	88.9	16	15	93.8	11	11	100.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	185	147	79.5	217	180	82.9	216	193	89.4

Female									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	292	239	81.8	326	273	83.7	321	276	86.0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							22	21	95.5
American Indian or Alaska Native							0	0	0.0
Asian							5	5	100.0
Black or African American							140	113	80.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							137	122	89.1
Two or more races							17	15	88.2
Special Education	33	18	54.5	41	25	61.0	40	27	67.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	15	13	86.7	10	10	100.0	13	13	100.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	203	158	77.8	227	181	79.7	225	189	84.0

1. Evidence of Elementary Mathematics Challenges

- a. **Elementary students' math proficiency continues to show a steady but minimal increase from previous years.**
- Within the elementary band, the increase in the total percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher performance was minimal.
 - The aggregate gain was 3.5 percentage points, moving from 84.9% to 88.4%.
- b. **Elementary subgroup performance is not consistently moving forward.**
- The African American subgroup missed the AMO of 84.5% by 1.3 percentage points scoring 83.6% proficient.
 - The Special Education subgroup, despite gaining 8.1 percentage points overall from 2010, failed to meet the AMO scoring 79.0% proficient.
 - The female African American students missed the AMO target by 3.8 percentage points scoring at 80.7% proficient.
 - The female Special Education students showed the greatest overall deficit missing the AMO target by 17 percentage points scoring 67.5% proficient.
 - The female FARMS subgroup scored .5 percentage points below the AMO target at 84% proficient.
- c. **Elementary Special Education Teachers do not consistently participate in Instructional Professional Development and/or mathematics meetings.**
- While there is an increased focus on instruction and student achievement the predominant in-service for special education teachers continues to be compliance and documentation issues.
 - Scheduling and limited staffing continues to be a concern with having the special education teachers participate in collaborative planning.
- d. **Several key Special Education initiatives continue to need focused attention and ongoing professional development.**
- While the Special Education staff has increased their repertoire of instructional methods and modalities, the need still exists for them to expand their knowledge base on meeting the challenges of such diverse learners.
 - Professional development activities continue to be centered around documentation and compliance rather than on effective instructional strategies.
- e. **A review of data and conditions of Special Education confirms several major issues.**
- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable.
 - Absenteeism of students and staff interferes with math student achievement.
 - Intensive structured/standardized 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 are lagging throughout the year with benchmark performances that are typically lower than their peers.
- f. **Declining budgets and funding have limited the ability of SCPS to provide the resources necessary to move all students' achievement ahead**
- Due to budgetary issues 30 positions have been cut county wide over the last four years
 - Lost math intervention assistant at Woodson Elementary

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

- a. **ADJUSTMENT: Collaboration sessions in mathematics between and among site based grade level teachers should be targeted to address the specific needs of the subgroups in need.**

Targets include:

- Analyzing data to guide instruction using the CFIP model (Classroom Focused Improvement Program).
- Improving lessons
- Developing strategies for engaging students
- Matching student needs to appropriate intervention
- Planning flexible grouping with differentiated lessons within the classroom.
- Planning ways to fully engage parents in their child's educational success.
- Continue implementation of MSA/HSA until a new assessment system tied to the Common Core Standards is fully operational (RTTT SOW, Part B).

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Continue to Schedule SIT Meetings once per month to provide more collaboration opportunities between site based grade level teachers Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Instructional Leadership SIT Leaders	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Provide training to make sure that staff can make full use of collaboration opportunities August 2011-June 2012	Embedded Professional Development Instructional Facilitators	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Add Cross Content collaboration opportunities during EDPD days and	Infrastructure	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
ensure that special education staff and ELL staff participate in regular education sessions August 2011—June 2012		
Utilize Ed line to communicate with parents regarding math concepts and assignments being worked on August 2011—June 2012	Edline	Source: unrestricted Cost: \$4,812
Utilize Connect Ed messages to remind parents of upcoming education events at their child's school August 2011—June 2012	Connect Ed	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$6,964

b. ADJUSTMENT: Continue efforts to 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) days.

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Convene Elementary Special Education teachers regularly with core academic teams Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Instructional Leadership SIT Leaders	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Increase Elementary Special Education teachers' participation in activities with regular education teachers on early dismissal days (EDPD). August 2011—June 2012	Early Dismissal Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$55,391

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

- Provide continued professional development in the use of technology to increase student engagement.
- Utilize collaborative planning time to discuss student engagement and strategies for incorporating available technology into the curriculum.

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide further training on the use of Promethean boards in classrooms. Improve quality of staff's skills in the area of technology Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Explicit and Embedded Professional Development Tech and Instructional Staffing	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0

d. ADJUSTMENT: Increase individualized math instructional opportunities for all students.

- Utilize collaborative planning time to monitor student performance and plan intervention activities for the remediation of students who are not proficient on local quarterly assessments.
- Utilize data from county benchmarks to develop flexible groups within classrooms to provide remediation to struggling students.

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide training to ensure that staff can make full and beneficial use of Computer Aided Instruction Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Successmaker Explicit and Embedded Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$6,785
Assign specialized teachers and paraprofessionals in the classrooms during math to support at-risk students with individualized support. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing	Source: Staff time Source: Cost \$0
Provide additional intervention for students who are experiencing difficulty in math. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing Math tutor at Greenwood Elementary School	Source: Restricted Title I Cost:\$41,300

Maintain monitoring of student learning through local quarterly assessments August 2011—June 2012	Formative Assessments	Source: Local Cost: \$1,000
--	-----------------------	--------------------------------

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

- Monitor the effectiveness of Co-teaching during intervention times
- Continue to monitor Special Education Instruction as well as compliance
- Provide additional intervention for students who are experiencing difficulty in Math

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide additional intervention for students who are experiencing difficulty in math. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing Math tutor at GES	Source: Restricted – Title I Cost:\$41,300
Returned full time math coach at Princess Anne Elementary School Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing:	Source: Restricted Title I Cost: \$20,765 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$62,383

f. ADJUSTMENT: Continue to monitor and adjust formative assessments to better measure student proficiency and inform instruction.

- Meet quarterly with facilitators to review and adjust local quarterly benchmarks based on teacher feedback and student performance.
- Continue refining CFIP process to more fully analyze benchmark performance data and make plans for remediation and intervention.

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Maintain monitoring of student learning through local quarterly assessments August 2011—June 2012	Formative Assessments	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$1,000

Continue to review and improve Quarterly assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers and improving scoring tools. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Math Facilitators and Supervisor Performance Matters	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,834
Data Warehouse Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Performance Matters	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,834

g. ADJUSTMENT: Keep key Special Education Initiatives in the forefront of instruction during 2011—2012.

- Support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and ELL Staff.
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Adjust Administrator’s duties to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as continuing to provide support for the co-teaching initiative. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing—shift in duties	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Continue modified assessments for qualifying students that are developed on the county and school level Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

h. ADJUSTMENT: Special Education data will be utilized for instructional purposes

- Special education teachers will document accommodations provided students on their caseload in their lesson plan books.
- Individual student data will be reviewed at IEP and data meetings to improve individual student achievement.

