

Local Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated Strategic Plan

November 2021

**Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Student Support, Academic Enrichment, and Educational Policy
Office of Finance**



2021 Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan

(Include this page as a cover to the submission indicated below.)

Due: October 15, 2021

Local School System Submitting this Report: Somerset

Address: 7982 A Tawes Campus Drive, Westover, MD 21871

Local School System Point of Contact: _Jill Holland_____

Telephone: _410-651-1616 ext. 10276_____

E-mail: _jholland@somerset.k12.md.us_____

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that, to the best of our knowledge, the information provided in the 2021 Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan is correct and complete and adheres to the requirements of the ESSA and Section 5-401. We further certify that this plan has been developed in consultation with members of the local School system's current Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan team and that each member has reviewed and approved the accuracy of the information provided in plan.

**Signature of Local Superintendent of Schools
or Chief Executive Officer**

Date

Signature of Local Point of Contact

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Planning Team Members	5
Executive Summary	7
Areas of Focus: Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan	
Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan Needs Assessment Summary	13
Areas of Focus: Reporting Requirements	24
Area of Focus #1	25
Area of Focus #2	44
Area of Focus #3	77
Transferability of Funds	97
Transferability of Funds – Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)	98
Transferability of Funds Chart	99
Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools, Targeted Support and Improvement Schools, and SIG IV Schools	100
COMAR Requirements	104
○ Educational Equity 13A.01.06 Educational Equity	
○ Gifted and Talented 13A.04.07 Gifted and Talented Education	
○ Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program 13A.07.01	
Appendices	
Appendix A: Content of Title I, Part A Application	
2021-2022 Title I, Part A Application and Monitoring Tool- Explanation of Terms	2
ESSA Law and Non-Regulatory Guidance Links	
Part 1: Title I, Part A Application - Attestation	9
STAFF CREDENTIALS AND CERTIFICATIONS	12
SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS	16
TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS	22
PARENT AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT	29
PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	35
EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH	40
SUPPORT FOR FOSTER CARE STUDENTS	43
ENGLISH LEARNERS	45
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT – TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT SCHOOLS	48
FISCAL REQUIREMENTS	51
Addendum: Progress Monitoring through Growth Measures and Outcomes	62
Program Review Follow-up Addendum	67
Guidance: Sign-in, Agenda, Notes, and Evaluations (SANE) as evidence of implementation for Title I purposes	68
Staff Credentials and Certification: Types of Certificates and Glossary of Terms	69
School wide Program Plan Components Checklist	74
Title I District-Level Parent and Family Engagement Policy/Plan Requirements – Section 1116: Checklist	76
Title I School Level Parent and Family Engagement Plan and School Parent Compact – Section 1116: Checklist	79

Equitable Services Topics of Consultation	82
Affirmation of Consultation Form	83
Intent to Participate Form	85
MSDE: ESSA Title I and Title III Questions and Answers	86
Title I Skipped Schools' Addendum SY 2021-2022	88
Appendix B: Title I, Part D Application	
Appendix C: Title II, Part A Application	
Appendix D: Title III, Part Application	
Appendix E: Title IV, Part A Application	
Title IV, Part A Application: Overview	
1.0 CONSULTATION - Required	
2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE COST – Allowable	
3.0 NEEDS ASSESSMENT- Required	
Prioritizing Funds to School- Required	
Prioritizing Educational Equity – As required by the Educational Equity regulation, COMAR 13A.Required (Please describe how the LEA is using an equity lens to address disparities to support marginalized student groups and practices.)	
4.0 ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT WELL-ROUNDED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES – Required [ESEA §4107(a)(1)]	
Activity Key for Well-Rounded Education Opportunities	
4.1 Well-Rounded Education Activities	
5.0 ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT SAFE AND HEALTHY STUDENTS – Required [ESEA §4108]	
Activity Key for Safe and Healthy Students	
5.1 Safe & Healthy Students' Activities	
6.0 ACTIVITIES TO THE EFFECTIVE USE OF TECHNOLOGY – Required [ESEA §4109]	
Activity Key for Effective Use of Technology	
6.1 Effective Use of Technology Activities (use drop down)	
7.0 EQUITABLE SERVICES TO STUDENTS IN PRIVATE (NONPUBLIC) SCHOOLS [ESEA, Section 8501] (use drop down)	
8.0 Assurances [ESEA, Section 4106(e)(2)]	
9.0 INTERNET SAFETY [ESEA, Section 4121]:	
10.0 BUDGET NARRATIVE:	
Sample Budget Narrative	
Appendix F: Fine Arts Application	
Appendix G: Equitable Services to Private Schools Under ESSA Section	
Appendix H: Contact Information for MSDE Program Managers	
Appendix I: SY 2020-2021 Network for Equity and Excellence in Education	
Appendix J: Contact Information for MSDE Program Managers	
Appendix K: Posting and General Submission Procedures	
Appendix L: Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan Points of Contact	
Appendix M: Points of Contact	
Appendix N: Adjustments made to final submission	

Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan Planning Team Members

Use this page to identify the members of the school system's 2021 Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan planning team. The planning team must include representation from the Educational Equity Office. Please include affiliation or title where applicable.

Name	Affiliation/Title
Jill Holland	Supervisor Social Studies & Media, LECS Coordinator
Dr. John Gaddis	Superintendent of Schools
Tom Davis	Deputy Superintendent of Schools
Tracie Bartemy	Director of Schools
Linda Johnson	Chief Financial Officer
Dr. William Johnson	Program Administrator Equity Monitor
Tracey Cottman	Supervisor of Student Services
Karen Karten	Supervisor of Early Childhood
Brandy Brady	Supervisor of Special Education
Ted Gibson	Supervisor of Instructional Technology
Tony Bevilacqua	Supervisor of Instruction & Mentoring
Cortney Monar	Supervisor of CTE & Principal Somerset Technical High School
Allison Romano	Student Information System Coordinator
Terry Drechsler	LAC & Supervisor Secondary Math
Traci Schneider	Supervisor Elementary Math & Science
Lilly Welch	Supervisor ELA K-12, EL
Will Gray	Supervisor of Special Programs
Chantal Russum	Principal, Washington Academy & High School

Jeff Hale	Principal, Crisfield Academy & High School
Corey Ballard	Principal, Somerset Intermediate School
Ashley Walters	Principal, Deal Island Elementary School
Dr. Terra Taylor	Principal, Princess Anne Elementary School
Kirstin Gibson	Principal, Greenwood Elementary School
Elizabeth Berry	Principal, Carter G Woodson Elementary School

Executive Summary

Though the state of Maryland was ranked the wealthiest in the country in 2021 as reported by US News, Somerset ranks among the poorest of those counties. The 3.2% population decrease in the county from 2010 to 2020 is reflected in school enrollment with a 2.3% decrease. The total student enrollment in 2021 of 2,759 was comprised of approximately 40% White students, 46% African American students, 10% Hispanic students, 6% More Than One Race Students, and less than 1% of other minority populations, including Asian and Native American/Pacific Islander. 73% of these students are eligible for Free and Reduced Meals (though we are a CEP county), providing evidence of a high poverty area. Additionally, the 2020 Census shows that 18.7% of the county population has less than a high school diploma and only 14.4% has a Bachelor's Degree or higher.

Being a county with extreme poverty in a wealthy state known for progressive education and high achievement is challenging. While wealthier systems rely heavily on local and county governments to fund their needs, we must be more creative in meeting our students' needs. Though the county government works hard to provide assistance with one time needs when they can, including a new technical high school in which they funded \$7.4 million, the regular maintenance of effort funding isn't sufficient. SCPS relies heavily on state funding and grants. While state funding continues to increase in small increments, we rely on grants to fill the funding gaps. All funding is prioritized to address our system priorities, identified as Focus Areas in this LECS Plan: **ELA Academic Achievement (as measured by state MCAP scores); Math Academic Achievement (as measured by state MCAP scores); and Improving Attendance & Chronic Absenteeism (by addressing the unique needs of students and families equitably).**

Conducting a Needs Assessment was challenging this year as we were forced to rely on old state data (due to testing waivers for COVID 19); incomplete and inconsistent local benchmark data, and in some cases data that wasn't collected in the same ways as prior to COVID 19. In a day and time when we have become trained to rely on data to inform direction and instruction, making decisions with such incomplete, inconsistent, and sometimes unreliable information has been a significant challenge.

Our last state data came from testing completed in 2019. In 2021 SCPS attempted to administer local ELA and Math Benchmarks as well as Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) assessments. Overall the implementation and results were so inconsistent that the data is generally unreliable.

All of this local data was gathered from different technology platforms, including Unify, NWEA MAP, and ALEKS. Administering secure, individual student testing in somewhat unfamiliar platforms (only used a few times a year) can be challenging under optimal circumstances: these were not optimal circumstances. Some testing windows fell during remote learning periods. In those cases wifi issues and a lack of tech savviness made testing difficult. Some students simply did not test. Other test data was so abnormal that it was obvious the tests were being taken by parents at home, not students. In addition to unreliable student response data, the number of students taking each test varied wildly, depending on the circumstance, making it difficult to correctly identify patterns and trends in data.

All things considered, NWEA Map Data is our most reliable and consistent local data when analyzing elementary reading and math. Using our last regular MAP testing data (spring 2019) and comparing it to spring 2021 data, students in grades 3-5 showed an average decline of 2.6%. The largest decline among this group was for white students in 5th grade, showing a full 6% drop.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, math scores for students in grades 3-5 as measured by NWEA Map declined even more, at 4.67%. The largest decline among this group was, again, white students in 5th grade, showing a 9.4% drop.

Reading scores in grades 6-8 varied much more with some student populations showing declines whereas others showed slight increases in performance. The analysis reveals in cases of increases, though, that significantly fewer students actually tested in 2021. Qualitative analysis reveals that many middle school students with significant challenges, including special education, remained virtual for the entire 2021 school year and neglected county tests. This means that the missing data represents many of our lower performing students, making the data appear higher than it is.

Math data for grades 6-8 comes from the ALEKS Program, not MAP. This data, shown on p. 22, is by module. Overall, the average score declined from the first module to the last for grades 6 and 8 but showed a dramatic increase for grade 7. In particular, scores of females in grades 6 and 8 dropped from the first to the last test. All data, however, is incomplete as the numbers are not reflective of the actual number of students in that grade (likely gaps with virtual learning due to lack of internet access and students “ghosting” class). Grades 6 and 7 average 220 students each but the number of students taking the assessments hovers around 140 grades 6 and 150 for grade 7. Grade 8 is closer with 103 students taking the test out of approximately 160.

Our response to student learning loss is a combination of evidence based programs, strategies, and wrap-around services to meet the needs of larger groups of students as well as provide for the unique and specific needs of others. With ESSER II funding SCPS was able to strengthen the academic programs and foundations to combat learning loss. This money was used to pay for a reading coach, intervention teachers at seven schools, a teacher mentor, and special software designed to meet the needs of our special education students as well as adaptive math software. The overall academic plan included three major components: summer acceleration and credit recovery; data-based learning and planning cycles utilizing Tier 2 (in-class) intervention; and consistent, evidence based Tier 3 intervention.

Our first component of the plan to accelerate learning and get students back on track was to provide an unbelievable robust summer program for students in grades PK3-rising seniors. The program included a variety of components to address all needs.

At the elementary level we provided summer learning in ELA and Math to 528 students. Of those, 252 were primary learners in grades PK3-1st grade and 276 were from grades 2-5. In all, we provided this accelerated learning program for ELA and Math to 69% of our elementary students in the county. Students with lower achievement scores on MAP tests and grades as well as special education and EL students were targeted for the program and given preferential enrollment. With the most need groups addressed first, remaining slots were provided on a first come, first served basis with nearly all applicants being accepted. Instruction was face to face with a blend of project based, collaborative learning and foundational reinforcement. Pre-tests were given at the beginning of the summer to those students so that we could determine baseline levels and measure growth.

At the secondary level, similar programs were implemented. Middle school mirrored the elementary program, providing face to face acceleration for ELA and Math instruction to 163 students in grades 6-8. High school focused on credit recovery, though instruction was provided face to face instead of virtually. The high school program was divided into two time blocks per ½ day to allow students to take two classes

if needed. 78 high school students participated in the summer school credit recovery program with 106 credits recovered total over the course of the summer.

The second component to the plan requires more planning, scheduling, and reflecting on a consistent basis. Our needs assessment revealed that despite using data to drive decisions, we have not consistently been using it well. Our CFIP data has often been used at the end of a unit instead of ongoing, formative data. Further, we are not confident that the “re-teaching” is being done with fidelity, targeting the standard, and that re-assessing is happening. We believe that pacing guides, benchmark schedules, extra activities, and other regular distractions are preventing us from efficiently using time on task to complete the learning cycle instead of stopping after “covering” the content. Keeping students in the regular classroom enables students to equitably receive regular remediation and re-teaching without being removed from other instruction and/or other interest based opportunities in their schedules. We intend to renew our focus on the CFIP process as formative data and emphasize the re-assessing component. We intend to provide job-embedded PD to our teachers on this throughout the year in team and faculty meetings. Additionally, supervisors, administrators, and instructional facilitators are being trained on the Student Centered Coaching Model, which incorporates this learning cycle. This strategy will be monitored through team meetings, student grades, and county benchmarks. Additionally, this will be the core component of the Student Centered Teaching program that instructional facilitators use with teachers.

The intent to focus on providing targeted, level 2 instruction also extends to our English Language Learners as we are striving to increase the number of students exiting the EL program. In addition to ensuring that ELL (English Language Learner) teachers are assigned to reading classes with ELL students, ELL teachers will provide push-in and pull-out services to those students. Expectations and strategies will be shared with parents in order to collaborate and maximize impact.

Finally, we intend to strengthen our evidence based intervention to improve consistency through improved logistics, human resource management, and data analysis. In addition to adding time in the day for reading and math intervention at elementary and middle levels, we hired more intervention teachers district-wide. Now we have dedicated times and people for ELA and Math, whereas before we only had ELA. Further, strengthening our Tier 2 (in-class) interventions with the regular education teacher will decrease the number of students that need Tier 3 (pull out) intervention. This will be measured by the progress of number of students needing Tier 3 intervention as well as their success on MAP, county benchmarks, and grades. The combination of providing the time, the people, the place, the evidence based program, and the right students will make this component stronger and more effective.

Similar academic inconsistencies applied to non-academic data like attendance and discipline, which influence student academic success. Throughout the 20-21 school-year SCPS had three kinds of students at any given time: face to face, virtual synchronous, and virtual asynchronous. The virtual asynchronous option wasn't really offered but evolved and developed as students chose to work without tuning in to Google Meets due to lack of wifi. We developed ways to track attendance for those students that relied on other factors, including completion of work. We also started tracking middle school attendance by period instead of days and ½ days, making the data itself inconsistent.

Attendance reports that we send to the state at the end of the year reveal negative attendance trends that persist from 2019-2021. Some of these trends correspond to achievement gaps for specific student populations and others correspond to specific grade levels. Root causes vary, depending on the student group.

While county attendance overall falls below 94% most years, students in grades 7 and 9 have lower percentages consistently. Root cause analysis indicates that social and emotional issues, sometimes compounded by school climate, are likely the biggest reason for this.

More concerning are consistently low attendance trends among specific student populations already identified as having academic equity challenges, including students with disabilities & 504 plans as well as migrant and homeless/FIT students. These populations already face significant challenges to academic success so decreasing time in school compounds those existing concerns.

Discipline data was generally reported in the same manner as before, but infractions were significantly lower as direct, face to face interactions led to less behavioral issues. If students didn't like something that another person said or did they could just logout or "ghost" the class instead of physically responding. For this reason, discipline data looks better in 2021 but that is not a reliable indicator for what we are likely to experience this year as we return face to face.

Even Mental Health data from 2020-2021 is skewed, showing a decrease in students receiving services. We know that it is extremely likely that mental health issues would increase during a global pandemic, but the data shows that less students received services during that school-year. Likely this data does not indicate improved circumstances, but rather a lack of students being able to access these services. Many students receive their services during the school day, in our buildings. While many providers moved to tele-therapy, coordinating these efforts may have been problematic for many families.

The root cause analysis done during our needs assessment revealed that many sub-issues fall under the overarching concern of attendance. If students do not attend then data shows that they are likely to perform at lower achievement levels. Behavior/discipline, homelessness, and mental health concerns are all major factors in student absences. For this reason, our last Focus Area is School Quality and Student Success with a focus on Attendance & Chronic Absenteeism.

In order to fully address the needs of our students and families we'll be implementing a multi-pronged approach. The prongs or components are: providing logistical and transportation services to students with attendance problems as well as students/families identified as FIT; implementing Social and Emotional Programs to provide students with resources, coping strategies, and a supportive school community; and implementing data collection, analysis, and evaluation cycles with respect to student absences.

While we provide comprehensive transportation services to our students, logistical issues sometimes prevent students from using it. For example, if parents are working or asleep after a late work shift then students may not get up in time to meet the bus. Other potential issues may include students not having any clean laundry and/or a ride to school after missing the bus. We intend to create and implement procedures for identifying which students have which issues and respond appropriately. We may have an "extra bus run" or perhaps a wake-up text, or laundry services.

Even with these services, though, some students do not want to attend school due to social and emotional concerns. We intend to create building level communities to facilitate a sense of belong using a variety of methods, including the House System, morning Circles, Homeroom SEL time, and Boys and Girls Clubs. Additionally, explicit mental health lessons will be provided monthly to reach students. Finally, students identified as needing additional mental health support will be monitored by Guidance, Learning Support Team (LST), and local mental health providers.

Four programs fall into the SEL intervention area. Two of these programs, Ron Clark's House Program and Conscious Discipline, are school-based programs that build community for all students. The other programs, Second Step and Check In Check Out, target students identified as needing additional social, emotional, and/or academic support. The students are identified by teachers, administrators, and support staff or may have been identified by feeder schools. The students targeted to receive Check In Check Out services are paired with an adult in the building to serve as a mentor or coach to check with the student every morning and afternoon. The Check In Check Out program incorporates academic concerns as well as SEL. The Second Step Program is an SEL curriculum that is administered to identified students in grades k-8 in chunks to assist with SEL issues.

The last prong is the most important: constantly get more information. We don't know what we don't know. Circumstances change and life events are not contained to the beginning of the school year. Creating a form to collect data on students will help us better meet their needs individually as well as track larger trends.

An additional goal within the School Quality and Student Success Focus Area is providing equitable access to instruction through universal distribution of devices to students as well as providing students and staff with high quality digital programs.

SCPS has strategically used pandemic related emergency funding to address student needs throughout the pandemic and moving into the third consecutive school year where Covid 19 issues impact instruction. As we have moved through 18 months of a global pandemic, some needs have increased and/or diminished while others have remained a constant. We continue to utilize grant funding to address those needs.

At the beginning of the pandemic the immediate needs of the system were for student devices, infrastructure to provide wifi, and health & sanitation products (cleaners, masks, etc...). With CARES money (ESSER 1), SCPS was able to purchase sufficient masks, back-pack sprayers, signage, and cleaning materials. Additionally, we used CARES money to purchase a large number of student laptops to be used for secondary students.

We also received a competitive GEER grant that enabled us to purchase mobile laptop charging units so that when we transported students to schools to access assignments they could charge their laptops on the bus. The grant also enabled us to purchase a screencasting software for the district so that teachers could provide direct instruction and explanations to go with information on their screens.

As the pandemic continued, the need for additional emergency funding became apparent. Remote learning necessitated updating infrastructure, including re-wiring and replacing cables. We also purchased two portable classrooms with ESSER II funds in order to provide social distancing in one of our more densely populated elementary schools.

We purchased more devices using a technology grant and emergency coronavirus funds shared by our county government. These devices enabled us to extend remote learning and our 1:1 device program all the way down to our early learners.

More recently we are looking at mental health issues as a top priority as a large number of students return to schools for the first time in 18 months. In an effort to address these needs we've increased our capacity to respond to students with social and emotional needs. Through a Concentration of Poverty Grant we've been fortunate enough to hire Community School Liaisons for five of our neediest schools. We have also

hired a mental health coordinator using a state grant to coordinate and oversee our district efforts. We have trained staff on the 2nd Step program using Project Aware money (grant ended) and we are moving forward with training staff on Restorative Practices using Title IV money. We also strive to help students and families in transition by using the McKinney Vento grant to pay for uniforms, tutors, and transportation for those students as needed.

Our comprehensive plans to address academic and social emotional needs with a focus on equitable resources and instruction will certainly put our county on the road to recovering learning loss as well as helping students grow and improve in every aspect of their lives.

Needs Assessment Results

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA REVIEW

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH – *percent of students meeting or exceeding the expectation.*

ELA MCAP DATA GRADES 3-5 2018

	# Tested	# Meeting or Exceeding	% Meeting or Exceeding
Subgroups			
All Students	637	199	31.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	1	50
Asian	8	5	62.5
Black or African American	291	67	23
Hispanic/Latino of any race	75	16	21.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1	100
White	228	100	43.9
Two or More Races	32	9	28.1
SWD	96	8	8.3
LEP	42	2	4.8
FARMS	431	107	24.8

ELA MCAP DATA GRADES 6-8 2018

	Tested Count	# Meeting or Exceeding	% Meeting or Exceeding
Subgroups			
All Students	618	200	32.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0
Asian	6	2	33
Black or African American	276	58	21
Hispanic/Latino of any race	50	15	30
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	1	50
White	250	115	46
Two or More Races	34	9	26.5
SWD	95	8	8.4
LEP	12	0	0
FARMS	408	118	28.9

MATH MCAP DATA GRADES 3-5 2018

	Tested Count	# Meeting or Exceeding	% Meeting or Exceeding
Subgroups			
All Students	638	151	23.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	1	50
Asian	8	5	62.5
Black or African American	293	44	15
Hispanic/Latino of any race	75	16	21.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0	0
White	227	82	36.1
Two or More Races	32	3	9.4
SWD	96	1	1
LEP	44	6	13.6
FARMS	430	69	16

MATH MCAP DATA GRADES 6-8 2018

	Tested Count	# Meeting or Exceeding	% Meeting or Exceeding
Subgroups			
All Students	618	108	17.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0
Asian	6	2	33.3
Black or African American	276	25	9.1
Hispanic/Latino of any race	50	9	18
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	1	50
White	250	67	26.8
Two or More Races	34	4	11.8
SWD	95	4	4.2
LEP	12	3	25
FARMS	408	58	14.2

WIDA ACCESS GROWTH TO TARGET DATA 2017 - 2018

WIDA ACCESS	2017 and 2018	GROWTH TO TARGET			33	
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Total		
met	7	8	6	21	64%	
not met	3	4	5	12	36%	
	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total	17	
met	8	1	3	12	71%	
not met	1	4	0	5	29%	
	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Total	7
met	2	3	0	0	5	71%
not met	0	1	1	0	2	29%

GRADUATION RATE – percent of students successfully earning a Maryland High School Diploma in four years and five years.

2017-18 GRADUATION RATES, 4 YEAR COHORT

Subgroup	Begin Count	Graduation Rate
All Students	184	84.53
Asian	3	100
Black or African	71	86.57
Hispanic/Latino of any race	15	85.71
White	78	82.05
Two or more races	17	84.21
SWD	20	68.42
LEP	2	1
FARMS	101	77.42

READINESS FOR POSTSECONDARY SUCCESS – percent of 9th graders earning four credits in core academic courses and World Language.

2017-18 On Track in 9th Grade Summary by Content

Content	Student Count 9 th Grade	On Track #	On Track %
Science	237	177	74.6
Social Studies	237	157	66.2
ELA	237	156	65.8
Math	237	158	66.6

EQUITABLE ACCESS-

Academic Achievement Elementary Grades 3-5

Student Population	Points Earned out of Points Possible	Achievement Gap
All Students	8.3 out of 20	
Asian		
Black or African	6.8 out of 20	-6.7%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	7.1 out of 20	5.3%
White	10.6 out of 20	4.7%
Two or More Races	7.3 out of 20	-13.3%
SWD	4.9 out of 20	-11.3%
LEP	6 out of 20	10%
FARMS	6.9 out of 20	-9.3%

Academic Achievement Middle School Grades 6-8

Student Population	Points Earned out of Points Possible	Achievement Gap
All Students	8 out of 20	
Asian		
Black or African	6.5 out of 20	-4.9%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	8 out of 20	13%
White	9.7 out of 20	3.5%
Two or More Races	6.9 out of 20	-12.5%
SWD	5.5 out of 20	-20%
LEP	5.6 out of 20	19.2%
FARMS	7.3 out of 20	-7.8%

Academic Achievement High School Grades 9-12

Student Population	Points Earned out of Points Possible	Achievement Gap
All Students	15.2 out of 30	
Asian		
Black or African	11.3 out of 30	-4.7%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	17.9 out of 30	19.4%
White	17.4 out of 30	-1.6%
Two or More Races	17 out of 30	5.6%
SWD	7.5 out of 30	-29.3%
LEP	n/a	
FARMS	14.1 out of 30	-5.6%

SCHOOL QUALITY AND STUDENT SUCCESS – *percent of students who are not chronically absent, and who are enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum.*

2017-18 Attendance Report

Subgroup	Chronically Absent #	Chronically Absent Denominator	Chronically Absent %	Attendance Rate %
Elementary 3-5	293	1414	20.7	94.2
Middle 6-8	202	697	29	92.2
High 9-12	232	779	29.8	91.4

2017-18 Elementary Access to Well Rounded Curriculum (Students enrolled in each of the following: Science, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Physical Education, Health)

Content	Student Count 5 th Grade	Access #	Access %
Science	218	218	100
Social Studies	218	218	100
Fine Arts	218	217	99.5
Physical Education	218	217	99.5
Health	218	217	99.5

2017-18 Elementary Credit for Well Rounded Curriculum (Students passing one of each of the following: Science, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Physical Education, Health)

Content	Student Count 5 th Grade	Credit For #	Credit For %
Science	218	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	218	193	88.5
Fine Arts	218	192	88
Physical Education	218	192	88
Health	218	192	88

2017-18 Middle School Access to Well Rounded Curriculum (Students enrolled in each of the following: Fine Arts, Physical Education, Health, Computational Thinking)

Content	Student Count 8 th Grade	Access #	Access %
Fine Arts	251	236	94
Physical Education	251	230	91.6
Health	251	223	88.8
Computational Thinking	251	206	82

2017-18 Middle School Credit for Well Rounded Curriculum (Students passing one of each of the following: Science, Social Studies, ELA, Math)

Content	Student Count 8 th Grade	Credit for #	Credit For %
Science	251	193	76.8
Social Studies	251	208	82.8
ELA	251	201	80
Math	251	190	75.6

2017-18 High School Access to Well Rounded Curriculum

Content	Access #	Access %
Dual Enrollment-students earning credit	27/29	93%
AP- students scoring 3 or better out of total participations	16/59	27%
CTE Concentrator	56/91	62%
Total Students Receiving Access to Well Rounded Curriculum using #s enrolled above	99/179	55%

MEAN RIT Score Math and **Reading**

	Ethnicity	Spring 2019	Spring 2021	Loss
2nd	African American	190.8 184.1	176.5 171.9	-14.3 -12.2
	Hispanic	192.2 186.1	180.5 170.6	-11.7 -15.5
	White	197.0 ??	180.9 194.6	-16.1
3rd	African American	194.1 188.5	190.6 183.8	-3.5 -4.7
	Hispanic	198.2 190.4	191.7 187.9	-6.5 -2.5
	White	199.9 195.3	196.8 195.3	-3.1 0
4th	African American	196.1 193.1	195.7 192.8	-.4 -.3
	Hispanic	201.7 200.0	201.3 199.7	-.4 -.3
	White	207.7 204.5	205.4 206.0	-2.3 +1.5
5th	African American	207.8 201.5	203.8 199.7	-4 -1.8
	Hispanic	199.7 206.6	204.9 202.6	+5.2 -4
	White	221.0 213.7	211.6 207.7	-9.4 -6
	Ethnicity	Spring 2019	Spring 2021	Loss
6th	African American	210.7	204.4	-6.3
	Hispanic	212.5	201.7	-10.8
	White	211.8	214.4	+2.6

7th	African American	209.8	210.8	+1.0
	Hispanic	214.9	207.6	-7.3
	White	219.1	220.6	-1.5
8th	African American	214.2	213.6	-0.6
	Hispanic	219.8	211.1	-8.7
	White	216.2	217.7	+1.5

LECS NEEDS ASSESSMENT ATTENDANCE DATA TRENDS 21-22

STUDENT POPULATION	18-19	19-20	20-21
All Students	92	92.5	93.4
Male	91.8	92.2	92.7
Female	92.1	92.7	94.1
EL	95.7	95.9	94.9
SWD	89.7	90.2	92.1
504	90.6	89.4	91.1
Migrant	89.1	92	77.4
Homeless	86.5	85.7	85.2
Two or more races	91.1	91.3	93.2
Grade 7	90	92.2	89.5
Grade 9	90.9	90	93.0

KEY

Color	Meaning
	Does not meet state criteria of 94% over the last three years
	Does not meet state criteria of 94% over the last three years and declined last year when multiple measures were used to count attendance (most populations increased)
	Meets or exceeds the state's 94% threshold

GRADE 6 ALEKS DATA

Math Grade 6	Modules 1 & 3												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (177/177)	42 %	No (37/37)	37 %	No (36/36)	44 %	No (10/10)	29 %	No (43/43)	43 %	No (27/27)	51 %	No (12/12)	32 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (4/177)	51 %												
African American (80/177)	40 %	African American (37/37)	37 %					African American (43/43)	43 %				
Hispanic (22/177)	30 %					Hispanic (10/10)	29 %					Hispanic (12/12)	32 %
Multi- Racial (8/177)	51 %												
Caucasian (63/177)	47 %			Caucasian (36/36)	44 %					Caucasian (27/27)	51 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
Female (85/177)	44 %							Female (43/43)	43 %	Female (27/27)	51 %	Female (12/12)	32 %
Male (92/177)	40 %	Male (37/37)	37 %	Male (36/36)	44 %	Male (10/10)	29 %						
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (140/177)	38 %	No (35/37)	36 %	No (23/36)	33 %	No (7/10)	26 %	No (37/43)	41 %	No (18/27)	48 %	No (12/12)	32 %
Yes (37/177)	57 %	Yes (2/37)	60 %	Yes (13/36)	64 %	Yes (3/10)	38 %	Yes (6/43)	56 %	Yes (9/27)	56 %		

<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>	
No (171/177)	42 %	No (37/37)	37 %	No (36/36)	44 %	No (8/10)	28 %	No (43/43)	43 %	No (27/27)	51 %	No (9/12)	31 %
Yes (6/177)	32 %					Yes (2/10)	32 %					Yes (3/12)	35 %
ELL (6/6)	32 %					ELL (2/2)	32 %					ELL (3/3)	35 %
<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>	
No (177/177)	42 %	No (37/37)	37 %	No (36/36)	44 %	No (10/10)	29 %	No (43/43)	43 %	No (27/27)	51 %	No (12/12)	32 %
<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>	
No (137/177)	44 %	No (23/37)	43 %	No (28/36)	44 %	No (8/10)	30 %	No (34/43)	44 %	No (26/27)	51 %	No (10/12)	36 %
Yes (40/177)	36 %	Yes (14/37)	29 %	Yes (8/36)	43 %	Yes (2/10)	25 %	Yes (9/43)	41 %	Yes (1/27)	40 %	Yes (2/12)	13 %
Not Available (40/40)	36 %	Not Available (14/14)	29 %	Not Available (8/8)	43 %	Not Available (2/2)	25 %	Not Available (9/9)	41 %	Not Available (1/1)	40 %	Not Available (2/2)	13 %
Math Grade 6	Modules 1, 2 & 3												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (165/165)	43 %	No (32/32)	36 %	No (37/37)	48 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (39/39)	42 %	No (27/27)	48 %	No (11/11)	30 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (4/165)	66 %					Hispanic (8/8)	40 %						
African America	39 %	African America	36 %					African America	42 %			Hispanic	30 %

n (71/165)		an (32/32)						an (39/39)				(11/11)	
Hispani c (19/165)	34 %												
Multi- Racial (7/165)	48 %												
Caucasi an (64/165)	48 %			Caucas ian (37/37)	48 %					Caucas ian (27/27)	48 %		
Gender		Gende r		Gender		Gende r		Gende r		Gender		Gende r	
Female (80/165)	43 %							Femal e (39/39)	42 %	Female (27/27)	48 %	Femal e (11/11)	30 %
Male (85/165)	43 %	Male (32/32)	36 %	Male (37/37)	48 %	Male (8/8)	40 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (127/165)	38 %	No (30/32)	34 %	No (23/37)	37 %	No (6/8)	38 %	No (33/39)	39 %	No (18/27)	44 %	No (11/11)	30 %
Yes (38/165)	60 %	Yes (2/32)	76 %	Yes (14/37)	68 %	Yes (2/8)	45 %	Yes (6/39)	54 %	Yes (9/27)	57 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (159/165)	43 %	No (32/32)	36 %	No (37/37)	48 %	No (6/8)	38 %	No (39/39)	42 %	No (27/27)	48 %	No (8/11)	30 %
Yes (6/165)	39 %					Yes (2/8)	44 %					Yes (3/11)	29 %
ELL (6/6)	39 %					ELL (2/2)	44 %					ELL (3/3)	29 %
Migrant		Migran t		Migrant		Migra nt		Migran t		Migrant		Migra nt	
No (165/165)	43 %	No (32/32)	36 %	No (37/37)	48 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (39/39)	42 %	No (27/27)	48 %	No (11/11)	30 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (132/165)	46 %	No (20/32)	43 %	No (29/37)	50 %	No (6/8)	41 %	No (34/39)	41 %	No (26/27)	48 %	No (8/11)	37 %
Yes (33/165)	33 %	Yes (12/32)	25 %	Yes (8/37)	41 %	Yes (2/8)	36 %	Yes (5/39)	46 %	Yes (1/27)	53 %	Yes (3/11)	14 %
Not Availabl e (33/33)	33 %	Not Availab le (12/12)	25 %	Not Availabl e (8/8)	41 %	Not Availa ble (2/2)	36 %	Not Availab le (5/5)	46 %	Not Availabl e (1/1)	53 %	Not Availa ble (3/3)	14 %

Math Grade 6	Modules 4 & 5												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (185/185)	50 %	No (37/37)	41 %	No (41/41)	57 %	No (11/11)	48 %	No (44/44)	48 %	No (27/27)	59 %	No (12/12)	43 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (4/185)	64 %												
African American (81/185)	44 %	African American (37/37)	41 %					African American (44/44)	48 %				
Hispanic (23/185)	46 %					Hispanic (11/11)	48 %					Hispanic (12/12)	43 %
Multi- Racial (9/185)	45 %												
Caucasian (68/185)	58 %			Caucasian (41/41)	57 %					Caucasian (27/27)	59 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
Female (87/185)	51 %					Male (11/11)	48 %	Female (44/44)	48 %	Female (27/27)	59 %	Female (12/12)	43 %
Male (98/185)	49 %	Male (37/37)	41 %	Male (41/41)	57 %								
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (144/185)	45 %	No (35/37)	39 %	No (25/41)	50 %	No (9/11)	43 %	No (38/44)	45 %	No (18/27)	50 %	No (12/12)	43 %

Yes (41/185)	68 %	Yes (2/37)	70 %	Yes (16/41)	69 %	Yes (2/11)	71 %	Yes (6/44)	63 %	Yes (9/27)	78 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (176/185)	51 %	No (37/37)	41 %	No (41/41)	57 %	No (7/11)	55 %	No (44/44)	48 %	No (27/27)	59 %	No (8/12)	49 %
Yes (9/185)	37 %					Yes (4/11)	36 %					Yes (4/12)	33 %
ELL (9/9)	37 %					ELL (4/4)	36 %					ELL (4/4)	33 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (185/185)	50 %	No (37/37)	41 %	No (41/41)	57 %	No (11/11)	48 %	No (44/44)	48 %	No (27/27)	59 %	No (12/12)	43 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (148/185)	53 %	No (24/37)	48 %	No (33/41)	56 %	No (9/11)	49 %	No (38/44)	50 %	No (26/27)	59 %	No (9/12)	46 %
Yes (37/185)	39 %	Yes (13/37)	28 %	Yes (8/41)	59 %	Yes (2/11)	45 %	Yes (6/44)	35 %	Yes (1/27)	61 %	Yes (3/12)	37 %
Not Available (37/37)	39 %	Not Available (13/13)	28 %	Not Available (8/8)	59 %	Not Available (2/2)	45 %	Not Available (6/6)	35 %	Not Available (1/1)	61 %	Not Available (3/3)	37 %
Math Grade 6	Modules 8 & 9												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	
No (184/184)	43 %	No (32/32)	37 %	No (40/40)	50 %	No (13/13)	40 %	No (42/42)	41 %	No (28/28)	46 %	No (13/13)	32 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (5/184)	51 %												

African American (74/184)	39 %	African American (32/32)	37 %					African American (42/42)	41 %				
Hispanic (26/184)	36 %					Hispanic (13/13)	40 %					Hispanic (13/13)	32 %
Multi-Racial (11/184)	42 %												
Caucasian (68/184)	49 %			Caucasian (40/40)	50 %					Caucasian (28/28)	46 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (89/184)	42 %							Female (42/42)	41 %	Female (28/28)	46 %	Female (13/13)	32 %
Male (95/184)	43 %	Male (32/32)	37 %	Male (40/40)	50 %	Male (13/13)	40 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (143/184)	38 %	No (30/32)	36 %	No (24/40)	40 %	No (10/13)	43 %	No (36/42)	39 %	No (19/28)	40 %	No (13/13)	32 %
Yes (41/184)	57 %	Yes (2/32)	63 %	Yes (16/40)	65 %	Yes (3/13)	30 %	Yes (6/42)	52 %	Yes (9/28)	59 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (174/184)	43 %	No (32/32)	37 %	No (40/40)	50 %	No (9/13)	40 %	No (42/42)	41 %	No (28/28)	46 %	No (9/13)	33 %
Yes (10/184)	36 %					Yes (4/13)	40 %					Yes (4/13)	29 %
ELL (10/10)	36 %					ELL (4/4)	40 %					ELL (4/4)	29 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (184/184)	43 %	No (32/32)	37 %	No (40/40)	50 %	No (13/13)	40 %	No (42/42)	41 %	No (28/28)	46 %	No (13/13)	32 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (149/184)	45 %	No (20/32)	42 %	No (33/40)	51 %	No (11/13)	44 %	No (37/42)	42 %	No (27/28)	47 %	No (10/13)	34 %
Yes (35/184)	34 %	Yes (12/32)	30 %	Yes (7/40)	48 %	Yes (2/13)	21 %	Yes (5/42)	38 %	Yes (1/28)	25 %	Yes (3/13)	25 %