- Aggregate data and teacher feedback will be utilized to select and provide professional development opportunities.
- Special education teachers will assist with planning activities for flexible groups within the regular classroom setting

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Require Special Education teachers to closely monitor and document the services given to students using the data collected to guide and inform instructional planning. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Make every effort to have special education teachers participate in common planning with regular education teachers Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0

i. **CHANGE: Begin implementation of strategies outlined in the Local Scope of Work under the Race to the Top Initiative**

- Develop a local plan for the implementation of the new Common Core State Standards.
- Participate in State gap analysis and curriculum development activities to support the transition to the Common Core Standards and curriculum.
- Review the State’s Common Core and Maryland State Curricula (Frameworks) to determine the extent of curricular movement and modification necessary at the local level, including changes in course schedules (i.e. semester vs. yearlong, course sequences, etc.).
- Determine gaps between existing local curriculum for reading/English language arts, mathematics, and science for PreK-12 by reviewing the gap analysis.
- Participate in Educator Effectiveness Academies sponsored by MSDE.
- Critical personnel will use a “train the trainers” model and provide professional development on transition to the Common Core Standards at individual school sites.
- Provide professional development on the implementation of the 8 Mathematical Practices into daily instruction.

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Provide professional development on the 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Monitor and evaluate teachers' implementation of the 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice through walkthroughs and observations. August 2011—June 2012	Staff	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source:

*Further explanation and clarification of the Elementary Math section can be found on pages 298.

Maryland School Assessment

Middle Level Mathematics

Maryland School Assessment Performance Results - Math - Middle

Table 2.5 Middle Level Mathematics Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	617	384	62.2	569	393	69.1	562	445	79.2
Hispanic/Latino of any race							25	15	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							6	6	100.0
Black or African American							236	176	74.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							269	228	84.8
Two or more races							25	19	76.0
Special Education	98	36	36.7	89	41	46.1	88	62	70.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	14	7	50.0	4	2	50.0	3	1	33.3
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	362	197	54.4	376	249	66.2	379	286	75.5

1. Evident Challenges

a. Aggregate achievement drops off severely in the 8th grade.

- Grade 6 aggregate proficiency rate is 89.4%.
- Grade 7 aggregate proficiency rate is 83.7%.
- Grade 8 aggregate proficiency rate is 65.2%. While this is a 23% gain over the previous year, significant growth still needs to be made to reach the 2012 AMO.

b. Students in the African-American sub-group in 6th and 7th grades exceeded the 2011 AMO, but 8th graders did not meet the AMO. In addition, the gap between this sub-group and the White subgroup grows as the grade level increases.

- Grade 6 African-American Subgroup proficiency rate is 86.7%, creating a gap between their performance and that of the White sub-group of only **6.7%**.
- Grade 7 African-American Subgroup proficiency rate is 79.2%, creating a gap between their performance and that of the White sub-group of only **10.9%**.
- Grade 8 African-American Subgroup proficiency rate is 54.5%, creating a gap between their performance and that of the White sub-group of **17.4%**.

c. Students in the Special Education sub-group in 6th and 7th grades exceeded the 2011 AMO, but 8th grade Special Education students did not meet the AMO.

- Grade 6 Special Education proficiency rate is **91.9%**.
- Grade 7 Special Education proficiency rate is **83.3%**.
- Grade 8 Special Education proficiency rate is **27.3%**.

2. Changes or Adjustments to Be Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

In analyzing the data and the conditions of curriculum, instruction and assessment at the middle level during 2010-2011, the following conclusions were drawn:

- Leadership is important for conducting meaningful data analysis and formulation of subsequent instructional strategies and interventions.
- Teachers need to use formative assessment during every class period and adjust instructional strategies accordingly.
- Attention and resources need to be directed toward providing assistance to 8th grade math teachers; with increased attention to the Special Education subgroup.

a. The following changes and adjustments will address these

- The Afternoon Professional Development (APD) schedule was developed concurrently for 2011-2011 with both high school principals with the intent to achieve the proper balance of collaboration between teachers of like subjects and new learning.
- Benchmarks and common assessments will be administered in math 6, 7, and 8 approximately every three weeks.
- Each school will use the Classroom Focused Improvement Process to analyze assessment data and student work in an effort to improve instruction throughout the school year.
- The intermediate school, which houses the sixth and seventh graders, is concentrating on maximizing attendance and time in class for at risk students.
- Seventh grade through tenth grade students will be provided laptops on a one to one basis.
- Administrators at the 8th grade level will meet with 8th grade special education teachers weekly to monitor progress for their case load.
- At WHS, eighth grade classes will attend a thirty minute intervention and coaching period daily, revolving through each of the content areas.
- Special Education teachers will work with their co-teachers to analyze common assessment and benchmark data for the sub-group and individual students. Students not showing proficiency will be targeted for in-class interventions designed to catch them up without being pulled out of the regular classroom.

- Special education teachers will document accommodations provided on a daily basis in an electronic format. Individual student data will be reviewed at IEP and data meetings to improve individual student achievement. Aggregate data will be utilized to select needed professional development.

ADJUSTMENT* And TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Inclusion of CFIP in School Improvement Plan Timeline: Establish schedule in September, 2011 Create leadership responsibilities		Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Benchmarks and Common Assessments Timeline: July 1 2011-June 1, 2012	Staffing Data Specialist and Associate Data Warehouse <i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$93,157 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,834
1 to 1 Laptops Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prof. Dev. Staff – September, 2011 – June, 2012 ▪ Orientation for students- Aug. ▪ Laptops provided- Sept. 	Technology	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$105,376
Leadership Academy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings with principals to analyze student performance data and plan improvement strategies. 	Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$4,138
School Based CFIP meetings	Professional Development	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Elementary Science

Table 2.7 Elementary Science Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	165	103	62.4	206	139	67.5	198	157	79.3
Hispanic/Latino of any race							14	12	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							5	5	100.0
Black or African American							76	54	71.1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							1	0	0.0
White							82	69	84.1
Two or more races							19	16	84.2
Special Education	26	13	50.0	40	27	67.5	30	23	76.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	2	100.0	5	4	80.0	8	7	87.5
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	113	66	58.4	156	99	63.5	140	109	77.9

Male									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	82	56	68.3	101	68	67.3	94	80	85.1
Hispanic/Latino of any race							6	5	83.3
American Indian or Alaska Native							1	1	100.0
Asian							2	2	100.0
Black or African American							33	25	75.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							41	36	87.8
Two or more races							11	11	100.0
Special Education	10	10	62.5	24	20	83.3	19	15	78.9
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0	0.0	5	4	80.0	2	1	50.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	35	35	64.8	77	51	66.2	65	54	83.1

Female									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	83	47	56.6	105	71	67.6	104	77	74.0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							8	7	87.5
American Indian or Alaska Native							0	0	0.0
Asian							3	3	100.0
Black or African American							43	29	67.4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							1	0	0.0
White							41	33	80.5
Two or more races							8	5	62.5
Special Education	10	3	30.0	16	7	43.8	11	8	72.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	2	100.0	0	0	0.0	6	6	100.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	59	31	52.5	79	48	60.8	75	55	73.3

1. Evidence of Elementary Science Challenge

a. Elementary students' science proficiency is still below the desired proficiency of 100%.

- Within the elementary band, there was an increase in the total percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher performance; with an aggregate gain of 11 percentage points, moving from 67.5% to 79.3% proficient, however this is still far below the state target of 100% proficient.
- The aggregate scores increased 11.8 percentage points from 2010 to 2011, doubling the increase shown from 2009 to 2010 of only 5.1 percentage points; however; students are still well below 100% proficiency.

b. Significant disparities exist between subgroups.

- The White subgroup, scoring at 84.1% exceeded the African American subgroup by 13 percentage points with African Americans scoring 71.1% proficient.
- The boys, scoring at 85.1% proficient, exceeded the girls by 11.1 percentage points with girls scoring 74.0% proficient.
- African American girls scored 8.4 percentage points below the African American boys.
- Female FARMS students scored 9.8 percentage points below the Male FARMS students. Female FARMS were at 73.3% proficient and Male FARMS students were at 83.1% proficient.

c. In analyzing data and the conditions of curriculum, instruction and assessment in the elementary band during 2010-2011, several concerns were identified.

- Students are not as engaged in the learning process as is desirable.
- Many students have limited background knowledge and vocabulary which puts them a greater disadvantage to learning higher level content in science.
- Decreased science instructional time negatively impacted on performance.
- Special Education teachers and ELL teachers are not available at the same time for planning and/or co-teaching of Science.

Elementary Science Benchmarks

Grade Level	2008-2009 Benchmark Scores	2009—2010 Benchmark Scores	2010-2011 Benchmark Scores	Percentage Points Difference
K	94%	100%	96%	-4%
1 st	60%	78%	76%	-2%
2 nd	69%	74%	87%	+13%
3 rd	56%	68%	64%	-4%
4 th	65%	51%	61%	+10%
5 th	65%	57%	72%	+15%

d. In analyzing the county benchmark data it was noted that there were areas of concern among grade levels.

- Third grade showed a drop of 4 percentage points from the 2009-2010 year.
- First grade students scored significantly lower overall than the Kindergarten students.
- Three grade levels, 2nd, 4th, and 5th showed significant improvement in the local benchmark assessments while Kindergarten, 1st and 3rd grades had slight decreases in their overall proficient levels.

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

a. ADJUSTMENT: Increase knowledge base of teachers in the development of rich inquiry based lessons.

- Continue to schedule SIT Meetings once per month and provide more collaboration opportunities for teachers of science.
- Continue to hold grade level meetings in science bi-weekly.
- Discuss student engagement at grade level meetings and how it relates to science instruction
- Continue to monitor student performance on county benchmarks and classroom assessments making adjustments as necessary.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Job embedded professional development	Instructional Facilitators	Source:

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
during instructional team meetings with facilitators Timeline: August 2011-June 2012		Unrestricted Cost: \$196,053 Restricted Title I Cost: \$20,675
Monitor student performance on county benchmarks Timeline: November 2011—May 2012	Performance Matters	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,834

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

Targets include:

- Analyzing data to guide instruction using the CFIP model.
- Improve lessons by including strategies for engaging students.
- Continue collaboration during SIT and team meetings as well as during EDPD days.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Continue to analyze data to inform instructional strategies and practice to optimally engage all students Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Instructional Facilitators	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$196,053 Restricted Title I Cost: \$20,675
Analysis of science benchmark data during team meetings November 2011—May 2012	<i>Performance Matters</i>	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,834

c. **ADJUSTMENT: Increase science instructional opportunities for students.**

- Science will be taught daily in grades Pre-K through 5.
- There will be a focus on experiments, investigations, the scientific process and performance based tasks.
- The use of hands on activities will be monitored through the use of grade level tracking calendars.
- Scheduled science instructional time will be increased to a minimum of 45 minutes daily for Grades 3-5 and 30 minutes daily in grades Pre-K-2.
- All students in Pre-K to Grade 2 will experience two units from the Primary Talent Development Curriculum along with their current science curriculum.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
PTD Units November 2011-May 2012	Supplies and Materials	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$721

d. CHANGE: Use Facilitators and/or outside consultants to provide science professional development in particular areas of need.

- 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.
- Students’ problem solving, building of background knowledge, and developing vocabulary will be emphasized.
- Teachers will receive assistance with planning and implementing hands on lessons that follow the 5 E Model of Instruction.
- Integrated STEM units will be purchased for 2nd and 3rd grades.
- Professional development will be provided on the successful implementation of STEM units in 2nd and 3rd grades.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Engineering is Elementary Units will be purchased to enhance science/STEM instruction in grades 2 and 3 December 2011—June 2012	EiE units	Source: Restricted – STEM grant Cost: \$9,150
Professional Development will be given to those teachers who will be teaching the EiE units in grades 2 and 3 January 2012	EiE consultant	Source: Restricted STEM grant Cost: \$6,410
Assist teachers with planning and implementing hands on lessons that follow the 5 E Lesson format. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Facilitators	Source: Restricted Title I Cost: \$8,000

e. ADJUSTMENT: Special Education teachers will continue to focus on two key strategies.

- Modification of benchmark and classroom assessments will be developed for special education students who qualify for these adjustments.

- Special education staff will be included in grade level collaborative planning and professional development with teachers whenever possible.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Spec. Educ. Teachers will work to develop modified assessments from the current county benchmarks. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Special Education Staff	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Spec. Educ. Teachers will participate in grade level planning and data meetings whenever possible. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Special Education Staff Leadership Teams	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0

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

- The number of elementary teachers with high tech classrooms will increase.
- Training will continue in the area of technology integration.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Increase the number of elementary teachers with high tech equipment in their classrooms including: Document cameras Laptops Promethean Boards Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Equipment	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$24,000
Continue to provide training to ensure staff can make full and beneficial use of Promethean Boards and other high tech equipment. Timeline: August 2011—2012	Explicit and embedded professional development Tech and Instructional Staff	Source: Restricted – Title I Cost: \$10,000

g. ADJUSTMENT: All teachers will utilize data:

- Individual student data will be reviewed at IEP and data meetings to improve individual student achievement.
- Aggregate data will be utilized to select needed professional development.
- County wide science benchmarks will be given three times per year to monitor student growth in the area of science.
- Teachers will give students prescriptive, informative feedback regarding their performance in science.

ADJUSTMENT* and TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Special Education teachers will closely monitor and document the services given to students using the data collected to guide and inform instructional planning. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Continue to review and improve Quarterly assessments checking for appropriate alignment, eliminating distracters in questions and answers and improving scoring tools. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Math Facilitators and Supervisor Performance Matters	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$20,824

h. ADJUSTMENT: Keep key Special Education Initiatives in the forefront of instruction during 2011—2012.

- Support the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and ELL Staff.
- Observe and provide data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.
- Instructional professional development will continue to be a part of the monthly special education meetings.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Administrator’s duties have been adjusted to include monitoring the Special Education instructional activities as well as provide support for the Co-teaching initiative. Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staffing—shift in duties	Source: Staff time Cost: \$0
Sessions on research based instructional strategies will continue to be a part of regular monthly Special Education meetings Timeline: August 2011—June 2012	Staff Meetings	Source: Restricted – Special Ed Cost: \$6,000

i. CHANGE: Two technology subscriptions will be purchased as a resource for both teachers and students.

- **Discovery Education Streaming Plus K-8** and **Discovery Education Science** will be purchased to enhance the science curriculum in the elementary grades.
- Teachers will receive training through a Train the Trainer Model with a Discovery Education consultant during a two day workshop that will emphasize the use of digital content in providing rich tech integrated STEM activities that are highly engaging for students.