Not Available (35/35)	34 %	Not Available (12/12)	30 %	Not Available (7/7)	48 %	Not Available (2/2)	21 %	Not Available (5/5)	38 %	Not Available (1/1)	25 %	Not Available (3/3)	25 %
Math Grade 6	Midterm												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (177/177)	48 %	No (34/34)	41 %	No (40/40)	54 %	No (10/10)	50 %	No (42/42)	42 %	No (26/26)	57 %	No (11/11)	38 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (4/177)	67 %						50 %		42 %				
African American (76/177)	42 %	African American (34/34)	41 %					African American (42/42)					
Hispanic (21/177)	44 %					Hispanic (10/10)	50 %					Hispanic (11/11)	38 %
Multi-Racial (10/177)	48 %												
Caucasian (66/177)	55 %			Caucasian (40/40)	54 %					Caucasian (26/26)	57 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
Female (83/177)	47 %	Male (34/34)	41 %					Female (42/42)	42 %	Female (26/26)	57 %	Female (11/11)	38 %
Male (94/177)	48 %			Male (40/40)	54 %	Male (10/10)	50 %						
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>				<i>Gifted</i>	

No (136/177)	42 %	No (32/34)	39 %	No (24/40)	43 %	No (8/10)	47 %	No (36/42)	39 %	Gifted		No (11/11)	38 %
Yes (41/177)	66 %	Yes (2/34)	65 %	Yes (16/40)	71 %	Yes (2/10)	67 %	Yes (6/42)	63 %	No (17/26)	51 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		Yes (9/26)	68 %	LEP	
No (169/177)	48 %	No (34/34)	41 %	No (40/40)	54 %	No (6/10)	57 %	No (42/42)	42 %	LEP		No (8/11)	45 %
Yes (8/177)	37 %					Yes (4/10)	40 %			No (26/26)	57 %	Yes (3/11)	20 %
ELL (8/8)	37 %					ELL (4/4)	40 %					ELL (3/3)	20 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (177/177)	48 %	No (34/34)	41 %	No (40/40)	54 %	No (10/10)	50 %	No (42/42)	42 %	No (26/26)	57 %	No (11/11)	38 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (141/177)	52 %	No (23/34)	48 %	No (32/40)	56 %	No (8/10)	54 %	No (35/42)	47 %	No (25/26)	56 %	No (9/11)	39 %
Yes (36/177)	33 %	Yes (11/34)	27 %	Yes (8/40)	48 %	Yes (2/10)	39 %	Yes (7/42)	19 %	Yes (1/26)	76 %	Yes (2/11)	33 %
Not Available (36/36)	33 %	Not Available (11/11)	27 %	Not Available (8/8)	48 %	Not Available (2/2)	39 %	Not Available (7/7)	19 %	Not Available (1/1)	76 %	Not Available (2/2)	33 %
Math Grade 6	Final Exam												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	
No (184/184)	39 %	No (34/34)	33 %	No (42/42)	44 %	No (13/13)	32 %	No (41/41)	38 %	No (27/27)	46 %	No (12/12)	32 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	

Asian (5/184)	54 %												
African American (75/184)	36 %	African American (34/34)	33 %					African American (41/41)	38 %				
Hispanic (25/184)	32 %					Hispanic (13/13)	32 %					Hispanic (12/12)	32 %
Multi- Racial (10/184)	34 %												
Caucasian (69/184)	45 %			Caucasian (42/42)	44 %					Caucasian (27/27)	46 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (86/184)	39 %		33 %		44 %			Female (41/41)	38 %	Female (27/27)	46 %	Female (12/12)	32 %
Male (98/184)	39 %	Male (34/34)		Male (42/42)		Male (13/13)	32 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (145/184)	34 %	No (32/34)	30 %	No (27/42)	34 %	No (10/13)	24 %	No (35/41)	35 %	No (18/27)	40 %	No (12/12)	32 %
Yes (39/184)	57 %	Yes (2/34)	69 %	Yes (15/42)	61 %	Yes (3/13)	52 %	Yes (6/41)	51 %	Yes (9/27)	57 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (174/184)	40 %	No (34/34)	33 %	No (42/42)	44 %	No (9/13)	34 %	No (41/41)	38 %	No (27/27)	46 %	No (8/12)	39 %
Yes (10/184)	22 %					Yes (4/13)	26 %					Yes (4/12)	18 %
ELL (10/10)	22 %					ELL (4/4)	26 %					ELL (4/4)	18 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (184/184)	39 %	No (34/34)	33 %	No (42/42)	44 %	No (13/13)	32 %	No (41/41)	38 %	No (27/27)	46 %	No (12/12)	32 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (149/184)	41 %	No (22/34)	37 %	No (35/42)	46 %	No (11/13)	31 %	No (36/41)	39 %	No (26/27)	47 %	No (9/12)	34 %

Yes (35/184)	29 %	Yes (12/34)	26 %	Yes (7/42)	37 %	Yes (2/13)	36 %	Yes (5/41)	31 %	Yes (1/27)	12 %	Yes (3/12)	27 %
Not Availabl e (35/35)	29 %	Not Availab le (12/12)	26 %	Not Availabl e (7/7)	37 %	Not Availa ble (2/2)	36 %	Not Availab le (5/5)	31 %	Not Availabl e (1/1)	12 %	Not Availa ble (3/3)	27 %

GRADE 7 ALEKS DATA

Math Grade 7	Modules 1 & 2												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (152/152)	50 %	No (36/36)	43 %	No (23/23)	55 %	No (5/5)	51 %	No (36/36)	42 %	No (28/28)	70 %	No (10/10)	46 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (1/152)	15 %												
African American (72/152)	42 %	African American (36/36)	43 %					African American (36/36)	42 %				
Hispanic (15/152)	48 %					Hispanic (5/5)	51 %					Hispanic (10/10)	46 %
Multi-Racial (13/152)	45 %												
Caucasian (51/152)	63 %			Caucasian (23/23)	55 %	<i>Gender</i>				Caucasian (28/28)	70 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>				<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
Female (81/152)	52 %							Female (36/36)	42 %	Female (28/28)	70 %	Female (10/10)	46 %
Male (71/152)	48 %	Male (36/36)	43 %	Male (23/23)	55 %	Male (5/5)	51 %						
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (115/152)	43 %	No (27/36)	38 %	No (17/23)	48 %	No (5/5)	51 %	No (32/36)	38 %	No (12/28)	58 %	No (8/10)	46 %
Yes (37/152)	71 %	Yes (9/36)	58 %	Yes (6/23)	76 %			Yes (4/36)	71 %	Yes (16/28)	78 %	Yes (2/10)	45 %

LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (145/152)	51 %	No (36/36)	43 %	No (23/23)	55 %	No (3/5)	55 %	No (34/36)	42 %	No (28/28)	70 %	No (8/10)	53 %
Yes (7/152)	29 %					Yes (2/5)	45 %	Yes (2/36)	33 %			Yes (2/10)	19 %
ELL (7/7)	29 %					ELL (2/2)	45 %	ELL (2/2)	33 %			ELL (2/2)	19 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (152/152)	50 %	No (36/36)	43 %	No (23/23)		No (5/5)	51 %	No (36/36)	42 %	No (28/28)	70 %	No (10/10)	46 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (134/152)	53 %	No (27/36)	48 %	No (20/23)	60 %	No (4/5)	53 %	No (34/36)	44 %	No (27/28)	69 %	No (10/10)	46 %
Yes (18/152)	31 %	Yes (9/36)	30 %	Yes (3/23)	23 %	Yes (1/5)	46 %	Yes (2/36)	8%	Yes (1/28)	77 %		
Not Available (18/18)	31 %	Not Available (9/9)	30 %	Not Available (3/3)	23 %	Not Available (1/1)	46 %	Not Available (2/2)	8%	Not Available (1/1)	77 %		
Math Grade 7	Modules 3 & 4												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	
No (131/131)	48 %	No (30/30)	36 %	No (20/20)	54 %	No (5/5)	43 %	No (29/29)	51 %	No (29/29)	61 %	No (7/7)	36 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (1/131)	53 %												
African American (59/131)	43 %	African American (30/30)	36 %					African American (29/29)	51 %				

Hispanic (12/131)	39 %					Hispanic (5/5)	43 %					Hispanic (7/7)	36 %
Multi-Racial (10/131)	41 %												
Caucasian (49/131)	58 %			Caucasian (20/20)	54 %					Caucasian (29/29)	61 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (71/131)	53 %							Female (29/29)	51 %	Female (29/29)	61 %	Female (7/7)	36 %
Male (60/131)	43 %	Male (30/30)	36 %	Male (20/20)	54 %	Male (5/5)	43 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (98/131)	41 %	No (23/30)	30 %	No (15/20)	48 %	No (5/5)	43 %	No (25/29)	48 %	No (14/29)	43 %	No (5/7)	30 %
Yes (33/131)	70 %	Yes (7/30)	57 %	Yes (5/20)	72 %			Yes (4/29)	70 %	Yes (15/29)	78 %	Yes (2/7)	53 %
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (127/131)	48 %	No (30/30)	36 %	No (20/20)	54 %	No (4/5)	45 %	No (27/29)	49 %	No (29/29)	61 %	No (7/7)	36 %
Yes (4/131)	61 %					Yes (1/5)	33 %	Yes (2/29)	78 %				
ELL (4/4)	61 %					ELL (1/1)	33 %	ELL (2/2)	78 %				
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (131/131)	48 %	No (30/30)	36 %	No (20/20)	54 %	No (5/5)	43 %	No (29/29)	51 %	No (29/29)	61 %	No (7/7)	36 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (117/131)	51 %	No (22/30)	43 %	No (19/20)	54 %	No (4/5)	47 %	No (28/29)	53 %	No (28/29)	61 %	No (7/7)	36 %
Yes (14/131)	29 %	Yes (8/30)	21 %	Yes (1/20)	50 %	Yes (1/5)	27 %	Yes (1/29)	17 %	Yes (1/29)	67 %		
Not Available (14/14)	29 %	Not Available (8/8)	21 %	Not Available (1/1)	50 %	Not Available (1/1)	27 %	Not Available (1/1)	17 %	Not Available (1/1)	67 %		

Math Grade 7	Modules 5 & 6												
Total Popul ation	Tot al Sc ore	Afric an Amer ican Male s	Tot al Sc ore	Cauca sian Males	Tot al Sc ore	Hisp anic Male	Tot al Sc ore	Afric an Amer ican Fema le	Tot al Sc ore	Cauca sian Femal e	Tot al Sc ore	Hisp anic Fem ale	Tot al Sc ore
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>				<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (121/121)	53 %	No (28/28)	46 %	No (17/17)	56 %			No (26/26)	49 %	No (28/28)	68 %	No (7/7)	58 %
<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>				<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnici ty</i>	
Asian (1/121)	45 %												
African America n (54/121)	47 %	African America n (28/28)	46 %					African America n (26/26)	49 %				
Hispani c (11/121)	50 %											Hispa nic (7/7)	58 %
Multi- Racial (10/121)	38 %												
Caucasi an (45/121)	63 %			Caucas ian (17/17)	56 %					Caucas ian (28/28)	68 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gender</i>				<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>	
Female (66/121)	59 %							Femal e (26/26)	49 %	Female (28/28)	68 %	Femal e (7/7)	58 %
Male (55/121)	46 %	Male (28/28)	46 %	Male (17/17)	56 %								
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>				<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (93/121)	47 %	No (22/28)	43 %	No (14/17)	52 %			No (24/26)	46 %	No (13/28)	58 %	No (5/7)	56 %
Yes (28/121)	72 %	Yes (6/28)	57 %	Yes (3/17)	71 %			Yes (2/26)	85 %	Yes (15/28)	78 %	Yes (2/7)	65 %
<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>				<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>	
No (117/121)	53 %	No (28/28)	46 %	No (17/17)	56 %			No (24/26)	49 %	No (28/28)	68 %	No (7/7)	58 %

Yes (4/121)	45 %							Yes (2/26)	50 %				
ELL (4/4)	45 %							ELL (2/2)	50 %				
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant				Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (121/121)	53 %	No (28/28)	46 %	No (17/17)	56 %			No (26/26)	49 %	No (28/28)	68 %	No (7/7)	58 %
SWD		SWD		SWD				SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (106/121)	57 %	No (22/28)	53 %	No (15/17)	56 %			No (23/26)	55 %	No (27/28)	69 %	No (7/7)	58 %
Yes (15/121)	29 %	Yes (6/28)	23 %	Yes (2/17)	58 %			Yes (3/26)	9%	Yes (1/28)	58 %		
Not Available (15/15)	29 %	Not Available (6/6)	23 %	Not Available (2/2)	58 %			Not Available (3/3)	9%	Not Available (1/1)	58 %		
Math Grade 7	2 Step Equation Pretest												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	
No (134/134)	24 %	No (31/31)	17 %	No (21/21)	28 %	No (5/5)	24 %	No (32/32)	25 %	No (26/26)	33 %	No (7/7)	18 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (1/134)	5%												
African American (63/134)	21 %	African American (31/31)	17 %					African American (32/32)	25 %				
Hispanic (12/134)	21 %					Hispanic (5/5)	24 %					Hispanic (7/7)	18 %

Multi-Racial (11/134)	18 %												
Caucasian (47/134)	31 %			Caucasian (21/21)	28 %					Caucasian (26/26)	33 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender				Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (71/134)	27 %							Female (32/32)	25 %	Female (26/26)	33 %	Female (7/7)	18 %
Male (63/134)	20 %	Male (31/31)	17 %	Male (21/21)	28 %								
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (103/134)	20 %	No (25/31)	16 %	No (16/21)	21 %	No (5/5)	24 %	No (29/32)	25 %	No (11/26)	20 %	No (5/7)	21 %
Yes (31/134)	36 %	Yes (6/31)	22 %	Yes (5/21)	52 %			Yes (3/32)	20 %	Yes (15/26)	42 %	Yes (2/7)	12 %
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (128/134)	24 %	No (31/31)	17 %	No (21/21)	28 %	No (3/5)	8%	No (30/32)	24 %	No (26/26)	33 %	No (6/7)	19 %
Yes (6/134)	28 %					Yes (2/5)	48 %	Yes (2/32)	28 %			Yes (1/7)	10 %
ELL (6/6)	28 %					ELL (2/2)	48 %	ELL (2/2)	28 %			ELL (1/1)	10 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (134/134)	24 %	No (31/31)	17 %	No (21/21)	28 %	No (5/5)	24 %	No (32/32)	25 %	No (26/26)	33 %	No (7/7)	18 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (118/134)	26 %	No (23/31)	20 %	No (19/21)	27 %	No (4/5)	29 %	No (30/32)	26 %	No (25/26)	34 %	No (7/7)	18 %
Yes (16/134)	12 %	Yes (8/31)	12 %	Yes (2/21)	35 %	Yes (1/5)	5%	Yes (2/32)	2%	Yes (1/26)	14 %		
Not Available (16/16)	12 %	Not Available (8/8)	12 %	Not Available (2/2)	35 %	Not Available (1/1)	5%	Not Available (2/2)	2%	Not Available (1/1)	14 %		

Math Grade 7	2 Step Equation Posttest												
Total Popul ation	Tot al Sc ore	Afric an Amer ican Male s	Tot al Sc ore	Cauca sian Males	Tot al Sc ore	Hisp anic Male	Tot al Sc ore	Afric an Amer ican Fema le	Tot al Sc ore	Cauca sian Femal e	Tot al Sc ore	Hisp anic Fem ale	Tot al Sc ore
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (138/138)	74 %	No (32/32)	61 %	No (17/17)	82 %	No (5/5)	70 %	No (32/32)	72 %	No (29/29)	89 %	No (9/9)	77 %
<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnici ty</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnici ty</i>	
Asian (1/138)	71 %												
African America n (64/138)	66 %	African America n (32/32)	61 %					African America n (32/32)	72 %				
Hispani c (14/138)	74 %					Hispani c (5/5)	70 %					Hispani c (9/9)	77 %
Multi- Racial (13/138)	71 %												
Caucasi an (46/138)	87 %			Caucas ian (17/17)	82 %					Caucas ian (29/29)	89 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>	
Female (76/138)	79 %							Femal e (32/32)	72 %	Female (29/29)	89 %	Femal e (9/9)	77 %
Male (62/138)	69 %	Male (32/32)	61 %	Male (17/17)	82 %	Male (5/5)	70 %						
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (106/138)	72 %	No (25/32)	60 %	No (12/17)	80 %	No (5/5)	70 %	No (29/32)	70 %	No (14/29)	88 %	No (7/9)	73 %
Yes (32/138)	84 %	Yes (7/32)	65 %	Yes (5/17)	89 %			Yes (3/32)	87 %	Yes (15/29)	90 %	Yes (2/9)	91 %
<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>	
No (131/138)	75 %	No (32/32)	61 %	No (17/17)	82 %	No (3/5)	68 %	No (30/32)	71 %	No (29/29)	89 %	No (7/9)	79 %

Yes (7/138)	73 %					Yes (2/5)	73 %	Yes (2/32)	79 %			Yes (2/9)	66 %
ELL (7/7)	73 %					ELL (2/2)	73 %	ELL (2/2)	79 %			ELL (2/2)	66 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (138/138)	74 %	No (32/32)	61 %	No (17/17)	82 %	No (5/5)	70 %	No (32/32)	72 %	No (29/29)	89 %	No (9/9)	77 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (125/138)	77 %	No (25/32)	68 %	No (16/17)	82 %	No (4/5)	71 %	No (31/32)	74 %	No (28/29)	89 %	No (9/9)	77 %
Yes (13/138)	52 %	Yes (7/32)	37 %	Yes (1/17)	95 %	Yes (1/5)	67 %	Yes (1/32)	0%	Yes (1/29)	86 %		
Not Available (13/13)	52 %	Not Available (7/7)	37 %	Not Available (1/1)	95 %	Not Available (1/1)	67 %	Not Available (1/1)	0%	Not Available (1/1)	86 %		

GRADE 8 ALEKS DATA

Math Grade 8	Module 2												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	
No (103/103)	48 %	No (23/23)	37 %	No (18/18)	50 %	No (8/8)	50 %	No (31/31)	48 %	No (10/10)	45 %	No (7/7)	59 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (2/103)	80 %												
African American (54/103)	44 %	African American (23/23)	37 %					African American (31/31)	48 %				
Hispanic (15/103)	54 %					Hispanic (8/8)	50 %					Hispanic (7/7)	59 %
Multi-Racial (4/103)	51 %												
Caucasian (28/103)	48 %			Caucasian (18/18)	50 %					Caucasian (10/10)	45 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (53/103)	50 %							Female (31/31)	48 %	Female (10/10)	45 %	Female (7/7)	59 %
Male (50/103)	45 %	Male (23/23)	37 %	Male (18/18)	50 %	Male (8/8)	50 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (96/103)	47 %	No (23/23)	37 %	No (17/18)	49 %	No (6/8)	51 %	No (29/31)	47 %	No (8/10)	39 %	No (7/7)	59 %
Yes (7/103)	60 %			Yes (1/18)	67 %	Yes (2/8)	45 %	Yes (2/31)	61 %	Yes (2/10)	75 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	