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
<p>Discovery Education Streaming K-8 and Discovery Education Science will be purchased to enhance science instruction</p> <p>Timeline: September 2011—June 2012</p>	<p>STEM MSDE Grant</p> <p>Discovery Education Streaming and Discovery Education Science</p>	<p>Source: Restricted – STEM grant</p> <p>Cost: \$9,483</p>
<p>Professional Development will be provided to representatives from each school who will be responsible for training teachers in the building on the use of the Discovery Education Streaming and Science components</p> <p>October 2011—November 2011</p>	<p>STEM MSDE Grant</p>	<p>Source: Restricted STEM grant</p> <p>Cost: \$11,250</p>
<p>STEM Representatives at each building will be available to monitor the use of and assist with troubleshooting the proper use of the Discovery Education subscriptions</p> <p>October 2011—June 2012</p>	<p>Stipends</p>	<p>Source: Restricted STEM grant</p> <p>Cost: \$6,700</p>

Middle Level Science

Table 2.8 Middle Level Science Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	223	124	55.6	198	124	62.6	184	142	77.2
Hispanic/Latino of any race							8	6	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native							0	0	0.0
Asian							3	3	100.0
Black or African American							65	42	64.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							95	81	85.3
Two or more races							13	10	76.9

Special Education	34	8	23.5	38	10	26.3	21	7	33.3
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	5	1	20.0	2	0	0.0	1	0	0.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	126	55	43.7	123	66	53.7	119	87	73.1

Male									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	124	71	57.3	96	65	67.7	100	80	80.0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							5	4	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native							0	0	0.0
Asian							2	2	100.0
Black or African American							41	29	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							46	40	87.0
Two or more races							6	5	83.3
Special Education	22	6	27.3	27	7	25.9	16	6	37.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	3	1	33.3	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	78	36	46.2	58	36	62.1	63	50	79.4

Female									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	99	53	53.5	102	59	57.8	84	62	73.8
Hispanic/Latino of any race							3	2	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native							0	0	0.0
Asian							1	1	100.0
Black or African American							24	13	54.2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							0	0	0.0
White							49	41	83.7
Two or more races							7	5	71.4
Special Education	12	2	16.7	11	3	27.3	5	1	20.0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	1	0	0.0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	48	19	39.6	65	30	46.2	56	37	66.1

1. Evidence of Challenges

- Scores went up this year but are below Math and Reading for the Middle Level
- The African American subgroup suffers almost a 20 point gap from their white counterparts.
- The Special Education subgroup experiences a much of a gap in Science than Reading and Math at this level.
- Females perform at a lower level than males in science

2. Changes or Adjustments Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress

- Each school included the Classroom Focused Improvement Process as a Professional Development Initiative.
- Each principal will share their school improvement plan with their peers in September to share strategies and expertise. At the end of the school year, a similar expo will be held so principals can share how implementation went.
- The Afternoon Professional Development (APD) schedule has been developed concurrently with both high school principals to achieve the proper balance of collaboration between teachers of like subjects and new learning.
- Benchmarks will be administered in science 6, 7, and 8.
- The intermediate school which houses the sixth and seventh grades is concentrating on maximizing attendance and time in class for at risk students.
- All school leadership teams attended a Cultural Proficiency Workshop provided by the *Pacific Educational Group* during the 2010-11 school year. This will be completed in November 2011.
- Eighth grade students will be provided laptops on a one to one basis.
- Eighth and ninth grade teachers will receive training from the *Anytime Anywhere Learning Foundation (ALF)* on utilizing one to one laptops.
- Administrators at the 8th grade level will meet with 8th grade special education teachers weekly to monitor progress for their case load.
- All school leadership teams participated in Educators Effectiveness Academy which included training in STEM
- Five teachers participated in the two year project, Maryland STEM Portfolio

ADJUSTMENT* And TIMELINE	RESOURCE**	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Continue Inclusion of CFIP Process/Teacher Collaboration Timeline: Aug. 2011-June 2012	Collaboration	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Benchmarks and Common Assessments	Professional Development	Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Timeline:		
1 to 1 Laptops Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prof. Dev. Staff – June-Aug. 2011 ▪ Orientation for students- Aug. ▪ Laptops provided- Sept. 	Technology	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$51,253
Complete Cultural Diversity Training through Pacific Group Timeline: November 2011	Professional Development	Source: Local Cost: Program paid in total previous year
Maryland Educator Effectiveness Academy Timeline-July 13-15, 2011	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$ 3,567
Implement Strategies from Maryland STEM Portfolio Project Timeline: August 2011-2012	Professional Development	Source: Restricted MD STEM Portfolio Project Grant Cost: \$ 178,183
Data Leaders Training August 2011-June 2012	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$560

Social Studies

1. SCPS' Social Studies Alignment with State Curriculum at the Elementary, Middle and High School Level.

Elementary Level

- a. **SCPS Uses a Thematic Approach for the Early Grades in Social Studies**

- Indicators from the six content standards are addressed thematically through grade three
- Basic understanding of Culture, Geography, and Economics lead to an understanding of how they relate to actual historical events.

- b. **Upper Elementary Social Studies Follows More of a Linear Approach**

- Fourth Grade Social Studies is based around Maryland and Local history
- Political Systems, Peoples of the Nation and the World, Geography and Economics expectations and indicators are taught in conjunction with the linear examination of historical facts
- Fifth Grade Social Studies is based around European Exploration and Colonial America.
- Political Systems, Peoples of the Nation and the World, Geography and Economics expectations and indicators are taught in conjunction with the linear examination of historical facts.

Middle Level

- a. **Middle Level Follows the State Curriculum using both a Linear and Thematic Approach.**

- Sixth Grade Social Studies is a linear approach to World History from the ancient civilizations to the middle Ages.
- Seventh Grade Social Studies is a thematic approach to world regions, including cultures and geography
- Eighth Grade Social Studies is a linear approach to U.S. History to and through the Civil War.

- b. **Political Systems, Peoples of the Nation and the World, Geography and Economics expectations and indicators are taught in conjunction with the linear and thematic examination of historical facts**

High School Level

- a. **SCPS Requires Completion of Four Social Studies Courses**

- World History-grade 9 Renaissance to Present-grade 9
- Government (Includes Financial Literacy)- grade 10
- U.S. History-Civil War to Present-grade 11
- Contemporary Issues-grade 12

b. SCPS utilizes the State Curriculum Historical Themes and Timelines to Organize the World and U.S. History Curricula.

- World History is taught linear through time from the Renaissance to present
- Political Systems, Peoples of the Nation and the World, Geography and Economics expectations and indicators are taught in conjunction with the linear examination of historical facts.
- U.S. History is taught linear through time from Reconstruction to the present
- Political Systems, Peoples of the Nation and the World, Geography and Economics expectations and indicators are taught in conjunction with the linear examination of historical facts.

c. The Government Course is Thematic and Follows the State Curriculum

- Units include Government Systems, Legislative, Executive, Judicial, Criminal and Civil Law, Rights of Citizens, Geography, Economics & Personal Finance
- Includes indicators of Political Science, Peoples of the Nation and the World, geography and economics
- Financial Literacy indicators have been included for the school year 2011-12 to meet COMAR requirement.

d. SCPS requires a Fourth Credit for High School Graduation

- Contemporary Issues is a twelfth grade required credit
- Curriculum Indicators are utilized from the National Council of Social Studies Teachers materials
- Most lessons are based around current issues, using either *Newsweek* or *Up Front*

2. Challenges SCPS Faces in Ensuring the Social Studies State Curriculum is Effectively Implemented at the Elementary, Middle and High School Levels.

3.

a. Elementary Level Challenges

- The elementary schedule is difficult to provide adequate time for all subjects.
- Planning time does not allow for team planning in Social Studies
- Finding appropriate engaging text for Social Studies at the primary level is challenging.

b. Middle Level Challenges

- Teacher collaboration and data analysis has been slower to put in place in Social Studies than the tested areas.
- Benchmark and common assessments have been slower to develop in Social Studies than the tested areas.

c. High School Level

- The sequence of theme makes continuity difficult; for example U.S. History part one in the eighth grade and part 2 in the eleventh grade.

- Varying reading levels of high school students can make finding appropriate texts difficult.
- In History the curriculum gets larger with time, thus makes it difficult for finding time for richer/deeper curriculum.

4. SCPS is Addressing Challenges

a. Meeting Elementary Level Challenges

- Several years ago, SCPS increased the instructional day at the elementary level, which provided more time for Social Studies
- SCPS elementary administrative staff continually look at the schedule and have shaved minutes from other areas to provide for more time in Social Studies
- Time will be devoted for elementary teachers on early dismissal professional development days for work in the Social Studies area.
- School teams, including instructional coaches work together to collect appropriate reading level materials for Social Studies classes.

b. Meeting Middle Level Challenges

- As the proficiency of tested area teachers has increased in the area of collaboration and data analysis, instructional coaches at the middle have been available to lead Social Studies teacher teams in these areas.
- As the workload for developing local benchmark assessments lessens for the tested areas, focus will be placed on the area of Social Studies for assessment development.

c. Meeting High School Level Challenges

- Continue to revise and review scope and sequences of high school courses
- Provide professional development to social Studies teachers on the Classroom Focused Improvement Strategies to identify effective practices. This would lessen the need to re-teach/intervene-providing more time to get to the richer/deeper work.
- Provide Social Studies Teachers with reading strategies for students, utilize various reading level materials.

High School Assessments (HSA) English

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

Table 2.3: Maryland High School Assessment Performance Results - Reading - High (English II)									
Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	160	119	74.4	167	127	76	165	125	75.8
Hispanic/Latino of any race									
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian									
Black or African American							77	49	63.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander									
White							80	68	85
Two or more races									
Special Education	13	2	15.4	15	4	26.7	18	8	44.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)									
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	70	50	71.4	81	61	75.3	82	53	64.6

Male									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	77	51	66.2	83	59	71.1	89	65	73.0
Hispanic/Latino of any race									
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian									
Black or African American							45	28	62.2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander									
White							42	35	83.3
Two or more races									
Special Education	11	1	9.1	10	2	20	11	5	45.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP)									
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	37	26	70.3	27	17	63.0	45	27	60.0

Females									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	83	68	81.9	84	68	81	76	60	78.9
Hispanic/Latino of any race									
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian									
Black or African American							32	21	65.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander									
White							38	33	86.8
Two or more races									
Special Education									
Limited English Proficient (LEP)									
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	33	24	72.7	54	44	81.5	37	26	70.3

1. Evidence of Challenges for English

a. HSA English performance is not consistently moving forward

- The Aggregate proficiency score dropped 0.4 of a percentage point from 2010
- The Special Education subgroup exhibits the largest gap of any group
- The African American and FARMS subgroups score at least 10 percentage points behind the all students group.
- Males in the FARMS subgroup score lowest of any group with the exception of the Special Education subgroup.

b. Staffing Reductions in High Schools

- Reduced 1 English teacher at Washington High School through attrition due to funding
- Reading intervention teacher at Crisfield High School reduced due to funding
- One English teacher transferred to Somerset Intermediate due to shift in enrollment
- Secondary Literacy Supervisor has been transferred to a school as principal

2. Changes and Adjustments Made to Ensure Progress

a. ADJUSTMENT: Increase collaborative structures for school and district administration to ensure more consistency of support.

- The Secondary Supervisor will take over for the Secondary Literacy Supervisor to provide to coordinate and align curriculum, instruction,

assessment, and professional development both vertically (across the grade levels) and geographically (across the district).

- Continue the full time instructional facilitators at High Schools in order to provide more support for teachers and to achieve consistency in the level of support and accountability across the county.
- Professional Development in the Common Core Curriculum will begin at all schools this year.
- A Technology/Instructional Coach has been hired to expand the one to one laptop program at the high schools.
- One High School English teacher from each high school attended the Summer Educator Academy in Wicomico County
- After School Professional Development will continue to provide collaborative planning/data analysis sessions for high school English teachers
- The central office has been reorganized and added a Director of Curriculum and Instruction who will reorganize the special education division in order to provide more services to students.
- Embedded professional development for English teachers will be provided by the Instructional Facilitators and Secondary Supervisor
- Vertical and grade-level collaboration meetings will be held during APD to analyze benchmark and common assessment data and formulate intervention strategies.
- Professional Development in Writing will be provided by local supervisors and the Eastern Shore Writing Project sponsored by Salisbury University.

b. Students will receive a variety of instructional strategies, enrichment and support

- The one to one laptop program will reach the tenth grade this year-English HSA students will be included in the program
- Grade nine and ten English will continue to be scheduled year long which in the block schedule will account for two credits.
- All English courses will include more writing including argumentative
- Students will be exposed to the Capacities of a Literate Individual
- Summer school was revised to more of an intervention based curriculum designed to target specific student deficiencies that enable students to proceed successfully through increasingly more difficult courses. The Reader's Advantage intervention program was used for English/Language Arts.

c. Special Education Department will undergo limited reorganization.

- Instructional and Curriculum Director will work with principals to organize scheduling for maximum student services

ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Curriculum and Instruction Director Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing/Embedded Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$92,389
Continue full-time Instructional Facilitators at both High School Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing/Embedded Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$138,462
Educator Effectiveness Academy Timeline: July 13-15, 2011		Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$ 3,567
Writing Professional Development provided by SCPS supervisors and Salisbury University Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$ 8,829
Professional Development-secondary teachers will continue to attend APD a 75 minute professional development period every week; Special Education teachers will increase their participation in content area collaboration meetings. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Extended Contract for Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$272,033
Hired Instructional Technology Facilitator Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing/Embedded Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$85,507
ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0
Secondary Special Education teachers will continue to participate in activities with regular education teachers at APD (After School Professional Development) Timeline: August 2011 – June 2012	After School Professional Development	Professional Development Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$34,388
One to One Laptop initiative will include grades 7, 8, 9, 10 Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Instructional Technology	Technology Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$ 125,776
Summer School Timeline: June 20-July 22, 2011	Core Program	Source: Restricted SFSF 84.394 Cost: \$30,877

Based on the examination of 2010 High School Assessment (HSA) results for English (Tables 3.1 and 3.2)

Table 3.2: HSA Test Participation and Status-English 2010 Population: All 10th Graders							
Subgroup	All Students						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	181	63.5	115	32.6	59	3.9	7
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	23	17.4	4	65.2	15	17.4	4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	0.0	0	100.0	2	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	102	53.9	55	39.2	40	6.9	7

Subgroup	Males						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	84	53.6	45	40.5	34	6.0	5
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	15	13.3	2	66.7	10	20.0	3
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	49	40.8	20	49.0	24	10.2	5

Subgroup	Females						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	97	72.2	70	25.8	25	2.1	2
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	8	25.0	2	62.5	5	12.5	1
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	53	66.0	35	30.2	16	3.8	2

Subgroup	Table 3.2: HSA Test Participation and Status-English 2010 Population: All 11th Graders						
	All Students						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	168	68.5	115	31.0	52	0.6	1
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	17	23.5	4	76.5	13	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	87	57.5	50	41.4	36	1.1	1

Subgroup	Males						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	92	67.4	62	31.5	29	1.1	1
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	12	33.3	4	66.7	8	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	48	52.1	25	45.8	22	2.1	1

Subgroup	Females						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	76	69.7	53	30.3	23	0.0	0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	5	0.0	0	100.0	5	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	39	64.1	25	35.9	14	0.0	0

1. Evidence of Challenges

- a. **A significant number of 10th grade students (3.9%) 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, Special Education, and Free and Reduced Meals subgroups. This has improved from 2009 however.

b. Intervention and retesting is not yielding positive growth

- The number and percentage of students achieving proficiency in English slightly improves from 10th to 11th grades; 63.5% in tenth grade to 68.5% in eleventh
- The highest rates for not reaching proficiency at the 11th grade are with the Special Education, and Free and Reduced Meals subgroups.
- Females out score males for first time testing by almost 20%. By 11th grade, males have closed that gap to 2.3%
- English staffing at the high schools was reduced by one at Crisfield High and three at Washington. This has produced higher class sizes and a reduction in the availability of flex grouping for intervention

2. Changes or Adjustments to Address the Challenges of All Students Passing the English High School Assessment

a. AJUSTMENT: SCPS High Schools will maintain proven strategies as budgets will allow.