No (97/103)	47 %	No (23/23)	37 %	No (18/18)	50 %	No (4/8)	45 %	No (31/31)	48 %	No (10/10)	45 %	No (6/7)	55 %
Yes (6/103)	62 %					Yes (4/8)	54 %					Yes (1/7)	81 %
ELL (6/6)	62 %					ELL (4/4)	54 %					ELL (1/1)	81 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (103/103)	48 %	No (23/23)	37 %	No (18/18)	50 %	No (8/8)	50 %	No (31/31)	48 %	No (10/10)	45 %	No (7/7)	59 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (84/103)	50 %	No (17/23)	39 %	No (13/18)	50 %	No (8/8)	50 %	No (25/31)	52 %	No (9/10)	47 %	No (7/7)	59 %
Yes (19/103)	37 %	Yes (6/23)	33 %	Yes (5/18)	51 %			Yes (6/31)	34 %	Yes (1/10)	19 %		
Not Available (19/19)	37 %	Not Available (6/6)	33 %	Not Available (5/5)	51 %			Not Available (6/6)	34 %	Not Available (1/1)	19 %		
Math Grade 8	Module 3												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED				ED		ED		ED	
No (94/94)	35 %	No (20/20)	30 %	No (13/13)	52 %			No (31/31)	36 %	No (13/13)	24 %	No (7/7)	35 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity				Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (2/94)	65 %												
African American (51/94)	33 %	African American (20/20)	30 %					African American (31/31)	36 %				
Hispanic (13/94)	31 %											Hispanic (7/7)	35 %

Multi-Racial (2/94)	40 %												
Caucasian (26/94)	39 %			Caucasian (13/13)	52 %					Caucasian (13/13)	24 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender				Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (54/94)	32 %							Female (31/31)	36 %	Female (13/13)	24 %	Female (7/7)	35 %
Male (40/94)	40 %	Male (20/20)	30 %	Male (13/13)	52 %								
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted				Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (89/94)	35 %	No (20/20)	30 %	No (13/13)	52 %			No (29/31)	35 %	No (10/13)	23 %	No (7/7)	35 %
Yes (5/94)	41 %							Yes (2/31)	48 %	Yes (3/13)	33 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP				LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (89/94)	35 %	No (20/20)	30 %	No (13/13)	52 %			No (31/31)	36 %	No (13/13)	24 %	No (5/7)	29 %
Yes (5/94)	40 %											Yes (2/7)	50 %
ELL (5/5)	40 %											ELL (2/2)	50 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant				Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (94/94)	35 %	No (20/20)	30 %	No (13/13)	52 %			No (31/31)	36 %	No (13/13)	24 %	No (7/7)	35 %
SWD		SWD		SWD				SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (80/94)	35 %	No (17/20)	29 %	No (10/13)	46 %			No (25/31)	39 %	No (11/13)	26 %	No (7/7)	35 %
Yes (14/94)	36 %	Yes (3/20)	34 %	Yes (3/13)	70 %			Yes (6/31)	26 %	Yes (2/13)	10 %		
Not Available (14/14)	36 %	Not Available (3/3)	34 %	Not Available (3/3)	70 %			Not Available (6/6)	26 %	Not Available (2/2)	10 %		
Math Grade 8	Module 5												

Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	
No (82/82)	39 %	No (16/16)	29 %	No (13/13)	52 %	No (9/9)	36 %	No (27/27)	41 %	No (9/9)	33 %	No (6/6)	34 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (1/82)	81 %												
African American (43/82)	37 %	African American (16/16)	29 %					African American (27/27)	41 %				
Hispanic (15/82)	35 %					Hispanic (9/9)	36 %					Hispanic (6/6)	34 %
Multi-Racial (1/82)	39 %												
Caucasian (22/82)	45 %			Caucasian (13/13)	52 %					Caucasian (9/9)	33 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (43/82)	38 %							Female (27/27)	41 %	Female (9/9)	33 %	Female (6/6)	34 %
Male (39/82)	41 %	Male (16/16)	29 %	Male (13/13)	52 %	Male (9/9)	36 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (75/82)	39 %	No (15/16)	27 %	No (13/13)	52 %	No (7/9)	33 %	No (25/27)	43 %	No (7/9)	27 %	No (6/6)	34 %
Yes (7/82)	42 %	Yes (1/16)	43 %			Yes (2/9)	45 %	Yes (2/27)	26 %	Yes (2/9)	57 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (77/82)	40 %	No (16/16)	29 %	No (13/13)	52 %	No (5/9)	38 %	No (27/27)	41 %	No (9/9)	33 %	No (5/6)	38 %
Yes (5/82)	29 %					Yes (4/9)	33 %					Yes (1/6)	16 %
ELL (5/5)	29 %					ELL (4/4)	33 %					ELL (1/1)	16 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	

No (82/82)	39 %	No (16/16)	29 %	No (13/13)	52 %	No (9/9)	36 %	No (27/27)	41 %	No (9/9)	33 %	No (6/6)	34 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (67/82)	39 %	No (13/16)	30 %	No (10/13)	46 %	No (9/9)	36 %	No (21/27)	43 %	No (7/9)	37 %	No (6/6)	34 %
Yes (15/82)	40 %	Yes (3/16)	25 %	Yes (3/13)	73 %			Yes (6/27)	36 %	Yes (2/9)	16 %		
Not Available (15/15)	40 %	Not Available (3/3)	25 %	Not Available (3/3)	73 %			Not Available (6/6)	36 %	Not Available (2/2)	16 %		
Math Grade 8	Module 6												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (103/103)	36 %	No (15/15)	27 %	No (17/17)	39 %	No (8/8)	32 %	No (32/32)	41 %	No (16/16)	28 %	No (9/9)	41 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (1/103)	70 %												
African American (47/103)	36 %	African American (15/15)	27 %					African American (32/32)	41 %				
Hispanic (17/103)	37 %					Hispanic (8/8)	32 %					Hispanic (9/9)	41 %
Multi-Racial (5/103)	41 %												
Caucasian (33/103)	34 %			Caucasian (17/17)	39 %					Caucasian (16/16)	28 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>	

Female (61/103)	37 %							Female (32/32)	41 %	Female (16/16)	28 %	Female (9/9)	41 %
Male (42/103)	35 %	Male (15/15)	27 %	Male (17/17)	39 %	Male (8/8)	32 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (95/103)	35 %	No (15/15)	27 %	No (16/17)	37 %	No (7/8)	36 %	No (30/32)	42 %	No (12/16)	16 %	No (9/9)	41 %
Yes (8/103)	49 %			Yes (1/17)	91 %	Yes (1/8)	15 %	Yes (2/32)	27 %	Yes (4/16)	73 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (98/103)	36 %	No (15/15)	27 %	No (17/17)	39 %	No (5/8)	24 %	No (32/32)	41 %	No (16/16)	28 %	No (7/9)	47 %
Yes (5/103)	37 %					Yes (3/8)	45 %					Yes (2/9)	28 %
ELL (5/5)	37 %					ELL (3/3)	45 %					ELL (2/2)	28 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (103/103)	36 %	No (15/15)	27 %	No (17/17)	39 %	No (8/8)	32 %	No (32/32)	41 %	No (16/16)	28 %	No (9/9)	41 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (86/103)	36 %	No (11/15)	23 %	No (14/17)	31 %	No (8/8)	32 %	No (25/32)	47 %	No (14/16)	28 %	No (9/9)	41 %
Yes (17/103)	39 %	Yes (4/15)	43 %	Yes (3/17)	71 %			Yes (7/32)	24 %	Yes (2/16)	23 %		
Not Available (17/17)	39 %	Not Available (4/4)	43 %	Not Available (3/3)	71 %			Not Available (7/7)	24 %	Not Available (2/2)	23 %		
Math Grade 8	Module 7												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	

No (86/86)	34 %	No (15/15)	22 %	No (16/16)	45 %	No (8/8)	31 %	No (23/23)	35 %	No (14/14)	34 %	No (5/5)	35 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (1/86)	85 %												
African American (38/86)	30 %	African American (15/15)	22 %					African American (23/23)	35 %				
Hispanic (13/86)	32 %					Hispanic (8/8)	31 %					Hispanic (5/5)	35 %
Multi-Racial (4/86)	15 %												
Caucasian (30/86)	40 %			Caucasian (16/16)	45 %					Caucasian (14/14)	34 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (46/86)	33 %					Male (8/8)	31 %	Female (23/23)	35 %	Female (14/14)	34 %	Female (5/5)	35 %
Male (40/86)	35 %	Male (15/15)	22 %	Male (16/16)	45 %								
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (79/86)	33 %	No (15/15)	22 %	No (15/16)	46 %	No (7/8)	31 %	No (21/23)	35 %	No (11/14)	27 %	No (5/5)	35 %
Yes (7/86)	45 %			Yes (1/16)	27 %	Yes (1/8)	30 %	Yes (2/23)	38 %	Yes (3/14)	63 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (81/86)	35 %	No (15/15)	22 %	No (16/16)	45 %	No (4/8)	36 %	No (23/23)	35 %	No (14/14)	34 %	No (4/5)	36 %
Yes (5/86)	27 %					Yes (4/8)	26 %					Yes (1/5)	30 %
ELL (5/5)	27 %					ELL (4/4)	26 %					ELL (1/1)	30 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (86/86)	34 %	No (15/15)	22 %	No (16/16)	45 %	No (8/8)	31 %	No (23/23)	35 %	No (14/14)	34 %	No (5/5)	35 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (70/86)	34 %	No (11/15)	24 %	No (13/16)	39 %	No (8/8)	31 %	No (17/23)	38 %	No (12/14)	33 %	No (5/5)	35 %
Yes (16/86)	35 %	Yes (4/15)	18 %	Yes (3/16)	77 %			Yes (6/23)	29 %	Yes (2/14)	37 %		

Not Available (16/16)	35 %	Not Available (4/4)	18 %	Not Available (3/3)	77 %			Not Available (6/6)	29 %	Not Available (2/2)	37 %		
Math Grade 8	Module 8												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (86/86)	41 %	No (11/11)	27 %	No (18/18)	50 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (24/24)	41 %	No (16/16)	38 %	No (6/6)	42 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (1/86)	76 %												
African American (35/86)	36 %	African American (11/11)	27 %					African American (24/24)	41 %				
Hispanic (14/86)	41 %					Hispanic (8/8)	40 %					Hispanic (6/6)	42 %
Multi-Racial (2/86)	40 %												
Caucasian (34/86)	45 %			Caucasian (18/18)	50 %					Caucasian (16/16)	38 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
Female (48/86)	40 %							Female (24/24)	41 %	Female (16/16)	38 %	Female (6/6)	42 %
Male (38/86)	43 %	Male (11/11)	27 %	Male (18/18)	50 %	Male (8/8)	40 %						
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (78/86)	41 %	No (10/11)	28 %	No (17/18)	50 %	No (6/8)	42 %	No (23/24)	39 %	No (13/16)	35 %	No (6/6)	42 %

Yes (8/86)	44 %	Yes (1/11)	21 %	Yes (1/18)	36 %	Yes (2/8)	36 %	Yes (1/24)	72 %	Yes (3/16)	55 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (82/86)	42 %	No (11/11)	27 %	No (18/18)	50 %	No (5/8)	44 %	No (24/24)	41 %	No (16/16)	38 %	No (5/6)	49 %
Yes (4/86)	30 %					Yes (3/8)	36 %					Yes (1/6)	15 %
ELL (4/4)	30 %					ELL (3/3)	36 %					ELL (1/1)	15 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (86/86)	41 %	No (11/11)	27 %	No (18/18)	50 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (24/24)	41 %	No (16/16)	38 %	No (6/6)	42 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (70/86)	40 %	No (9/11)	25 %	No (14/18)	44 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (18/24)	43 %	No (12/16)	38 %	No (6/6)	42 %
Yes (16/86)	45 %	Yes (2/11)	39 %	Yes (4/18)	67 %			Yes (6/24)	35 %	Yes (4/16)	37 %		
Not Available (16/16)	45 %	Not Available (2/2)	39 %	Not Available (4/4)	67 %			Not Available (6/6)	35 %	Not Available (4/4)	37 %		
Math Grade 8	Module 9												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED	
No (77/77)	34 %	No (14/14)	19 %	No (16/16)	41 %	No (8/8)	41 %	No (19/19)	30 %	No (12/12)	37 %	No (6/6)	38 %
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity	
Asian (1/77)	53 %												
African American (33/77)	25 %	African American (14/14)	19 %					African American (19/19)	30 %				

Hispanic (14/77)	39 %					Hispanic (8/8)	41 %					Hispanic (6/6)	38 %
American Indian (1/77)	10 %												
Caucasian (28/77)	40 %			Caucasian (16/16)	41 %					Caucasian (12/12)	37 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender	
Female (37/77)	34 %							Female (19/19)	30 %	Female (12/12)	37 %	Female (6/6)	38 %
Male (40/77)	34 %	Male (14/14)	19 %	Male (16/16)	41 %	Male (8/8)	41 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted	
No (69/77)	33 %	No (13/14)	20 %	No (16/16)	41 %	No (6/8)	34 %	No (17/19)	31 %	No (9/12)	32 %	No (6/6)	38 %
Yes (8/77)	41 %	Yes (1/14)	7%			Yes (2/8)	60 %	Yes (2/19)	21 %	Yes (3/12)	59 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP	
No (72/77)	34 %	No (14/14)	19 %	No (16/16)	41 %	No (5/8)	48 %	No (19/19)	30 %	No (12/12)	37 %	No (4/6)	47 %
Yes (5/77)	27 %					Yes (3/8)	32 %					Yes (2/6)	20 %
ELL (5/5)	27 %					ELL (3/3)	32 %					ELL (2/2)	20 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (77/77)	34 %	No (14/14)	19 %	No (16/16)	41 %	No (8/8)	41 %	No (19/19)	30 %	No (12/12)	37 %	No (6/6)	38 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (67/77)	34 %	No (12/14)	19 %	No (12/16)	41 %	No (8/8)	41 %	No (16/19)	32 %	No (11/12)	38 %	No (6/6)	38 %
Yes (10/77)	30 %	Yes (2/14)	21 %	Yes (4/16)	42 %			Yes (3/19)	19 %	Yes (1/12)	33 %		
Not Available (10/10)	30 %	Not Available (2/2)	21 %	Not Available (4/4)	42 %			Not Available (3/3)	19 %	Not Available (1/1)	33 %		

Math Grade 8	Module 10												
Total Popul ation	Tot al Sc ore	Afric an Amer ican Male s	Tot al Sc ore	Cauca sian Males	Tot al Sc ore	Hisp anic Male	Tot al Sc ore	Afric an Amer ican Fema le	Tot al Sc ore	Cauca sian Fema le	Tot al Sc ore	Hisp anic Fema le	Tot al Sc ore
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (66/66)	34 %	No (13/13)	21 %	No (17/17)	35 %	No (8/8)	26 %	No (25/25)	30 %	No (11/11)	37 %	No (6/6)	45 %
<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnici ty</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnicit y</i>		<i>Ethnici ty</i>	
Asian (1/66)	82 %												
African America n (28/66)	26 %	African America n (13/13)	21 %					African America n (25/25)	30 %				
Hispani c (13/66)	36 %					Hispa nic (8/8)	26 %					Hispa nic (6/6)	45 %
America n Indian (1/66)	0%												
Caucasi an (23/66)	41 %			Caucas ian (17/17)	35 %					Caucas ian (11/11)	37 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gende r</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gende r</i>	
Female (32/66)	39 %							Femal e (25/25)	30 %	Female (11/11)	37 %	Femal e (6/6)	45 %
Male (34/66)	30 %	Male (13/13)	21 %	Male (17/17)	35 %	Male (8/8)	26 %						
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (61/66)	33 %	No (12/13)	23 %	No (16/17)	35 %	No (7/8)	22 %	No (24/25)	29 %	No (9/11)	30 %	No (6/6)	45 %
Yes (5/66)	48 %	Yes (1/13)	7%	Yes (1/17)	32 %	Yes (1/8)	54 %	Yes (1/25)	54 %	Yes (2/11)	75 %		
<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>	
No (61/66)	34 %	No (13/13)	21 %	No (17/17)	35 %	No (4/8)	30 %	No (25/25)	30 %	No (11/11)	37 %	No (4/6)	42 %
Yes (5/66)	35 %					Yes (4/8)	21 %					Yes (2/6)	50 %

ELL (5/5)	35 %					ELL (4/4)	21 %					ELL (2/2)	50 %
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant	
No (66/66)	34 %	No (13/13)	21 %	No (17/17)	35 %	No (8/8)	26 %	No (25/25)	30 %	No (11/11)	37 %	No (6/6)	45 %
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD	
No (56/66)	32 %	No (9/13)	15 %	No (13/17)	28 %	No (8/8)	26 %	No (19/25)	31 %	No (10/11)	34 %	No (6/6)	45 %
Yes (10/66)	49 %	Yes (4/13)	38 %	Yes (4/17)	62 %			Yes (6/25)	27 %	Yes (1/11)	64 %		
Not Available (10/10)	49 %	Not Available (4/4)	38 %	Not Available (4/4)	62 %			Not Available (6/6)	27 %	Not Available (1/1)	64 %		
Math Grade 8	Module 11												
Total Population	Total Score	African American Males	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American Female	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score
ED		ED		ED		ED		ED		ED			
No (88/88)	45 %	No (12/12)	36 %	No (18/18)	49 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (26/26)	47 %	No (15/15)	38 %		
Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity		Ethnicity			
Asian (2/88)	52 %												
African American (38/88)	43 %	African American (12/12)	36 %					African American (26/26)	47 %				
Hispanic (12/88)	47 %					Hispanic (8/8)	40 %						
Multi-Racial (3/88)	47 %												

Caucasian (33/88)	44 %			Caucasian (18/18)	49 %					Caucasian (15/15)	38 %		
Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender		Gender			
Female (49/88)	45 %							Female (26/26)	47 %	Female (15/15)	38 %		
Male (39/88)	44 %	Male (12/12)	36 %	Male (18/18)	49 %	Male (8/8)	40 %						
Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted		Gifted			
No (79/88)	46 %	No (11/12)	40 %	No (17/18)	49 %	No (6/8)	44 %	No (24/26)	46 %	No (12/15)	39 %		
Yes (9/88)	34 %	Yes (1/12)	6%	Yes (1/18)	47 %	Yes (2/8)	28 %	Yes (2/26)	51 %	Yes (3/15)	35 %		
LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP		LEP			
No (83/88)	44 %	No (12/12)	36 %	No (18/18)	49 %	No (5/8)	40 %	No (26/26)	47 %	No (15/15)	38 %		
Yes (5/88)	47 %					Yes (3/8)	41 %						
ELL (5/5)	47 %					ELL (3/3)	41 %						
Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant		Migrant			
No (88/88)	45 %	No (12/12)	36 %	No (18/18)	49 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (26/26)	47 %	No (15/15)	38 %		
SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD		SWD			
No (71/88)	44 %	No (8/12)	32 %	No (14/18)	47 %	No (8/8)	40 %	No (21/26)	48 %	No (11/15)	37 %		
Yes (17/88)	45 %	Yes (4/12)	44 %	Yes (4/18)	54 %			Yes (5/26)	40 %	Yes (4/15)	41 %		
Not Available (17/17)	45 %	Not Available (4/4)	44 %	Not Available (4/4)	54 %			Not Available (5/5)	40 %	Not Available (4/4)	41 %		
Math Grade 8	Final Exam												
Total Population	Total Score	African American	Total Score	Caucasian Males	Total Score	Hispanic Male	Total Score	African American	Total Score	Caucasian Female	Total Score	Hispanic Female	Total Score