- Instructional Facilitator/coaches positions have been maintained at the high schools.
- Although reading intervention teachers, have been cut, limited sections of reading intervention have been scheduled using available staff.
- *Read 180*, a software program designed to help struggling readers has been purchased with RTTT funds and will be implemented this year.
- Continue full time teachers to provide reading intervention for all 6th and 7th graders in need.
- Reschedule Special Education teachers with regular education teachers to provide more co-teaching sections for students.
- Revise duties for all content supervisors to add leadership support for Special Education to include:
 - Applying the administrator “look fors” list to Special Education lessons
 - Supporting the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
 - Observing and providing data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.
- HSA courses will continue to be scheduled for two semesters (2 credit)
- Limited numbers of single semester HSA courses will be scheduled for second time test takers (Passed course/failed test)
- Bridge projects will continue to provide effective intervention

b. Staffing changes will require shifting of duties and/or re-targeting of focus

- The special education department will be reorganized as budget/funding will allow.
- Two core area staff at Washington High were reassigned to the Intermediate school to meet enrollment demands
- Crisfield High School lost one teacher due to budget.
- Both schools will use limited flex grouping, pullout intervention and added intervention sections
- High School staff will continue improving the use of the CFIPS (Classroom Focused Improvement Process) to lessen the need for outside and/or extra intervention.
- One additional Instructional technology facilitator will be added to meet the demands of implementing effective one to one laptop instruction
-

c. HSA Teachers will begin to transition to new curriculum and new instructional strategies

- Professional Development will be provided to English Teachers on the Maryland Common Core Curriculum.
- English Teachers will begin to infuse more “writing” into the curriculum
- One to One Laptop instructional professional development will be provided to HSA teachers as the initiative has reached the 10th grade this year

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Instructional Technology Facilitator Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing	Staffing Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$85,507
Expanded One to One Laptop Initiative to include HSA Courses Timeline: August 2011-June 2012		Technology Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$67,074
Continue with a full time teacher to provide reading intervention for all 6 th and 7 th graders in need with the intent that earlier skills will impact later HSA performance and progress. Timeline: August 2010-June 2011	Staffing	Staffing Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$125,776
Professional Development: English and Special Education co-teachers will receive professional development in best practices of literacy instruction and CFIP	Professional Development during APD/Pullout Sessions	Professional Development Source: Unrestricted

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Timeline: August 2011-June 2012		Cost: \$272,033
Purchased Read 180 Timeline June 2011-June 2015	Core Program	Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$57,900
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Maryland High School Assessment (HSA) Algebra/Data Analysis

Based on the examination of AYP proficiency data for Algebra/Data Analysis (Table 2.6):

Table 2.6: Maryland High School Assessment Performance Results - Math - High (Algebra/Data Analysis)									
Subgroup	All Students								
	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	155	127	81.9	172	136	79.1	163	129	79.1
Hispanic/Latino of any race									
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian									
Black or African American							75	50	66.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander									
White							79	71	89.9
Two or more races									
Special Education	11	5	45.5	20	4	20	19	6	31.6
Limited English Proficient (LEP)									
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	68	54	79.4	83	67	80.7	82	56	68.3

Male									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	74	60	81.1	87	66	75.9	88	71	80.7
Hispanic/Latino of any race									
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian									
Black or African American							44	30	68.2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander									
White							42	39	92.9
Two or more races									
Special Education				14	2	14.3	12	5	41.7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)									
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	36	27	75.0	28	22	78.6	45	33	73.3

Female									
All Students	2009			2010			2011		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All students	81	67	82.7	85	70	82.4	75	58	77.3
Hispanic/Latino of any race									
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian									
Black or African American							31	20	64.5
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander									
White							37	32	86.5
Two or more races									
Special Education									
Limited English Proficient (LEP)									
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	32	27	84.4	55	45	81.8	37	23	62.2

1. Evidence of Challenges for Algebra/Data Analysis

a. HSA Algebra/Data Analysis performance is not consistently moving forward

- Algebra proficiency has fallen below the 2009 level for 2 straight years.
- The female/FARMS group exhibited the largest decrease going from 81.8 in 2010 to 62.2 in 2011.
- The special education subgroup shows the largest gap from the other subgroups with a proficiency of 31.6%.

b. Staffing issues remain in High Schools

- The majority of high school math teachers have 5 years experience or less
- Neither high school is staffed with a full time Math Facilitator/Coach
- SCPS lacks a dedicated mathematics supervisor at the secondary level
- One math teacher from Washington high school was transferred to Somerset Intermediate due to shift in enrollment

c. Mathematics professional development resources have been cut

- Funding has prevented the use of a math consultant who worked for approximately 10 years in SCPS schools. This service helped fill the gap of no dedicated mathematics supervisor
- The GEAR UP Grant previously funded the software program *Apangea*. This is no longer available.

2. The Changes or Adjustments that will be Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress.

a. **STRATEGY: Somerset County will increase the use of technology to enhance instruction and improve effectiveness**

- 8th and 9th and 10th graders will implement the 1 to 1 laptop initiative in 2011.
- The *Anytime Anywhere Learning Foundation* (ALF) will provide professional development on effective use of 1 to 1 laptops.

b. **STRATEGY: Staff will continue to collaborate, analyze data, and modify instruction**

- Each school included the Classroom Focused Improvement Process as a Professional Development Initiative.
- The Afternoon Professional Development (APD) schedule was developed concurrently with both high school principals to provide at least one and sometimes two algebra data meetings per month to achieve the proper balance of collaboration between teachers of like subjects and new learning.
- Benchmarks and common assessments will continue to be administered in math 6, 7, and Algebra I Part A and B.
- A schedule will be developed so that many, if not most, of the algebra data meetings will be covered by facilitators, supervisors or administrators

c. **STRATEGY: Math teachers and staff will participate in continuing Professional Development**

- Two high school math teachers attended the Educator Effectiveness Academy this past summer in Wicomico County
- Math teachers will be trained in implementing the Math Practices part of the Maryland Common Core Curriculum this school year.
- Teachers will work during Afternoon Professional Development (APD) with a balance of collaboration between teachers of like subjects and new learning.
- Algebra teachers will continue to create common assessments which will focus on particular skill sets so that intervention can be timelier and on target.
- All school leadership teams attended a two day Cultural Proficiency Workshop provided by the *Pacific Educational Group* during the summer.