		Male						Female					
<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>		<i>ED</i>	
No (83/83)	26 %	No (13/13)	19 %	No (17/17)	31 %	No (7/7)	21 %	No (28/28)	26 %	No (10/10)	27 %	No (6/6)	23 %
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Asian (1/83)	40 %												
African American (41/83)	24 %	African American (13/13)	19 %					African American (28/28)	26 %				
Hispanic (13/83)	22 %					Hispanic (7/7)	21 %					Hispanic (6/6)	23 %
Multi-Racial (1/83)	26 %												
Caucasian (27/83)	29 %			Caucasian (17/17)	31 %					Caucasian (10/10)	27 %		
<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
Female (45/83)	26 %							Female (28/28)	26 %	Female (10/10)	27 %	Female (6/6)	23 %
Male (38/83)	26 %	Male (13/13)	19 %	Male (17/17)	31 %	Male (7/7)	21 %						
<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>		<i>Gifted</i>	
No (74/83)	25 %	No (11/13)	19 %	No (16/17)	30 %	No (5/7)	20 %	No (27/28)	25 %	No (7/10)	19 %	No (6/6)	23 %
Yes (9/83)	33 %	Yes (2/13)	24 %	Yes (1/17)	40 %	Yes (2/7)	24 %	Yes (1/28)	39 %	Yes (3/10)	45 %		
<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>		<i>LEP</i>	
No (78/83)	26 %	No (13/13)	19 %	No (17/17)	31 %	No (4/7)	22 %	No (28/28)	26 %	No (10/10)	27 %	No (4/6)	27 %
Yes (5/83)	19 %					Yes (3/7)	19 %					Yes (2/6)	18 %
ELL (5/5)	19 %					ELL (3/3)	19 %					ELL (2/2)	18 %
<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>		<i>Migrant</i>	
No (83/83)	26 %	No (13/13)	19 %	No (17/17)	31 %	No (7/7)	21 %	No (28/28)	26 %	No (10/10)	27 %	No (6/6)	23 %
<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>		<i>SWD</i>	

No (67/83)	26 %	No (10/13)	18 %	No (13/17)	27 %	No (7/7)	21 %	No (22/28)	29 %	No (7/10)	32 %	No (6/6)	23 %
Yes (16/83)	25 %	Yes (3/13)	24 %	Yes (4/17)	39 %			Yes (6/28)	17 %	Yes (3/10)	15 %		
Not Availabl e (16/16)	25 %	Not Availab le (3/3)	24 %	Not Availabl e (4/4)	39 %			Not Availab le (6/6)	17 %	Not Availabl e (3/3)	15 %		

In order to create a comprehensive needs assessment that addressed the challenges of individual schools and the district as a whole, SCPS utilized the Root Cause Analysis Facilitator Guide protocol published on marylandresourcehub.org. SCPS has three TSI schools that needed to go through the process, so we started with each of those schools conducting its own needs assessment and then using that information as contributing information, or baseline information for the county needs assessment.

For the individual school needs assessments the team included the Director of Schools, the administrative team (Principals, Vice-Principals, Dean of Students, etc...), Reading Coaches, and teachers. These teams analyzed both state and local data for their individual schools, identifying problem statements and root causes. As schools worked on creating action plans to address these deficiencies, those teams joined the district-wide Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis Teams.

District level teams convened to analyze district data but with the perspective, data, and ideas of individual schools and their building level data. The district team included the Deputy Superintendent, Director of Schools, all instructional supervisors and coordinators, student services supervisor, and all principals. This team convened initially to preview district data to identify the most pressing challenges that were considered most actionable. The team applied 17-18 state data to the Data Range for Areas of Focus, analyzing critical areas. After reviewing district data, it became obvious that our needs are great and varied. While SCPS could have benefitted from any and all of the focuses, the team agreed that the two greatest needs continued to be Achievement in ELA and Math grades 3-5 and 6-8, and School Quality and Student Success.

Our last state data came from testing completed in 2019. In 2021 SCPS attempted to administer local ELA and Math Benchmarks as well as Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) assessments. Overall the implementation and results were so inconsistent that the data is generally unreliable.

All things considered, NWEA Map Data is our most reliable and consistent local data when analyzing elementary reading and math. Using our last regular MAP testing data (spring 2019) and comparing it to spring 2021 data, students in grades 3-5 showed an average decline of 2.6%. The largest decline among this group was for white students in 5th grade, showing a full 6% drop.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, math scores for students in grades 3-5 as measured by NWEA Map declined even more, at 4.67%. The largest decline among this group was, again, white students in 5th grade, showing a 9.4% drop.

Reading scores in grades 6-8 varied much more with some student populations showing declines whereas others showed slight increases in performance. The analysis reveals in cases of increases, though, that significantly fewer students actually tested in 2021. Qualitative analysis reveals that many middle school students with significant challenges, including special education, remained virtual for the entire 2021 school year and neglected county tests. This means that the missing data represents many of our lower performing students, making the data appear higher than it is.

While we do not have comparable data for math grades 6-8, we anticipate even more serious learning losses.

Similar academic inconsistencies applied to non-academic data like attendance and discipline, which influence student academic success. Throughout the 20-21 school-year SCPS had three kinds of students at any given time: face to face, virtual synchronous, and virtual asynchronous. The virtual asynchronous

option wasn't really offered but evolved and developed as students chose to work without tuning in to Google Meets due to lack of wifi. We developed ways to track attendance for those students that relied on other factors, including completion of work. We also started tracking middle school attendance by period instead of days and ½ days, making the data itself inconsistent.

Attendance reports that we send to the state at the end of the year reveal negative attendance trends that persist from 2019-2021. Some of these trends correspond to achievement gaps for specific student populations and others correspond to specific grade levels. Root causes vary, depending on the student group.

While county attendance overall falls below 94% most years, students in grades 7 and 9 have lower percentages consistently. Root cause analysis indicates that social and emotional issues, sometimes compounded by school climate, are likely the biggest reason for this.

More concerning are consistently low attendance trends among specific student populations already identified as having academic equity challenges, including students with disabilities & 504 plans as well as migrant and homeless/FIT students. These populations already face significant challenges to academic success so decreasing time in school compounds those existing concerns.

Discipline data was generally reported in the same manner as before, but infractions were significantly lower as direct, face to face interactions led to less behavioral issues. If students didn't like something that another person said or did they could just logout or "ghost" the class instead of physically responding. For this reason, discipline data looks better in 2021 but that is not a reliable indicator for what we are likely to experience this year as we return face to face.

Even Mental Health data from 2020-2021 is skewed, showing a decrease in students receiving services. We know that it is extremely likely that mental health issues would increase during a global pandemic, but the data shows that less students received services during that school-year. Likely this data does not indicate improved circumstances, but rather a lack of students being able to access these services. Many students receive their services during the school day, in our buildings. While many providers moved to tele-therapy, coordinating these efforts may have been problematic for many families.

The root cause analysis done during our needs assessment revealed that many sub-issues fall under the overarching concern of attendance. If students do not attend then data shows that they are likely to perform at lower achievement levels. Behavior/discipline, homelessness, and mental health concerns are all major factors in student absences. For this reason, our last Focus Area is School Quality and Student Success with a focus on Attendance & Chronic Absenteeism.

Area of Focus Reporting Requirements

Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan Reporting Requirements

(Complete a separate plan for each area of focus)

Area of Focus #1: Academic Achievement Reading/English Language Arts

1. Based on the analysis of local academic and non-academic data, identify the area of focus where the local school system did not meet the goals (*areas where the local school system is performing below expectations*). In the response, provide the rationale for selecting the area of focus, including the implementation of strategies and/or evidence-based interventions to support student achievement. Describe priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions to address disparities in achievement to improve student performance and to measure and address learning loss. As school systems respond to area of focus #1, refer to page 13 to guide your response to address specific student groups.
 - a. **Description.** Describe **Area of Focus #1** and how it aligns with your system's educational equity policy. Describe the rationale for selecting the area of focus (**up to 1,000 characters**).

C

Student achievement in ELA is well below acceptable levels at both elementary and middle schools. The percentage of all students achieving is extremely low with achievement gaps prominent with specific sub-groups. An achievement gap for African American students widens from elementary to 25% in middle school and is joined by an 18% gap between males and females, with females out-performing males.

Finally, special education students showed the highest achievement gap in all categories with the majority of those students performing in the bottom two levels. In terms of equitable access, special education students represented the largest achievement gap by far for middle and high school with gaps of 20% and 30% respectively. In elementary school special education students represented the second highest gap at 11%.

The focus will be on grades 3 and 6 to try to reduce the achievement gap. Further, studies show that a variety of factors, including a switch to more informational text in third grade, cause third grade to be one of the most important years in reading comprehension throughout a child's career.

In order to address achievement for all students and groups with achievement gaps, SCPS developed curriculum and instruction goals for these groups respectively. Specific resources have been identified for groups with achievement gaps to provide equitable access to learning.

Overall student achievement will be addressed primarily through use of data informed instruction cycle, professional development on student engagement, and consistent, Tier 2 evidence-based intervention. Goals specific to SWD and EL identify unique and different strategies that are above and beyond what is being done for regular instruction. These strategies include specific, tiered intervention programs; more collaboration and training for regular educators, special educators, and EL educators; special efforts at communicating with parents and families; and special focus on these populations in instructional leadership meetings with regular data review to identify shifts necessary in schedules, programs, etc...

Low achievement for all students in both grade bands suggest systemic issues with Tier 2 and 3 intervention. Achievement gaps that grow with increasing grades, such as the special education population and African American population, suggests that we are not providing equity to all of our students. The largest equity gap county-wide is special education which jumps from 11% in elementary grades to 20% in middle school and 30% in high school. In needs assessment and root-cause analysis conversations, complaints about intervention fidelity, time, and programs all surfaced suggesting that ineffective intervention at all levels is a systemic issue that causes a lack of mastery and growth.

Special programs and strategies will be utilized for students populations that are under-achieving and further based on individual student needs. EL teachers will provide regular education teachers with training on specific strategies for EL learners. Both EL and SWD populations will be given preference for spots in scheduled intervention programs. LLI and Exact Path will be used for SWD to improve reading. Additionally, these specific student groups will be a standing focus at instructional leadership meetings, looking at data specifically for these groups.

- b. Analysis.** To support student achievement, provide an interpretation or justification for data used to identify this need. *(up to 1,000 characters).*

Two years ago we used the same state MCAP data to identify achievement gaps, strengths, and weaknesses. Then, we identified weak curriculum and inconsistent interventions as primary root causes for low achievement and equity gaps. Since then, though, we have done extensive curriculum work to update and improve our curriculum. We continued to find inconsistent intervention as a root cause for low achievement and equity gaps when reviewing the old state MCAP data as well as local benchmark and NWEA MAP data from last school year.

Specifically, our problems with intervention grew as we identified more students that needed it (Tier 3), less to no time to do it, and staff/substitute absences and shortages. NWEA MAP scores were particularly revealing. We noticed that our lower achieving students DID show growth throughout the school year but never made enough gains to make it to grade level. We call this group of students “intervention lifers” because they seem to stay in intervention throughout most of their school careers, always making gains but never enough to get out. Compounding this problem is the number of students we identify as needing Tier 3 intervention. The number often is larger than what we are able to service, making it a real challenge to staff and schedule.

Within our root cause analysis we discussed the identification process for students needing Tier 3 and considered that not enough in-class, Tier 2 intervention was happening to prevent students from needing Tier 3 support. While teachers often identify those that didn’t master the content, this isn’t always done *formatively* in a fashion where it can be addressed in a timely manner. Additionally, there seems to be a lack of *re-assessment* to determine whether the re-teaching (Tier 2) intervention worked.

- c. **Identify** the root cause (s) for area of focus #1 and **describe** how you intend to address them (*up to 1,000 characters*).

The root cause for lack of academic achievement in ELA is ineffective and inconsistent Tier 2 instruction as part of the data based instruction cycle. Lack of differentiation as part of regular instruction and Tier 2 intervention means that large numbers of students are not mastering assessed skills and content. Instead of formatively assessing, re-teaching, and re-assessing, grades are marked and instruction moves to the next content and/or skill. These failing grades and scores are utilized to identify students in need of Tier 3 intervention, which is overtaxed and logistically challenging to start with. In other words, teachers are teaching in a linear fashion without continuously re-teaching and re-assessing to those that need it.

In order to improve the process, we will use team and content meetings system-wide to focus on the Classroom Focused Improvement Process (CFIP) process as a formative assessment measure (not summative as has been done frequently). This will be led by our instructional facilitators who will be trained in the Student Centered Coaching Model. This will enable them to work individually with teachers to regularly and formatively assess data and use that data to drive instruction.

Using data formatively will lead to several outcomes. First, students will receive multiple opportunities to master a skill prior to local tests. This will enable them to score higher and avoid Tier 3 intervention. Similarly, adding in multiple formative assessment grades in the gradebook, including re-assessment grades given after re-teaching, will increase the students' average scores (hopefully preventing the need for Tier 3 intervention).

Finally, with lower numbers of students needing Tier 3 intervention the staff will be able to focus more resources and attention on the students that actually do need the more comprehensive intervention programs.

- d. **Identify and describe evidence-based interventions** to measure and address learning loss (*up to 1,000 characters*).

SCPS will address learning loss through a variety of programs and structures with the regular school day and year as well as through summer and after school. In order to accelerate student learning and address learning loss SCPS implemented a robust summer school program that focused on reading and math in elementary and middle grades. This comprehensive program utilized face to face instruction that included project based learning and also incorporated foundational skills, key grade-level skills, and adaptive interventions. The program provided door to door transportation, free breakfast and lunch to all, and a comprehensive after-care program that provided a large variety of special activities as well as dinner. The county provided this outstanding service to 276 students in grades 2-5, with special preferences given to special education students and English Language Learners. Reading progress was tracked by implementing a pre and post-test to students to measure growth.

Each school will also have an after school tutoring program where students will receive assistance on assignments as well as work on foundational skills.

The primary focus for accelerating learning and tackling learning loss is implementing strategic, Tier 2 intervention using an evidence based coaching program called Student Centered Coaching. This will enable our building level Instructional Facilitators to take teachers through coaching cycles where the focus is student data. A consultant will train Administrators, Supervisors, and Facilitators on the theory, process, monitoring, evaluation, and trouble-shooting.

Implementing the Student Centered Coaching program will allow more individual teacher/facilitator conversations that focus on the data and strategies. While CFIP (Classroom Focused Improvement Program) has long been a practice in Somerset County, we will be focusing heavily on using CFIP formatively instead of summatively. This will ensure that teachers are using formative classroom data to determine who needs to be re-taught what content/skills and more importantly, re-assessing to ensure student success. This persistent, targeted Tier 2 intervention will provide more student success in the classroom, leading to improvements on NWEA MAP and state tests. The other benefit, though, of rigorous Tier 2 intervention, re-teaching, and re-assessing, though, is that less students enter Tier 3 intervention. This will allow for smaller numbers of Tier 3 students and more individualized attention for those that do still need Tier 3.

Success will be measured in a variety of ways. The NWEA MAP is given three times a year so we will track student progress throughout the year on that test. Additional formative measures of progress will include student grades and local benchmark assessments.

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

- Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 3-5 that score at least proficient on the Reading MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	Increase the percentage of students in the average, high average, and high levels on the NWEA MAP test by at least 10 percentage points as measured by Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 data.	Schools identify students for tiered intervention by reviewing student assessment data Increase Tier 1 and Tier 2 intervention through the use of student centered coaching Classroom teachers provide Tier 2 intervention during the scheduled intervention block All students will have the opportunity for intervention or enrichment during the scheduled FLEX time block	October 2021 and ongoing	☒ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☒ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	The MAP assessment is aligned with the standards so using the Fall 2021, Winter 2022 and Spring 2022 MAP data as a predictive measure of who will score at least proficient will be used. Walk-throughs and formal observations will be used to ensure that tiered interventions are occurring. Intervention Tracking Log will be used to identify who is receiving which level of intervention and compared to growth in order to make adjustments as needed. Local benchmarks will be given at least three times a year to measure growth towards master of standards. Instructional Facilitator logs will be collected to ensure that they are spending the majority of their time working with teachers in order to improve student learning.

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

2. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 3-5 that score at least proficient on the Reading MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	Increase the percentage of students in the average, high average, and high levels on the NWEA MAP test by at least 10 percentage points as measured by Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 data.	Build master schedules to include a math and reading tier 3 intervention CFIP will be used with formative assessments Additional Reading Intervention teachers will be hired so more students can be served Once the evidence based interventions are matched to students' needs, new staff, or those that were not previously trained, will be trained by the intervention company's Professional Development Consultant.	October 2021 and ongoing	☒ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Local benchmarks will measure progress made with formative assessments and intervention. Number of students in evidence based Tier 3 intervention programs. SANE documentation

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

3. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 3-5 that score at least proficient on the Reading MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	Increase the percentage of students in the average, high average, and high levels on the NWEA MAP test by at least 10 percentage points as measured by Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 data.	Students set individual mid-point and end of year goals based on MAP data Special Education teachers will utilize MAP scores in the creation and evaluation of IEP goals Special Education teachers will co-plan and co-teach with ELA teachers. Robust Summer School will be offered to those students who are in the low and low average range for data.	October 2021 and ongoing Spring/Summer 2021	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding	The MAP assessment is aligned with the standards so using the Fall 2021, Winter 2022 and Spring 2022 MAP data as a predictive measure of who will score at least proficient will be used Local benchmarks will measure progress made with formative assessments and intervention. MAP was administered at the end of summer school to measure growth since the

		MAP and/or failing their Reading class.		☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☒ Other (funding source) state grant for summer school	pre-test (spring MAP administration)
--	--	---	--	---	--------------------------------------

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

4. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 3-5 that score at least proficient on the Reading MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	After school tutoring will be offered to students in the low and low average percentile ranges as measured on MAP Growth	Classroom teachers, facilitators and administration will utilize MAP Growth reports to determine the students that need tutoring. Staff will be hired to provide tutoring. Interventions will be matched to the needs of the students. Tutoring groups will be 4 or less students	October 21-May 22	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding	Student Performance Data Tracker will be used to monitor attendance and growth for after school tutoring program. An increase of 20% of the grades 3-5 students participating in the after school tutoring program will score at grade level or above on the RIT for reading during the current school year compared to the previous year's scores. 60% of participating grades 3-5 students in the after school tutoring program will demonstrate at least 1 year's growth (100 Lexile points) between their Fall and MAP testing sessions.