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY
Professional Development- secondary teachers will continue to attend APD a 75 minute professional development period every week Timeline: August2011-May 2012	Extended Contract for Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$272,033
Educator Effectiveness Academy	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTTCFDA 84.395

Timeline: July 13-15 2011		Cost: \$3,567
Content Area Workshop Timeline: August 4, 2011	Professional Development	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$3080
1 to 1 Laptops Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prof. Dev. Staff – June-May 2011 ▪ Orientation for students- Aug. Laptops provided- Sept.	Technology	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$51,253
Data Leaders Workshop Timeline: August 2011	Professional Development	Source: Restricted RTTTCFDA 84.395 Cost: \$560

Table 3.3: HSA Test Participation and Status-Algebra Data Analysis 2010							
Population: All 10th Graders							
Subgroup	All Students						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	178	70.2	125	24.7	44	5.1	9
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	23	30.4	7	56.5	13	13.0	3
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	0.0	0	100.0	2	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	100	63.0	63	29.0	29	8.0	8

Subgroup	Males						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	83	67.5	56	26.5	22	6.0	5
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	15	33.3	5	46.7	7	20.0	3
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	49	61.2	30	28.6	14	10.2	5

Subgroup	Females						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	95	72.6	69	23.2	22	4.2	4
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	8	25.0	2	75.0	6	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	51	64.7	33	29.4	15	5.9	3

Table 3.4: HSA Test Participation and Status-Algebra Data Analysis 2010 Population: All 11th Graders							
Subgroup	All Students						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	164	78.7	129	20.1	33	1.2	2
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	17	29.4	5	70.6	12	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	85	70.6	60	27.1	23	2.4	2

Subgroup	Males						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	89	79.8	71	19.1	17	1.1	1
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	11	36.4	4	63.6	7	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	46	71.7	33	26.1	12	2.2	1

Subgroup	Females						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	75	77.3	58	21.3	16	1.3	1
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	6	16.7	1	83.3	5	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	39	69.2	27	28.2	11	2.6	1

1. Evidence of Challenges

a. Participation

- The non-participation figure for special education students for 10th grade was 13% for 2010. This improved to 0% by 11th grade however.
- Special Education Males had a 20% non participation in 10th grade. This fell to 0% by 11th grade.

b. Performance

- The special education subgroup scored 39.3 % below the aggregate for the 10th grade and 49.3 % for the 11th grade in 2010.
- Some capable students are settling for earning the composite score or Bridge rather than seeking additional re-testing and passage.
- The FARMS subgroup scored 9% below the aggregate in the 10th grade and 8.1 % below for the 11th grade.
- Females outperformed males by 5.1 % in the tenth grade
- Males outperformed females by 2.5% in the eleventh grade

c. HSA Intervention

- Present intervention methods are not efficient; tenth grade proficiency was 70.2% and only grew to 78.7% by the eleventh grade
- After school intervention for HSA was provided through the GEAR UP grant last year. This grant has been completed, present funding does not provide to pay for this

- At Washington, two math teachers have transferred to other schools in the district. This has produced higher class sizes and a reduction in the availability of flex grouping for intervention.

2. Changes and Adjustments Made to Ensure Progress

a. AJUSTMENT: SCPS High Schools will maintain proven strategies as budgets will allow

- Continue full time teachers to provide Mathematics intervention for all 6th and 7th graders in need.
- Reschedule Special Education teachers with regular education teachers to provide more co-teaching sections for students.
- Revise duties for all content supervisors to add leadership support for Special Education to include:
 - Applying the administrator “look fors” list to Special Education lessons
 - Supporting the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
 - Observing and providing data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.
- HSA courses will continue to be scheduled for two semesters (2 credit)
- Limited numbers of single semester HSA courses will be scheduled for second time test takers (Passed course/failed test)
- Bridge projects will continue to provide effective intervention
- The 1 to 1 laptop initiative will be reaching HSA courses this year

b. Staffing changes will require shifting of duties and/or re-targeting of focus

- The special education department will be reorganized as budget/funding will allow.
- Two core area staff at Washington High were reassigned to the Intermediate school to meet enrollment demands
- Crisfield High School lost one teacher due to budget.
- Both schools will use limited flex grouping, pullout intervention and added intervention sections
- High School staff will continue improving in the use of the CFIPS (Classroom Focused Improvement Process) to lessen the need for outside and/or extra intervention.
- One additional Instructional technology facilitator will be added to meet the demands of implementing effective one to one laptop instruction

c. HSA Teachers will begin to transition to new curriculum and new instructional strategies

- Professional Development will be provided to Mathematics Teachers on the Maryland Common Core Curriculum.

- Mathematics Teachers will begin to infuse “ Math Practices” into the curriculum
- One to One Laptop instructional professional development will be provided to HSA teachers as the initiative has reached the 10th grade this year

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Instructional Technology Facilitator Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing	Staffing Source: Restricted RTTT Grant CFDA 84.395 Cost: \$85,507
Expanded One to One Laptop Initiative to include HSA Courses Timeline: August 2011-June 2012		Technology Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$125,776
Continue with a full time teacher to provide math intervention for all 6 th and 7 th graders in need with the intent that earlier skills will impact later HSA performance and progress. Timeline: August 2010-June 2011	Staffing	Staffing Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$86,777
Professional Development: Math and Special Education co-teachers will receive professional development in best practices of literacy instruction and CFIP Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Professional Development during APD/Pullout Sessions	Professional Development Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$272,033
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

Biology

Based on the Examination of 2010 High School Assessment Results for Biology (Tables 3.5 and 3.6):

Table 3.5: HSA Test Participation and Status-Biology 2010 Population: All 10th Graders							
Subgroup	All Students						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	180	73.9	133	22.2	40	3.9	7
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	23	26.1	6	56.5	13	17.4	4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	50.0	1	50.0	1	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	102	66.7	68	28.4	29	4.9	5

Subgroup	Males						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	84	73.8	62	20.2	17	6.0	5
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	15	33.3	5	40.0	6	26.7	4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	49	65.3	32	26.5	13	8.2	4

Subgroup	Females						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	96	74.0	71	24.0	23	2.1	2
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	8	12.5	1	87.5	7	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	53	67.9	36	30.2	16	1.9	1

Table 3.6: HSA Test Participation and Status-Biology 2010 Population: All 11th Graders							
Subgroup	All Students						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	167	71.3	119	28.7	48	0.0	0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	17	35.3	6	64.7	11	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	87	57.5	50	42.5	37	0.0	0

Subgroup	Males						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	167	71.3	119	28.7	48	0.0	0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	17	35.3	6	64.7	11	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	87	57.5	50	42.5	37	0.0	0

Subgroup	Females						
	Number of Students	% Taken and Passed	Number Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	76	67.1	51	32.9	25	0.0	0
Hispanic/Latino of any race							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Black or African American							
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Two or more races							
Special Education	5	40.0	2	60.0	3	0.0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	39	46.2	18	53.8	21	0.0	0

1. Evidence of Challenges

a. Participation

- The non-participation figure for the cohort in 2010 was 3.9%, for males it was 6%. This improved to 0% by 2011.
- The non-participation figure for special education students for 10th grade was 17.4% for 2010. This improved to 0% by 11th grade however.
- Special Education Males had a 26.7% non participation in 10th grade. This fell to 0% by 11th grade.

b. Performance

- The special education subgroup scored 47.8 % below the aggregate for the 10th grade and 36 % for the 11th grade in 2010.
- The FARMS subgroup scored 7.2% below the aggregate in the 10th grade and 13.8 % below for the 11th grade.
- Females and males scored within a percentage point in the tenth grade
- Males outperformed females by 4.2% in the eleventh grade

c. HSA Intervention

- Present intervention methods are not efficient; tenth grade proficiency was 73.9% and fell to 71.3% by the eleventh grade
- After school intervention for HSA was provided through the GEAR UP grant last year. This grant has been completed, present funding does not provide to pay for this
- At Crisfield, one science teacher was not replaced upon retirement. This has produced higher class sizes and a reduction in the availability of flex grouping for intervention.

2. Changes and Adjustments Made to Ensure Progress

a. AJUSTMENT: SCPS High Schools will maintain proven strategies as budgets will allow

- Reschedule Special Education teachers with regular education teachers to provide more co-teaching sections for students.
- Revise duties for all content supervisors to add leadership support for Special Education to include:
 - Applying the administrator “look fors” list to Special Education lessons
 - Supporting the co teaching initiative through observation and feedback to both special and regular education teachers, and
 - Observing and providing data on the frequency and type of modified lessons delivered to Special Education students.
- HSA courses will continue to be scheduled for two semesters (2 credit)
- Limited numbers of single semester HSA courses will be scheduled for second time test takers (Passed course/failed test)
- Bridge projects will continue to provide effective intervention
- The 1 to 1 laptop initiative will be reaching HSA courses this year.

b. Staffing changes will require shifting of duties and/or re-targeting of focus

- The special education department will be reorganized as budget/funding will allow.
- Two core area staff at Washington High were reassigned to the Intermediate school to meet enrollment demands
- Crisfield High School lost one science teacher due to budget.

- Both schools will use limited flex grouping, pullout intervention and added intervention sections
- High School staff will continue improving in the use of the CFIPS (Classroom Focused Improvement Process) to lessen the need for outside and/or extra intervention.
- One additional Instructional technology facilitator will be added to meet the demands of implementing effective one to one laptop instruction

ADJUSTMENTS and TIMELINE	RESOURCE	CATEGORY AND FUNDING
Instructional Technology Facilitator Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Staffing	Staffing Source: Restricted RTTT 84.395 Cost: \$85,507
Expanded One to One Laptop Initiative to include HSA Courses Timeline: August 2011-June 2012		Technology Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$125,776
Continue with a full time teacher to provide math intervention for all 6 th and 7 th graders in need with the intent that earlier skills will impact later HSA performance and progress. Timeline: August 2010-June 2011	Staffing	Staffing Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$45,064
Professional Development-STEM lessons will be included across curriculum as required by the RTTT reform. STEM projects can and will be grounded in Biological projects/problems. Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Professional Development during APD/Pullout Sessions	Professional Development Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$272,033
Secondary Special Education teachers will meet regularly with core academic teams Timeline: August 2011-June 2012	Meeting to analyze data to modify instruction	Intervention Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0

High School Assessments (HSA)

HSA Graduation Requirement

Class of 2011

Based on the Examination of Data for 2011 Graduates Who Met the High School Assessment Graduation Requirement by Option and Bridge Projects Passed (Tables 3.9 and 3.10):

Table 3.9: Graduates Who Met the High School Assessment (HSA) Graduation Requirement by Option														
	School Year	Enrolled #	HSA Graduation Requirement Options								Total			
			Passing Scores on Four HSAs		1602 Option		Bridge Projects		Waivers		Met		Not Met	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Students	2008-2009	160	90	56.25	48	30	22	13.75	0	0	160	100	0	0
	2009-2010	170	112	65.8	41	24.1	17	10	0	0	170	100	0	0
	2010-2011	171	109	63.7	30	17.5	31	18.1	1	.5	171	100	0	0
Male	2008-2009													
	2009-2010													
	2010-2011	94	61	64.9	14	14.9	18	19.1	1	1	94	100	0	0
Female	2008-2009													
	2009-2010													
	2010-2011	77	48	62.3	16	20.8	13	16.9	0	0	77	100	0	0

Table 3.10: Bridge Projects Passed						
	School Year	Algebra	Biology	English	Government	Total
		#	#	#	#	#
All Students	2008-2009	13	18	16	10	57
	2009-2010	12	14	15	10	51
	2010-2011	38	30	34	23	125
Male	2008-2009					
	2009-2010					
	2010-2011					
Female	2008-2009					

1. Somerset County's Results for the Class of 2011 Meeting the High School Assessment Requirement for Graduation

a. All students met the HSA Graduation Requirement in the Class of 2010.

- 171 Students completed the required HSA graduation requirements.
- 109 or 63.7% passed all 4 HSA assessments.
- 30 or 17.5% completed through scoring the 1602 composite.
- 31 or 18.1% completed by completing the required number of bridge projects.
- Students completed 125 total Bridge Projects. They included 38 Algebra, 30 Biology, 34 English, and 23 Government.

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

- During the summer of 2010, SCPS implemented a two week Bridge/HSA Prep to enable students to complete projects and prepare for re-testing in August. Projects were completed, but needed revisions before being accepted.
- Washington dropped the full time bridge class but utilized the Bridge Teacher in a pull out and Access period set up. Access is the one hour lunch period some schools use to provide intervention or enrichment.
- Crisfield High School continued scheduling full time Bridge classes both semesters.
- One student was granted a waiver
- All students completed the HSA Graduation Requirement.

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.
- Tutoring is provided during the ACCESS (One hour lunch) period at Washington High
- Tutoring is provided during the period at Crisfield High.
- 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 continues to be funded. Duties are assumed by a teacher with an extended contract.
- Each school dedicates 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 was 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	Source: Unrestricted Cost: \$ 14,190
Staffing	4 Teachers for 2 week summer session	Source: Restricted SFSF 84.394 Cost: \$3,200
Staffing	Stipends paid for after school scoring sessions	Source: Restricted SFSF 84.394 Cost: \$ \$1,260

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.

3. **Evidence of Challenge in Graduation Requirement**

a. **A high number of students continue to not pass the HSA assessment by the end of their 12th grade year.**

- 18.1% of graduates completed HSA requirements through Bridge up from 10% in 2010
- Completed projects in Algebra/Data Analysis tripled in 2011 from 2010

- Completed Biology projects doubled from 2010
- Completed English II projects doubled from 2010
- Completed Government projects doubled from 2010

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.
- Forty four of 171 students or 25.7% of the 2011 cohort had not met the HSA graduation requirement at the beginning of their senior year, in September of 2010.

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

- Bridge sections are built into existing staff members' schedules.
- Fewer electives or larger class sizes result from additional Bridge sections.
- Building student confidence to meet the rigor of projects remains a challenge.
- All HSA content area teachers must allot additional time out of their schedule to accommodate specific student needs.

d. Budget reductions will reduce available interventions.

- Reductions in the Summer School budget did not provide for a summer offering of Bridge classes
- Funding was lost for after school stipends for Bridge Tutors

Table 3.11: Rising Seniors Who Have Not Yet Met the Graduation Requirement

	School Year	Enrolled #	Met # %		Not Yet Met								Total # %	
					Needing to Pass 4		Needing to Pass 3		Needing to Pass 2		Needing to Pass 1			
					#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
All Students	2009-2010	169	141	83.4	8	4.7	11	6.5	7	4.1	2	1.2		
	2010-2011	188	144	76.5	14	7.4	14	7.4	11	5.8	5	2.4		
	2011-2012	176	146	83	12	6.9	9	5.1	5	2.8	4	2.2	176	100
Male	2009-2010													
	2010-2011													
	2011-2012	80	67	83.75	6	7.5	2	2.5	2	2.5	3	3.75	80	100
Female	2009-2010													
	2010-2011													
	2011-2012	96	79	82.3	6	6.25	7	7.3	3	3.1	1	1.05	96	100

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

a. The Bridge Program will continue to be a major pathway to graduation for students

- Thirty students will enter the Bridge Program down from Forty four last year.
- Twenty one students must pass 3 or more assessments or complete corresponding Bridge projects
- Twelve students need to pass all 4 assessments or complete corresponding Bridge projects.

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.
- High school staffs are considerably less skilled at analyzing data to modify instruction than those at the earlier grades
- Elementary and intermediate staffs have been successful at developing targeted intervention through the use of data. Leadership for this is supplied by the instructional coaches.

- Budget reductions have eliminated the possibility of increasing the number of instructional coaches at the high schools so they are staffed at the same level as the elementary and intermediate.
- Scheduling for intervention becomes a problem as students needing intervention also need credit earning opportunities in order to graduate on time.

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.

- Bridge class sections will be offered both semesters at both high schools.
- Washington High School will again schedule 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.