		The intervention's assessment will be monitored at least twice per month to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention Tutoring data will be shared with the classroom teacher, facilitator and administrators Classroom teachers will provide tutors with data on students' needs.		☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☒ Other (funding source) Tutoring Supplemental Instruction Grant, Transitional Supplemental Instructional Additional Grant	Each year, 60% of participating after school tutoring program students will score At Expectations or Exceeds Expectations on each of the local assessments quarterly, in reading or ELA. Each year, 80% of participating after school tutoring program students will perform at a satisfactory level ('C' or above) in reading and ELA for terms 2, 3 and 4 as reported by teachers to parents on the Somerset County report cards.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

5. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 3-5 that score at least proficient on the Reading MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	Each teacher will participate in a full and mini cycle of Student Centered Coaching	District level and school based administrators will participate in professional development on Student Centered Coaching Facilitators will collect artifacts detailing Student Centered Coaching Cycles and impact on student achievement	September 2021-June 2022	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Teachers and Instructional Facilitators will collaborate to create standards-based performance tasks that will be used to measure student achievement.

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

6. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 6-8 that score at least proficient on the ELA MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	Increase the percentage of students in the average, high average, and high levels by at least 10 percentage points as measured by NWEA MAP Fall 21 to Spring 22	Creative scheduling to provide more tier 3 intervention Focus on tier 2 intervention provided by the teacher Schools identify students for tiered intervention by reviewing student assessment data Increase Tier 1 and 2 intervention through the	October 21 and ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☒ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding	The MAP assessment is aligned with the standards so using the Fall 2021, Winter 2022 and Spring 2022 MAP data as a predictive measure of who will score at least proficient will be used. Walk-throughs and formal observations will be used to ensure that tiered interventions are occurring. Intervention Tracking Log will be used to identify who is receiving which level of intervention and compared to growth in order to make adjustments as needed.

		use of student centered coaching All students in grades 6-7 will participate in “What I Need” (WIN) which will provide additional intervention or enrichment opportunities CFIP will be used with formative assessments Intervention company’s consultants will provide training to new staff or those that were not trained yet by the consultant Students set individual midpoint and end of year goals based on MAP data Special Education teachers will utilize MAP scores in the creation and evaluation of IEP goals. Special Education teachers will co-plan c-teach with ELA teachers		☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Local benchmarks will be given at least three times a year to measure growth towards mastery of standards. Instructional Facilitator logs will be collected to ensure that they are spending the majority of their time working with teachers in order to improve student learning. NoRedInk usage reports Meeting notes Passing rate of students enrolled in Summer School Student Growth on MAP as measured by Spring 21 data (pre-test) and end of Summer School data (post-test)
--	--	--	--	---	--

		Robust Summer School will be offered to those students who are in the low and low average range for MAP and/or failing their Reading class			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

7. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 6-8 that score at least proficient on the ELA MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	After school tutoring will be offered to students in the low and low average percentile ranges as measured on MAP growth on MAP growth	Classroom teachers, facilitators and administration will utilize MAP Growth reports to determine the students that need tutoring. Staff will be hired to provide tutoring. Interventions will be matched to the needs of the students. Tutoring groups will be 4 or less students	September 21 – June 22	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☐ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III	An increase of 20% of the grades 3-5 students participating in the after school tutoring program will score at grade level or above on the RIT for reading during the current school year compared to the previous year's scores. 60% of participating grades 3-5 students in the after school tutoring program will demonstrate at least 1 year's growth (100 Lexile points) between their Fall and MAP testing sessions. Each year, 60% of participating after school tutoring program students will score At Expectations or Exceeds Expectations on each

		The intervention's assessment will be monitored at least twice per month to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention Tutoring data will be shared with the classroom teacher, facilitator and administrators Classroom teachers will provide tutors with data on students' needs.		☒ Other (funding source) Tutoring Supplemental Instruction Grant, Transitional Supplemental Instructional Additional Grant	of the local assessments quarterly, in reading or ELA. Each year, 80% of participating after school tutoring program students will perform at a satisfactory level ('C' or above) in reading and ELA for terms 2, 3 and 4 as reported by teachers to parents on the Somerset County report cards.
--	--	--	--	---	---

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

8. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 6-8 that score at least proficient on the ELA MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	Each teacher will participate in a full and mini-cycle of Student Centered Coaching	District level and school based administrators will participate in professional development on Student Centered Coaching Facilitators will collect artifacts detailing Student Centered Coaching Cycles and impact on student achievement	September 21- June 22	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Teachers and Instructional Facilitators will collaborate to create standards-based performance tasks that will be used to measure student achievement.

Area of Focus # 1: _Academic Achievement Reading/ELA_____

9. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of students in grades 6-8 that score at least proficient on the ELA MCAP by at least 5 percentage points.	Students in grades 6-8 will use NoRedInk at least 1 hour per week in all ELA classrooms	Weekly reports will be shared with teachers about student usage. Strategies for how teachers are using NoRedInk in the classroom will be shared at team or content level meetings in schools	September 21 – June 22	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Weekly usage reports from NoRedInk

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

10. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of EL students in grades 3-8 that score at least proficient on the Reading MCAP by at least 10 percentage points.	Increase the number of students exiting EL services by at least 10 percentage points as based on ACCESS for ELLs	ESOL teachers are assigned to each Reading class that contains EL students ESOL teachers have push in and pull out time in their schedule to provide services to students ACCESS for ELLs expectations strategies will be shared with families	September 21-June 22	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☒ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	ACCESS for ELL scores 2022 Master schedules ESOL Schedule of Services Participation in WIDA ecourses SANE documentation from family engagement events After school tutoring Student Performance Tracker

		MCAP expectations and strategies will be shared with families Individual student goals will be crafted with the ESOL teacher, student and the family EL students will be given priority in tutoring groups Additional ESOL staff will be hired Disaggregate local assessments by EL student population Staff will participate in WIDA self-paced ecourses related to equity and/or Newcomers			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

- Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of SWD students in grades 3-5 that score at least proficient on the Reading by 25 percentage points.	Intentionally schedule human resources to provide more individualized and small group attention to SWD.	SWD will be given priority in after school tutoring sessions. SWD given priority placement in summer school. SWD with IEP goals in Reading will be part of daily, evidence based Reading Intervention. Special Education Teachers will co-plan and	Summer 21-June 22	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Monitor Student IEP Reading Goals Monitor disaggregated MAP data Monitor disaggregated, local benchmark data Walkthroughs

		co-teach with Reading Teachers. Teachers will participate in full and/or mini student centered coaching cycles. Special Education Teachers will attend team meetings where classroom data is analyzed Targeted small group instruction for SWD County developed ELA curriculum has suggestions for modifications			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Area of Focus # 1: Academic Achievement Reading/ELA

- Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase the number of African American students in grades 3-5 that score at least proficient on the Reading by 27 percentage points.	Intentionally monitor all disaggregated ELA data at state and local levels to be mindful of equity issues and learning gaps.	Local and state assessment data will be disaggregated to track growth of the African American student population. African American students that are not on track to meet proficiency on the Reading MCAP will be brought to the Learning Support Team at the school level.	September 21-June 22, ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding	Monitor disaggregated local and state assessment data Track reading intervention progress by using a data tracking form for African American Students Monitor disaggregated Reading MAP data Observations and walkthroughs Learning Support Team minutes and logs

		African American students will be given priority placement in the after school tutoring program and intervention.		☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	
--	--	---	--	---	--

Area of Focus #2: Academic Achievement Mathematics

1. Based on the analysis of local academic and non-academic data, identify the area of focus where the local school system did not meet the goals (*areas where the local school system is performing below expectations*). In the response, provide the rationale for selecting the area of focus, including the implementation of strategies and/or evidence-based interventions to support student achievement. Describe priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions to address disparities in achievement to improve student performance and measure and address learning loss. As school systems respond to area of focus #1, refer to page 13 to guide your response to address specific student groups.

a. Description. Describe **Area of Focus #2** and how it aligns with your system's educational equity policy. Describe the rationale for selecting the areas of focus (**up to 1,000 character**).

Student achievement in Math is well below acceptable levels at both elementary and middle schools. The percentage of all students achieving is extremely low with achievement gaps prominent with specific sub-groups. Low student achievement for all students gets worse from elementary to middle, dropping from 23% meeting or exceeding the standards to only 17%. Further, Students of Two or More Races performed at very low levels in elementary and middle school math, a trend that showed up in some individual school data as well. Finally, special education students showed the highest achievement gap in all categories with the majority of those students performing in the bottom two levels. In terms of equitable access, special education students represented the largest achievement gap by far for middle and high school with gaps of 20% and 30% respectively. In elementary school special education students represented the second highest gap at 11%. Math scores decline from elementary to middle school so providing solid curriculum and instruction with targeted support to 4th grade should increase achievement moving forward. Strategies will be used throughout the grade-bands but the grades identified for closer scrutiny for focus area 1 were selected strategically. Overall student achievement will be addressed primarily through use of data informed instruction cycle, professional development on student engagement, and consistent, evidence-based intervention. Goals specific to SWD and EL identify unique and different strategies that are above and beyond what is being done for regular instruction. These strategies include preferential slots for summer school, specific, tiered intervention programs; more collaboration and training for regular educators, special educators, and EL educators; special efforts at communicating with parents and families; and special focus on these populations in instructional leadership meetings with regular data review to identify shifts necessary in schedules, programs, etc... Achievement gaps that grow with increasing grades, such as the special education population and African American population, suggests that we are not providing equity to all of our students. The largest equity gap county-wide is special education which jumps from 11% in elementary grades to 20% in middle school and 30% in high school. In needs assessment and root-cause analysis conversations, complaints about intervention fidelity, time, and programs all surfaced suggesting that ineffective intervention for reading and math at all levels is a systemic issue that causes a lack of mastery and growth.	
---	--

Special programs and strategies will be utilized for students populations that are under-achieving and further based on individual student needs. EL teachers will provide regular education teachers with training on specific strategies for EL learners. Both EL and SWD (Students With Disabilities) populations will be given preference for spots in scheduled intervention programs. LLI and Exact Path will be used for SWD to improve reading. Additionally, these specific student groups will be a standing focus at instructional leadership meetings, looking at data specifically for these groups.

- b. Analysis.** To support student achievement, provide an interpretation or justification for data used to identify this need. *(up to 1,000 characters).*

At the elementary level, the NWEA MAP assessment is the data used to determine our greatest area of need. The number of students scoring above 61% on the MAP assessment was less than 20% in grades 2, 4 and 5 with only 21.8% of students scoring above 61% in grade 3. Additional data from the spring 2021 administration of the MAP assessment compared to the 2019 administration of the assessment reveal that the African American subgroup in 2nd grade experienced a significant dip in the mean RIT score dropping from 190.8 in 2019 to 176.5 in 2021. The Hispanic population as well as the white students in 2nd grade also experienced a significant decline from 2019 to 2021 in their mean RIT scores as compared to other grade levels. The Hispanic population saw an 11.7 point drop while the white students dropped by 16.1 percentage points.

- c. Identify** the root cause (s) for area of focus #2 and describe how you intend to address them *(up to 1,000 characters).*

The root cause of poor student achievement relates directly to the learning loss experienced because of the pandemic. Many students were virtual for the majority of the 2020-2021 school year and teachers were unable to use solid instructional math strategies virtually.

- d. Identify evidence-based interventions** to measure and address learning loss *(up to 1,000 characters).*

SCPS will address learning loss through a variety of programs and structures with the regular school day and year as well as through summer and after school. In order to accelerate student learning and address learning loss SCPS implemented a robust summer school program that focused on reading and math in elementary and middle grades. This comprehensive program utilized face to face instruction that included project based learning and also incorporated foundational skills, key grade-level skills, and adaptive interventions. The program provided door to door transportation, free breakfast and lunch to all, and a comprehensive after-care program that provided a large variety of special activities as well as dinner. The county provided this outstanding service to 276 students in grades 2-5, with special preferences given

to special education students and English Language Learners. Reading progress was tracked by implementing a pre and post-test to students to measure growth.

Each school will also have an after school tutoring program where students will receive assistance on assignments as well as work on foundational skills.

At the elementary level three evidence based interventions that will be implemented in the 2021-2022 school year. The math curriculum, REVEAL, has a targeted intervention component to be used as part of Tier I and Tier II instruction in the classroom. The Tier III math intervention teachers will utilize the Arrive Math Booster. All students in grades K-5th will be utilizing the Exact Path program that provides specific, targeted, interactive, computerized lessons based on student needs. Intervention teachers also have the option, with Exact Path, to search and execute hands on lessons in areas where students are weak based on the specific needs of each child.

Area of Focus #2: Academic Achievement Mathematics

2. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase all student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 13% to 20%.	For 100% of K-5th grade math teachers to use the vetted math curriculum, Reveal Math, with fidelity as evidenced by their tracking of student data in the data dashboard.	Continue use of Reveal Math, an evidenced based, standards aligned, culturally sensitive, curriculum for elementary and middle school. Provide Pre-K3 (FrogStreet) and Universal Pre-K 4 (Origo) to build a strong mathematical foundation. Continue to train teachers on the use of the Reveal data dashboard in order to drive instructional decisions for Tier II and III intervention. Provide differentiated professional development for teachers as needed to ensure use of the math programs with fidelity.	Fall 2021, ongoing Summer 2021, ongoing Summer 2021, ongoing	☒ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding	Walk through data on use of the Reveal Math program. Spot checks on teacher use of their data dashboard. Having teachers share data collected on their data dashboard at bi monthly team meetings reflected in the notes from the meeting.

				☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other(<i>funding source</i>)	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

2. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase all student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 13% to 20%.	Improve mathematics pedagogy and depth of knowledge regarding best practices in teaching mathematics. Increase student engagement in mathematics.	Utilize math facilitators to assist in school based data analysis, instructional strategies, and co-teaching. Provide training in the "math workshop" approach to teaching math and providing for the needs of various levels of students.	Fall 2021, ongoing Initial training August 2021, ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Monitor facilitator logs. Walkthrough feedback will be used to collect data on specific strategies advocated by the facilitator. Local grades and benchmarks will be used to evaluate student progress.

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

3. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase all student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 13% to 20%.	Use evidence based screening tool, MAP testing, to track student growth and achievement.	Administer the MAP test 3 times per year: Fall, Winter, Spring Track student growth on the MAP assessment.	Fall 2021 Winter 2022 Spring 2022 Fall 2021, Winter 2022, Spring 2022	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Beginning with the fall MAP administration, student growth will be analyzed. MAP reports show not only raw growth, but whether the growth exceeds what would happen naturally in order to close the achievement gap. Students not exceeding raw yearly growth or not showing growth will be provided with an intervention plan or a NEW intervention plan. Special emphasis will be put on SWD and EL students.

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

4. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase all student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 13% to 20%.	Increase overall math instructional time. Provide evidence based programs to students in need of math intervention.	Include a dedicated math intervention time in the daily schedule for all grade levels. Implement Arrive Math, Exact Path and/or Targeted Intervention lessons embedded in Reveal Math for students in need of Tier II and III intervention. Hire additional intervention teachers at each of the elementary schools. Analyze data from intervention programs to determine effectiveness of each.	Fall 2021, ongoing Fall 2021, ongoing Summer 2021 Fall 2021, Ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Intervention plans will be adjusted based on data collected during intervention. Special emphasis will be put on SWD and EL students. Exact Path is adaptive in nature and has shown promising results in previous years.

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

5. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase EL student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 5% to 15%.	Provide adaptive, evidence-based intervention for EL students not meeting standards. Provide human resources to assist EL students in math classes. Use instructional strategies that are evidence-based for EL students in instruction and intervention.	Use MAP testing to identify students needing intervention. Provide daily math intervention using Exact Path, Reveal Math and/or Arrive Math Booster. Schedule paraprofessionals and/or co-teachers in all math classes for student assistance and/or co-teaching. EL teachers in each building train staff on evidence based practices and strategies for EL students. Train identified regular ed staff on EL strategies by providing professional development on academic vocabulary for EL students.	Fall 2021, ongoing Fall 2021, ongoing Fall 2021, Ongoing Fall 2021, ongoing Fall 2021	☒ Title I Part A ☒ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☒ Title III EL ☒ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding	Beginning with the winter MAP administration student growth will be analyzed. MAP reports show not only raw growth, but whether the growth exceeds what would happen naturally in order to close the achievement gap. Students not exceeding raw yearly growth or not showing growth will be provided with an intervention plan or a NEW intervention plan. Special emphasis will be put on SWD and EL students.

				☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Track student math grades, benchmark scores, and MAP data Formative assessment grades for EL students on assignments where EL strategies were used will help measure student learning.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

6. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase EL student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 5% to 15%.	Provide after school math tutoring for EL students. Include EL student population as a focus area for instructional leadership teams. Target EL families for parent events that focus on providing home support for student academic success.	Identify EL students struggling in math. Reach out to identified EL families with translated/interpreted materials to coordinate math tutoring. Review math data from all sources (classwork, grades, intervention, etc...) and attendance weekly in leadership meetings to identify individual student needs.	Fall 2021 Fall 2021 Fall 2021, Ongoing	☒ Title I Part A ☒ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☒ Title III EL ☒ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding	Local grades will be used to track student progress for students that attend 3 or more days a week. Track EL student attendance for after school tutoring in math. ILT teams will shift the students, programs used, and frequency of intervention based on data analysis. In cases where students are not making progress despite multiple efforts, the leadership team will spearhead identifying new/revised resources, strategies, and schedules.

	Provide continuity of learning for EL and migrant students in summer.	Provide individual contacts to EL families for family events including Breakfast of Champions and Lunch n Learns. Contact all EL and migrant students for summer school. School lasts 5 days a week and includes extended hours for migrant workers. In addition to regular content instruction students receive EL instruction and a variety of enrichment classes.	Fall, Ongoing Contact & Registration Spring 2022 Summer School & Post-test, Summer 2022	☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Track EL family attendance for after school tutoring in math. Track EL/migrant attendance in summer school. Evaluate student growth using pre-post tests. Evaluate student level on Fall MAP test.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_

7. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase SWD student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 5% to 15%.	Provide adaptive, evidence-based intervention for SWD students not meeting standards. Provide human resources to assist SWD students in math classes.	Use MAP testing to identify students needing intervention. Provide daily math intervention using Arrive Math Booster, Exact Path or lessons from the Targeted Intervention in the Reveal math program. Schedule paraprofessionals and special educators in all math classes for student assistance and/or co-teaching.	Fall 2021 Fall 2021, ongoing Daily, ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Beginning with the fall MAP administration student growth will be analyzed. MAP reports show not only raw growth, but whether the growth exceeds what would happen naturally in order to close the achievement gap. Students not exceeding raw yearly growth or not showing growth will be provided with an intervention plan or a revised intervention plan. Special emphasis will be put on SWD and EL students.

Area of Focus # 2: Academic Achievement Mathematics

8. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase SWD student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 5% to 15%.	Provide adaptive, evidence-based intervention for SWD students not meeting standards. Provide human resources to assist SWD students in math classes.	Use MAP testing to identify students needing intervention. Provide daily math intervention using Arrive Math Booster, Exact Path or lessons from the Targeted Intervention in the Reveal math program. Schedule paraprofessionals and special educators in all math classes for student assistance and/or co-teaching.	Fall 2021 Fall 2021, ongoing Daily, ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Beginning with the fall MAP administration student growth will be analyzed. MAP reports show not only raw growth, but whether the growth exceeds what would happen naturally in order to close the achievement gap. Students not exceeding raw yearly growth or not showing growth will be provided with an intervention plan or a revised intervention plan. Special emphasis will be put on SWD and EL students.

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

9. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase SWD student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 5% to 15%.	Make SWD student population focus area for instructional leadership teams Target SWD families for parent events that focus on providing home support for student academic success. Provide continuity of learning for SWD students in summer.	Review math data and attendance weekly in leadership meetings to identify individual student needs. Provide individual contacts to SWD families for family events held at the school and district level. Contact identified SWD students for summer school.	Fall 2021, ongoing Ongoing Spring 2022	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	ILT teams will shift the students, programs used, and frequency of intervention based on data analysis. In cases where students are not making progress despite multiple efforts, the leadership team will spearhead identifying new/revised resources, strategies, and schedules. Track SWD family attendance. Track SWD attendance in summer school. Evaluate student growth using pre-posttests. Use local grades, benchmarks, and MAP data to evaluate.

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

10. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase SWD student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 5% to 15%.	Implement co-teaching to provide differentiated instruction and accommodations to meet the needs of SWD students in math classes. Include special educators in educational decision-making and professional development.	Provide training to teachers on effective co-teaching. Schedule common planning for co-teachers. Include special educators in content professional development. Include special educators in team meetings, data analysis, etc.	Fall 2021, ongoing Summer 2021, Ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☒ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Walkthrough and observation data will be used in addition to student grades, benchmark and MAP data. Local grades and benchmarks will be used to evaluate student progress for students that attended 3 or more days per week. Track student attendance in after school tutoring.

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

11. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase SWD student achievement on Math MCAP tests grade 4 from 5% to 15%.	Provide accessible instruction to SWD students by incorporating UDL practices. Target SWD students for summer school	Continue to provide professional development on UDL strategies and collect data through walk-throughs. Utilize student grades and local benchmark scores to target SWD students in need of extra help. Reach out to families to coordinate enrollment.	Fall 2021, ongoing Fall 2021 Spring 2021	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III	Track progress of participating students that attended a minimum of three days per week with grades, benchmark and MAP data.

	Target SWD students for after school tutoring in math.	Utilize math data points to identify students for tutoring. Contact families of students personally to coordinate scheduling of after school math tutoring for identified students. Provide one hour of math tutoring three days per week after school.	Fall 2021, ongoing Fall 2021, ongoing	X Other (funding source) Tutoring Supplemental Instruction Grant, Transitional Supplemental Instructional Additional Grant	
--	---	--	---	---	--

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

12. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	To increase the rigor in middle and high school mathematics classes	Deep dive into the Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors, PLD's. Read and discuss "The Opportunity Myth" as to what needs to be done within the classroom Analyze and make adjustments to local mathematics assessments based on the PLD's Work with special educators and EL specialists to provide access and equity throughout curriculum and assessments.	August 2021, ongoing August 2021, ongoing September 2021, ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☒ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Observations, assignment checks, and gradebooks checks will be used to determine the rigor within classrooms for all students within mathematics classrooms with a special emphasis on student groups performing below expectations. Local benchmarks will be used to evaluate student achievement. Analyze disaggregated benchmark data to address achievement gaps, specifically looking at special education and EL students.

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

13. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	To increase the rigor in middle and high school mathematics classes	Implement teachers incorporating Constructive Responses within the classroom every two weeks. Mathematics facilitator will meet with the mathematics teachers every two weeks to examine the rigor of assignments being made and to help develop Constructive Response questions.	September 2021, ongoing September 2021, ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Local benchmarks given during the 2020-2021 school year will be analyzed to determine the performance level of current questions. Make sure that there is a balance of performance level questions on local benchmarks. Mathematics facilitator's logs

Area of Focus # 2: __Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

14. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	To increase the rigor in middle and high school mathematics classes	Mathematics facilitator will meet with the mathematics teachers every two weeks to examine the data of Constructive Response questions and any common benchmarks that have been given.	September 2021, ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Mathematics facilitator's logs Copies of data sheets used

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

15. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	Increase student engagement in mathematics.	Provide training in the “math workshop” approach to teaching math and providing for the needs of various levels of students. Walk-throughs and observations will focus on the amount of work/talking the teacher is doing versus the amount of work/taking the students are doing Work with special educators and EL specialists to provide access & equity in curriculum, instruction, and engagement.	Initial training August 2021, ongoing August 2021	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Held, August 12th, 2021 Walk-through data and observation data. Analyze disaggregated benchmark data and student grades to determine success of specific populations, including SWD and EL.

Area of Focus # 2: Academic Achievement Mathematics

16. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	Increase student engagement in mathematics.	Review instructional strategies from the "Math Workshop" training at school level afterschool mathematics meetings and have teachers present activities/strategies that they have used during the month to engage students in the mathematics	Beginning September 2021 and ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Meeting agendas

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_

17. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	Provide remediation at the middle school and high schools to provide additional mathematical support to "bubble" students	Remediation/intervention teacher hired for Somerset Intermediate School and Crisfield Academy/High School Students identified to be assigned to the remediation/intervention teacher at Somerset Intermediate School Students identified for the "push-in" intervention teacher to work with at Crisfield Academy/High School.	August 2021, August 2021 August 2021	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Analysis of students grades on assignment, classroom assessments and local county benchmarks as well as Early Fall and Spring MCAP results of students receiving remediation/intervention. Analysis of students grades on assignment, classroom assessments and local county benchmarks as well as Early Fall and Spring MCAP results of students receiving remediation/intervention

Area of Focus # 2: _Academic Achievement Mathematics_____

18. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	Provide remediation at the middle school and high schools to provide additional mathematical support to "bubble" students	At Washington Academy/High School, Crisfield Academy/High School and Somerset Intermediate continue the after-school tutoring program. Enrichment time added time added to the schedules at Washington Academy/High School, Crisfield Academy/High School and Somerset Intermediate to provide remediation and enrichment activities for students.	School year 2021-2022	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III	Analysis of students grades on assignment, classroom assessments and local county benchmarks as well as Early Fall and Spring MCAP results for those students attending at least 4 sessions per month.

				☒	Other (funding source) Tutoring Supplemental Instruction Grant, Transitional Supplemental Instructional Additional Grant	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--

Area of Focus # 2: Academic Achievement Mathematics

19. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of special education students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	Provide remediation at the middle school and high schools to provide additional mathematical support.	At Washington Academy/High School, Crisfield Academy/High School and Somerset Intermediate continue the after-school tutoring program reaching out to special education students that need extra help. Enrichment time added time added to the schedules at Washington Academy/High School, Crisfield Academy/High School and Somerset Intermediate to provide remediation and enrichment activities for students.	School year 21-22	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☒ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III	Analysis of students grades on assignment, classroom assessments and local county benchmarks as well as Early Fall and Spring MCAP results for those students attending at least 4 sessions per month. Data will be disaggregated to monitor progress of special education and EL students.

				X Other (funding source) Tutoring Supplemental Instruction Grant, Transitional Supplemental Instructional Additional Grant	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Area of Focus # 2: __Academic Achievement Mathematics__

20. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	Combat learning loss in math for middle school students that failed two or more courses during the 20-21 school year.	Implement summer school math for students in grades 6, 7, and 8 that reinforce concepts and skills from regular curriculum. Provide devices for all students in summer school to provide equitable access to anytime, anywhere, adaptive learning. Provide door to door transportation to all students indicating a need.	Summer 21	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III	ALEKS pre and post test Device distribution list Summer School registration survey indicating need for transportation

				☐ Other (funding source) state grant for summer school	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Area of Focus # 2: Academic Achievement Mathematics

21. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
To increase the number of students in grades 6-8 who are scoring proficient or above on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) by 5%	Combat learning loss in math for middle school students that failed two or more courses during the 20-21 school year.	Provide face to face, accelerated math instruction focusing on key concepts from the 20-21 school year. Provide adaptive intervention to strengthen foundational math skills. Provide breakfast and lunch to all students. Provide wrap-around after care services that incorporate 16 different enrichment specials on alternating days (8 each day) as well as dinner.	Summer 21 Summer 21 Summer 21	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III	Pre and post tests in ALEKS intervention program Meals served report from Food Services Post Summer School staff survey

				☒	Other (funding source) State summer school grant	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--

Area of Focus #3: __Scool Quality and Student Success_____

1. Based on the analysis of local academic and non-academic data, identify the area of focus where the local school system did not meet the goals (*areas where the local school system is performing below expectations*). In the response, provide the rationale for selecting the area of focus, including the implementation of strategies and/or evidence-based interventions to support student achievement. Describe priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions to address disparities in achievement to improve student performance and measure and address learning loss. As school systems respond to area of focus #1, refer to page 13 to guide your response to address specific student groups.

- a. **Description.** Describe *Area of Focus #3* and how it aligns with your system’s educational equity policy. Describe the rational for selecting the area of focus (*up to 1,000 characters*).

The components of School Quality and Student Success that SCPS will be working on are attendance/chronic absenteeism and educational resource equity. Both of these components are critical to any school and its students’ success.

Attendance was identified as an area of concern in the 2019 LECS Plan as data revealed that most of our schools were not meeting the state attendance threshold of 94%. While attendance data for 2020 looks marginally better, we believe that the varied means of counting students present in a remote learning environment skewed that data. Further, we believe that prolonged remote learning, paired with social and emotional issues, will make attendance an even greater problem in our school system.

The reason attendance is critical is because students that miss school regularly literally miss the experiences necessary to really learn the content and skills. When students miss school the miss the teacher’s direction instruction, collaboration with peers, class discussions, and teachable moments. While they can always turn in assignments, they miss a lot of context, background, and clarification when they are not in the classroom. This negative impact is compounded when specific, low-achieving populations lose these experiences and become disconnected from learning continuity. Time honored instructional strategies that utilize repetition, applying and practicing skills learned the day before, and “growing” concepts are ineffective when students are not present for the full sequence of instruction. For students with disabilities and/or students

learning English these challenges are crippling. Ironically, these students often have higher rates of absenteeism.

Unfortunately, one reason attendance will remain an issue in the 21-22 school year is Covid-19 and quarantine absences. These events make equitable access to instructional resources more critical than ever. Access to assignments, textbooks, and research tools need to be available to all students in order to ensure educational equity through illnesses and quantines. This means that students should not fall behind in school work due to lack of assignments, tools, and instruction. Students will need digital devices, connectivity, and high quality digital resources to maintain learning during potentially extended absences.

- b. Analysis.** To support student achievement, provide an interpretation or justification for data used to identify this need (*up to 1,000 characters*).

Attendance reports that we send to the state at the end of the year reveal negative attendance trends that persist from 2019-2021. Some of these trends correspond to achievement gaps for specific student populations and others correspond to specific grade levels. Root causes vary, depending on the student group.

While county attendance overall falls below 94% most years, students in grades 7 and 9 have lower percentages consistently. Root cause analysis indicates that social and emotional issues, sometimes compounded by school climate, are likely the biggest reason for this.

More concerning are consistently low attendance trends among specific student populations already identified as having academic equity challenges, including students with disabilities & 504 plans as well as migrant and homeless/FIT students. These populations already face significant challenges to academic success so decreasing time in school compounds those existing concerns.

Discipline data was generally reported in the same manner as before, but infractions were significantly lower as direct, face to face interactions led to less behavioral issues. If students

didn't like something that another person said or did they could just logout or "ghost" the class instead of physically responding. For this reason, discipline data looks better in 2021 but that is not a reliable indicator for what we are likely to experience this year as we return face to face.

Even Mental Health data from 2020-2021 is skewed, showing a decrease in students receiving services. We know that it is extremely likely that mental health issues would increase during a global pandemic, but the data shows that less students received services during that school-year. Likely this data does not indicate improved circumstances, but rather a lack of students being able to access these services. Many students receive their services during the school day, in our buildings. While many providers moved to tele-therapy, coordinating these efforts may have been problematic for many families.

The root cause analysis done during our needs assessment revealed that many sub-issues fall under the overarching concern of attendance. If students do not attend then data shows that they are likely to perform at lower achievement levels. Behavior/discipline, homelessness, and mental health concerns are all major factors in student absences.

- c. **Identify** the root cause (s) for area of focus #3 and describe how you intend to address them (*up to 1,000 characters*).

The major root cause for attendance issues in our county is social and emotional issues. This is supported by the fact that specific populations, including students with disabilities, have higher absence rates than other groups. Groups that struggle with academics often struggle with their lack of success, making school an undesirable place to be. In other cases, students struggle emotionally due to conflicts with peers and family. Addressing absenteeism in light of social/emotional issues requires a three part approach.

First, all schools will be incorporating social and emotional learning lessons and/or frameworks into their school program in order to provide mental health support for all students. All schools will be trained on Restorative Practices and begin implementation of strategies. Other full school programs include Ron Clark Academy House System and Conscious Discipline.

Next, we need to provide targeted, individualized support for students identified as experiencing issues or situations. This step inherently requires that the school have explicit and comprehensive procedures to identify students in need of additional support. Once identified, school support personnel will implement appropriate, evidence-based interventions with these students, including the Check in Check Out Program, Second Step Program and Conscious Discipline.

Finally, schools need to provide students with strategies for physically getting to school. These strategies vary from wake-up texts to transporting students that miss the bus to laundering school uniforms for students that do not attend because they do not have clean clothes.

As a district, we intend to continue investigating the myriad of reasons for student absences. One way to do this is to interview and/or survey students as to why they are absent. These surveys may reveal logistical issues with internal transportation or other concerns or they may shed light on individual student and family circumstances.

Another district level strategy is to create publication materials on attendance procedures, statistics, concerns, etc... so that parents are more aware of the impact attendance has on student learning.

d. Identify and describe evidence-based interventions to measure and address learning loss (up to 1,000 characters).

One of the best ways to prevent student absences from school is to build a culture and climate of safety, acceptance, and learning. Two programs utilized by schools in our county that help foster this climate are Restorative Practices, Conscious Discipline, and Ron Clark's House System.

Restorative Practices is a program that focuses on maintaining and repairing human relationships instead of disciplinary measures for wrongful actions. The intent of the program is to provide students with a more empathetic mindset when involved in personal conflict. Instead of automatically dispensing a disciplinary action, an administrator or guidance counselor may discuss the reason the student's action was wrong, identify who was wronged, and discuss ways

to make it right. This enables to use empathy to feel badly for whatever wrong he/she did and to somehow compensate by doing or saying something. Forgiveness is also an integral component. This enables students to interact better socially but also keeps student discipline from progressing to time out of school and/or involvement with the legal system.

Conscious Discipline is employed by several elementary schools as a way to teach young students that consciousness, or awareness of one's own actions, is better than consequences. Through that, students learn to make connections to others and use problem solving to stay safe and well.

The House System is a community building system in which students and teachers work in random teams to support one another. The system builds in competitive challenges and community celebrations in a way that helps students feel part of the school.

The Second Step program is another program that is infused throughout school buildings. This approach is more holistic, incorporating compassion and well-being in all parts of students' and teachers' days. Hallmarks of the program include communication, cooperation, and decision making.

A more personalized program targeting students with specific needs is the Check-In Check Out Program. This pairs staff members with students and enables a physical check in to assess student well-being at the beginning and end of each day, or throughout the day as appropriate.

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

2. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.	Schools will include student attendance and/or chronic absenteeism as a focus for the year. School will be monitoring attendance weekly, using data to address student needs using staff. District will monitor attendance data at monthly A&S meetings.	School leadership teams will regularly look at attendance in instructional meetings with leadership team and staff. Administrative & Supervisory Group will review school attendance as a standing agenda item each month.	Weekly School Leadership Meetings Monthly A&S Meetings	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☒ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III	SANE documentation of meetings & attendance. We will evaluate success by successfully evaluating data trends with respect to absences and absence reasons. We will be analyzing data by school, grade, gender, ethnicity/race, economic, special education, and EL categories. Identifying patterns within will allow us to further drill down using the root cause analysis protocol to brainstorm solutions. Identifying specific student issues and barriers related to attendance will enable us to address unique student and family situations and find possible solutions/resources to address those needs. Since each school's chronic absenteeism rate averaged 20% or higher, a tentative

				☐ Other	measure of progress would be end of year chronically absent students be below 20%.
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------	---

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

3. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.	Schools will educate staff, parents, and students about new attendance policies, state accountability, graduation requirements, and the importance of good attendance.	Administrators and Guidance staff will re-train staff on monitoring student attendance, identifying issues, and working with guidance/admin to support students & families. Schools identify socio-economic, cultural, and/or logistical reasons for school absences. Using data, school will assign staff to check in/check out with students daily and	Once in the Fall with monitoring ongoing and revisit as necessary First quarter identify and assign staff to students. Revisit quarterly.	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☒ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III	We will evaluate by SANE documentation of staff meetings where these processes are reviewed. We will also evaluate monthly as administrators to determine whether teachers are regularly identifying students absences equitably and early. If not, the process will need to be revisited. Schools will monitor check in/out logs each quarter to ensure continuity and impact as well as make adjustments based on staffing changes (substitutes, etc...). If this strategy is not effective, reach out to families and LST to re-evaluate and amend based on student needs.

Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.		contact home in the event of absence. Staff will implement evidence based programs including: Check in/out, 2nd Step, Restorative Practices, House System, and Conscious Discipline. Provide professional development to appropriate staff on interventions (check in/out, 2nd Step, Restorative Practices, House System, Conscious Discipline	Ongoing Fall 2021 (CI/CO) Fall 2021 (2nd Step) Restorative Practices training will be provided to all buildings by the end of the school year. Conscious Discipline Training will be held in Summer and Fall 21	☒ Other (funding source) (funding source) Judy Center & Pre-K expansion grants	Schools will monitor referrals and suspensions monthly using disaggregated data to track trends overall as well as by specific student populations. Climate survey results & analysis should provide evidence of program success or failure.
---	--	---	---	---	--

Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.		County Publicist will create an informational infographic to be shared on website and social media, posted throughout schools, shared with parents at PTC and other family nights, and presented to students on morning announcements. Interpreters will translate informational literature for English learner families. This literature will be reviewed at all IEP meetings and sent home to parents and guardians of all special education students. Schools and county publicist will ensure all communication sites are up to date (websites, Facebook, other media platforms)	Create and post in the first quarter and spot check once in the fall and once in the spring. Updates ongoing. Ongoing		This will be evaluated by a spot-check by the county publicist of each website and Facebook account each semester to ensure current information and updates regarding attendance. The publicist will also identify where the same information can be found for EL students and families. Review attendance data of chronically absent students in leadership meetings to check for progress and/or need for additional supports and resources. Provide follow-up interviews to student and family as necessary. SANE documentation of trainings and informational literature will be saved. Ensuring all mental health resources and partnerships are listed on all school and county websites and social media pages.
---	--	--	---	--	---

Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.		Schools and county publicist will advertise local partnerships with mental health agencies and service providers. LST will refer students to truancy reduction program and file failure to send paperwork in a timely manner.	Fall and ongoing Ongoing, as appropriate		We will evaluate number of students in the truancy reduction program and track individual student data to determine impact of program on those student's attendance.
--	--	---	--	--	--

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

4. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.	Administrators and Supervisors will work with state officials to find a way to exclude Covid related quarantine absences from attendance and/or chronic absenteeism. Schools will provide incentives for outstanding attendance for staff and students through PBIS.	Student Information System Coordinator will work with Deputy Superintendent and Principals to identify from the state how to code such absences Schools will recognize outstanding attendance for staff and students with quarterly incentives (possibly using House program for schools that participate).	Ongoing Quarterly or Monthly, by school	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (<i>funding source</i>)	Collaboration between central office, the local health department, school attendance offices, MSDE, and the Student Information System Coordinator will help accurately code these absences. We will evaluate by reviewing numbers and demographics of students who receive awards. Due to Covid 19 quarantines and illnesses language will be “unexcused absences” instead of just absences so that students aren’t penalized.

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

5. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.	Increase the use of incentives and other "shout out" opportunities to recognize staff equitably. Remove logistical barriers for Families in Transition.	Building administrators keep a list of who gets recognized to ensure equity as well as making an effort to include more staff in recognitions. Provide transportation when system bus schedules do not meet needs. Provide school supplies & materials, uniforms, and laundry services to "in need" families.	Ongoing Ongoing, as identified by LST and/or student services Ongoing, as identified by LST and/or student services	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☒ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☒ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☒ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III	Building administrators will monitor individual staff recognized with a checklist throughout the year to ensure that all staff receive positive praise/feedback for their efforts. Climate survey We will evaluate the success of this program by monitoring the attendance of students identified as FIT. Constant communication with these families to re-assess and address their needs will enable us to quickly identify changes in situations and needs.

Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.	Train staff on restorative justice practices and implement in schools as an alternative to out of school suspension.	Train staff on restorative justice practices and in-house procedures for implementation. Implement Conscious Discipline at Princess Anne Elementary Trained Implement Ron Clark’s “House System” at Woodson Elementary and Crisfield Academy & High School	Training Summer of 21, implementation ongoing Ongoing Ongoing	☐ Other (<i>funding source</i>)	Track suspension data (monthly) by school building. Track discipline data by specific student populations (race, ethnicity, gender, grade, economics, EL) and do root cause analysis for any disproportional data and/or inequities. Track discipline data by specific student populations (race, ethnicity, gender, grade, economics, SWD, EL) and do root cause analysis for any disproportional data and/or inequities.
--	--	---	--	--	---

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

6. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.	Provide engaging, culturally relevant, and meaningful instruction to all students.	Provide embedded training and reflection on instructional techniques by utilizing the Student Centered Coaching model with Instructional Facilitators and teachers. Teacher mentors work with teachers to reflect on engagement and achievement.	Facilitator and Administrator training in Student Centered Coaching Model in Summer 21. Training cycles with teachers-ongoing. Ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☒ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☒ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☒ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding	Track discipline data by specific student populations (race, ethnicity, gender, grade, economics, SWD, EL) and do root cause analysis for any disproportional data and/or inequities. We will evaluate by analyzing teacher instruction, student grades, and student benchmark grades. Teachers should have more summative assessments, more re-teaching, and more re-assessing. This data should regularly be analyzed by specific students and student populations (race, ethnicity, gender, economic, EL, SWD) to identify and inequities. Review mentor and facilitator logs.

Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.		Walkthrough tools and all data/planning meetings should reference cultural sensitivity and differentiation for special student populations. Invite EL and SWD teachers to team and/or content meetings to ensure classroom instruction is equitably addressing student needs.	Ongoing Ongoing, weekly	☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (<i>funding source</i>)	We will review walkthrough tools as administrators to evaluate using an equity lens and make adjustments as necessary. We will evaluate by SANE documentation of instructional meetings.
---	--	---	---------------------------------------	---	--

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

7. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Increase school and county attendance to 94% while reducing the number of chronically absent students.	Train staff on mental health & self care, ACES for students and Trauma informed instruction to ensure staff are able to address student needs. Use lessons from Student Services staff to provide social/emotional supports necessary for student success.	Train A&S and bus drivers on mental health & self care Review mental health data for SCPS. Train teachers & staff on ACES (trauma factors) Schools use community circle time, Girls and Boys Clubs, morning homeroom, lunch bunches and classroom lessons. LST and Guidance will work with Behavior Intervention Specialists and Community Liaisons to review needs of students. Special education teachers create BIPs as necessary.	August 9 August 20 August 24 Ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Team or instructional meeting SANE documentation. SANE documentation. SANE documentation Student Services staff will work with schools to create a check-list for lessons and dates when they are delivered to ensure fidelity of program. Discipline data will be reviewed monthly in staff meetings and will be disaggregated by specific student groups (race, ethnicity, gender, economics, SWD, EL) to identify disproportionalities and identify root causes. BIP Documents EL Access Data

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

8. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Provide equitable access to educational resources, classroom assignments, and digital literacy by implementing a 1:1 device program.	Provide all students with a device to access high quality, digital, educational resources.	Distribute laptops for students in grades 1-12 with grades 3-12 taking home every day. Distribute iPads for early learners (PK3, PK4, K). Use Clever SSO to centralize as many digital resources, programs, and textbooks as possible for ease of use. Provide high quality digital resources for students to enrich student learning, including: Flocabulary, Nearpod, Newsela, Pebble Go, Math Type, and Discovery Education.	September Ongoing Ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☒ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	We will evaluate by tracking distribution lists and contacting those that have not responded to provide additional information and opportunities to acquire the device. We will monitor program usage reports as well as qualitative classroom use to determine success of each programs. We will evaluate success by ease of use from students and families. We will monitor help desk requests to IT with respect to accessing materials.

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

9. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Provide equitable access to educational resources, classroom assignments, and digital literacy by implementing a 1:1 device program.	Provide all students with a device to complete assignments anytime, anywhere (including inclement weather days, quarantine periods, etc..). Investigate purchasing, use, funding, and implementation of hot spots for students with limited or no wifi	Use enterprise version of Google Workspace to provide a range of digital tools staff and students can use to learn individually, collaboratively, remotely, synchronously or asynchronously. Purchase Wifi hotspots for students in need Develop procedures for who/how to disseminate, monitor, and collect hotspots Implement use of wifi hotspots	Ongoing Fall	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☒ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☒ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	We will monitor Google Workspace usage by individual platform to determine use as well as qualitative feedback from staff and students. We will identify students that cannot fully access due to lack of wifi and create workaround opportunities for those students, including making Google documents available offline. We will evaluate by monitoring student success for those using (mostly quarantine and other extended absences). We will evaluate by monitoring the volume and nature of help desk tickets to determine the feasibility of large scale use.

Area of Focus #3: ____ School Quality and Student Success_____

10. Using the chart below, identify goals, objectives, and strategies and/or evidence-based interventions that will be implemented to ensure progress. In your response, include how your educational equity policy impacted the selection and use of evidence-based interventions/strategies to address the need, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the use of an equity lens in the evaluation. In addition, include timeline and funding source (s). As you consider funding source, take into consideration federal, state, and other available sources.

Goals	Objectives	Identify priority strategies and/or evidence-based interventions. Describe the impact of the LSS's educational equity policy on the selection of interventions to address needs.	Timeline	Funding Source (s)	Describe how you will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention(s) / strategies. Describe how you will use an equity lens as described in the Education Equity regulation COMAR 13A.01.06 in your evaluation.
Provide equitable access to educational resources, classroom assignments, and digital literacy by implementing a 1:1 device program.	Provide all students with training on digital citizenship & literacy.	Teachers use a variety of programs to teach digital citizenship, including: NetSmartz, Everfi, Common Sense Media, and Google Be Internet Awesome.	Fall and Ongoing	☐ Title I Part A ☐ Title I Part C ☐ Title I SIG ☐ Title II Part A ☐ Title III EL ☐ Title III Immigrant ☐ Title IV Part A ☐ Title V RLIS ☐ IDEA ☐ McKinney Vento ☒ Local Funding ☐ State Funding ☐ ESSER Funds II or III ☐ Other (funding source)	Formative assessments grades will be given for elementary students in computer lab classes as will students in grades 6 and 7.

TRANSFERABILITY

OVERVIEW

Under the ESEA, LEAs may transfer funds they receive by formula under certain programs to other programs to better address State and local needs. The ESSA amended the transferability authority by changing the programs from and to which an LEA may transfer funds and removing limits on the amount of funds that may be transferred. This guidance addresses those changes.

Except as provided in this guidance, the *Guidance on the Transferability Authority* [available at www2.ed.gov/programs/transferability/finalsummary04.doc] remains applicable.

TRANSFERS BY LEAs

Updates to programs from which an LEA may transfer funds

Updated Programs from which an LEA May Transfer Funds

- Title II, Part A – Supporting effective instruction state grants
- Title IV, Part A – Student support and academic enrichment grants
(ESEA section 5103(b)(2).)

An LEA may not transfer funds it receives under any other ESEA program.

Updates to programs to which an LEA may transfer funds

Updated Programs to which an LEA May Transfer Funds

- Title I, Part A – Improving basic programs operated by LEAs
- Title I, Part C – Education of migratory children
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk
- Title II, Part A – Supporting effective instruction state grants
- Title III, Part A – State grants for English language acquisition and language enhancement
- Title IV, Part A – Student support and academic enrichment grants
- Title V, Part B – Rural education
(ESEA section 5103(b).)

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. ***Is there a limit on the amount of funds an LEA may transfer?***

No. An LEA may transfer all or a portion of funds it receives under each of the programs listed under .

2. ***What are the responsibilities of an SEA or LEA for the provision of equitable services to private school children and teachers with respect to funds being transferred?***

Excluding Title I, Part D and Title V, Part B, each program covered by the transferability authority is subject to the equitable services requirements under Title I or VIII, which may not be waived. (ESEA section 8401(c)(5).) Before an SEA or LEA may transfer funds from a program subject to equitable services requirements, it must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate private school officials. (ESEA section 5103(e)(2).) With respect to the transferred funds, the SEA or LEA must provide private school students and teachers equitable services under the program(s) to which, and from which, the funds are transferred, based on the total amount of funds available to each program after the transfer.

3. ***May an SEA or LEA transfer only those funds that are to be used for equitable services to private school students or teachers?***

No. An SEA or LEA may *not* transfer funds to a particular program solely to provide equitable services for private school students or teachers. Rather, an SEA or LEA, after consulting with appropriate private school officials, must provide equitable services to private school students and teachers based on the rules of each program and the total amount of funds available to each program after a transfer. (See ESEA section 5103(e).)

TRANSFERABILITY OF FUNDS CHART

Local school systems may transfer ESSA funds by completing this page as part of the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan submission. Receipt of this chart as part of the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan will serve as the required 30 day notice to MSDE. An LEA may transfer all or a portion of funds it receives under each of the programs listed below. The school system must consult with nonpublic school officials regarding the transfer of funds. In transferring funds, the school system must: (1) deposit funds in the original fund; (2) show as expenditure – line item transfer from one fund to another, and (3) reflect amounts transferred on expenditure reports.

Total FY 2022 Allocation	Funds Available for Transfer	\$ Amount to be transferred <u>out of each</u> <u>program</u>	Programs to which an LEA May Transfer Funds	\$ Amount to be transferred into the program
\$	Title II, Part A – Supporting effective instruction state grants		☐ Title I, Part A – Improving basic programs operated by LEAs	
			☐ Title I, Part C – Education of migratory children	
			☐ Title I, Part D – Prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk	
	\$		☐ Title II, Part A – Supporting effective instruction state grants	
			☐ Title III, Part A – State grants for English language acquisition and language enhancement	
			☐ Title IV, Part A – Student support and academic enrichment grants	
			☐ Title V, Part B – Rural education	
\$	Title IV, Part A – Student support and academic enrichment grants		☐ Title I, Part A – Improving basic programs operated by LEAs	
			☐ Title I, Part C – Education of migratory children	
			☐ Title I, Part D – Prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk	
			☐ Title II, Part A – Supporting effective instruction state grants	
	\$		☐ Title III, Part A – State grants for English language acquisition and language enhancement	
			☐ Title IV, Part A – Student support and academic enrichment grants	
			☐ Title V, Part B – Rural Education	

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools, and SIG IV Schools

Please provide responses to address schools with areas of identification

1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools.

- a. For school systems with CSI schools, as a school system how are you supporting your schools identified for low achievement? *(up to 1,000 characters)*.

N/A

- b. How are you supporting your schools identified for low graduation rate? *(up to 1,000 characters)*.

N/A

2. Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools.

- a. For school systems with TSI schools, please list schools identified as a Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools, the student groups identified in each school, and the number of students being served in each school *(up to 1,000 characters)*.

Greenwood Elementary School- Two or More Races, Special Education – 454 Students
Somerset Intermediate – Special Education- 424 Students Deal Island
Elementary –Economically Disadvantaged – 121 Students

- b. If the LEA's TSI schools conduct a root cause analysis, describe trends in the findings of the root cause analysis in the LEA's TSI schools, if there are any.

Root cause analysis was used to create the needs assessment at each school and this led to the identification of the largest challenges and equity issues at the TSI schools. The inequities identified were loss of instructional time due to the pandemic, special education, attendance, math resources, and some social/emotional concerns depending on the school. The Central Office leadership team will be ensuring that the schools leadership teams through School Improvement Planning and the instructional facilitators at each site are utilizing data consistently and evaluating the intervention plan that each team has developed. The plans have identified goals, objectives and evidence-based strategies to meet the gaps identified in developing the plan to target identified student populations. The monitoring approach will be through intentional and targeted communication, data collection, and regular adjustments to the intervention plan based on individual student data. The district will coordinate meetings with leadership teams monthly to review progress of TSI plans, review student data, and make adjustments using the data informed instruction cycle. The district will provide targeted resources (see below) using local, state and federal funds from ESSER funding, Title grants, special education grants, and Kirwan money allocation to special programs, struggling learners, and concentration of poverty grants. Since attendance, social/emotional and family involvement was identified as a gap, the teams are also adding in additional activities and strategies for student attendance, communication with parents, increasing family engagement, and better aligned ideas to help improve the deficits. Restricted funds are utilized to address the resource inequities in various capacities. The Concentration of Poverty Grant is being utilized for a Community Liaison at both Somerset Intermediate (SIS) and Greenwood Elementary (GES) to help with improving, Student Attendance, Communication with Parents and Families, and increasing Family Involvement. Similar supports are being provided for the GES feeder school, Princess Anne Primary (PAES), including a behavior interventionist, an alternative Classroom Instructor for neediest intervention, and a transitional teacher to aid in Early Childhood needs. GES also is adding an interim Dean of Students to help with behavior management and lead some of the proactive discipline strategies being put in place. GES also received an alternative classroom instructor. The ESSER 3 grant funds are providing GES, SIS, and DI with a Reading Coach to DRAFT help with small group instruction, professional development for teachers, co-teaching, and reading intervention. Title I is being used to target professional development to GES in planning and practices, along with using a consultant to help with coaching and data diagnosing. Title I funds are providing an additional Math Intervention staff member to increase the number of students receiving Tier 3 intervention. Struggling Learners funds are being used to help DIS with Reading Intervention through a Para-professional and also to do tutoring and small group assistance. GES is using these funds for a Math Interventionist to work with small group of students for additional math time. Title II funding is providing the district with mentors who are focusing a majority of their time in TSI schools.

- c. Describe the process the local school system is using to plan and implement its support for TSI schools.
(up to 1,000 characters).

SCPS is addressing special education needs at both Greenwood Elementary and Somerset Intermediate in several ways, including a more targeted, tiered approach to reading and math interventions with preference given to special education students. Central Office worked over the summer to identify scheduling (programs, times, and human resources) adjustments to provide more consistent, effective intervention plans. Additionally, Greenwood Elementary received a special education grant funding small group and/or 1:1 intervention for ELA and Math. Special Education grant is funding an additional coach to help with 5th grade math at Greenwood. Community Liaisons Support positions were added at both Greenwood and SIS to better coordinate social, emotional, and academic supports for students. A paraprofessional at each location was added to do small group instruction in intervention. Greenwood also was needing help in the student population of two or more races and professional development is being done through cultural competency and coaching with Learning Science, Inc. Deal Island Elementary acquired a reading coach in 2018-19 to provide more targeted data analysis and intervention. Additionally, the school acquired an additional paraprofessional for the 19-20 school year in order to provide smaller group instruction with a focus on the economically disadvantaged student population. Deal Island also is implementing an attendance check system as this was a deficit last year and hurt their star rating. In 2021-2022 an additional Para Professional is being added to increase the number of students receiving Tier 3 Intervention. DRAFT Additional, specific strategies are also being put in place for extra attention in the area of behavior management, family engagement, and attendance. For behavioral and management, professional development in Conscious Discipline and the Ron Clark Academy is being provided to building level administrators at several schools with implementation timelines varying. Small group intervention with scheduling blocks of time in both Reading and Math using evidence-based programs are being utilized. Schools hope to increase family engagement using parenting classes, improved communication (using text messages, newsletters, robo-calls, and emails), learning parties, and instructional collaborations. Finally, all three TSI schools have added attendance plans as part of their School Improvement plans focusing on positive incentives for both staff and students, weekly reminders about the importance of attendance, check-ins and out with the high flyers, and looking at data at least monthly to track attendance.

- d. How are you supporting TSI schools by their student group identifications?
Please provide funding sources.
(up to 1,000 characters).

Greenwood Elementary School- Two or More Races, Special Education – Title I
Concentration of Poverty ESSER Funding Early Learning Grant Transitional Supplemental
Instruction Grant Somerset Intermediate – Special Education- 424 Students Concentration

of Poverty ESSER Funding Deal Island Elementary –Economically Disadvantaged – 121
Students Transitional Supplemental Instruction Grant ESSER Funding

- e. Please provide the name(s), position, address and email address of the staff with primary responsibility for administering/coordinating the LEA's TSI program.

Tracie Bartemy- Director of Schools – tbartemy@somerset.k12.md.us
Linda R. Johnson- CFO- lrjohnson@somerset.k12.md.us
Stefanie Tawes- Title I Liaison & Family Engagement Specialist
stawes@somerset.k12.md.us

[Code of Maryland Regulations \(COMAR\) Reporting Requirements](#)
(Click the link above to access the Educational Equity regulation)

Title 13A STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Subtitle 01 STATE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Chapter 06 Educational Equity

Authority: Education Article, §2-205(c) and (h), Annotated Code of Maryland

.01 Purpose

.01 Purpose.

The purpose of this chapter is to establish as a matter of policy and priority that:

A. Each Maryland public school will provide every student equitable access to the educational rigor, resources, and supports that are designed to maximize the student's academic success and social/emotional well-being;

B. Each local school system's procedures and practices provide for educational equity and ensure that there are no obstacles to accessing educational opportunities for any student; and

C. Achievement will improve for all Maryland students and achievement gaps will be eliminated.

.02 Scope.

This chapter applies to all local school systems, the Maryland State Department of Education, and entities that provide educational services to children birth—age 21, including licensed childcare facilities and programs.

.03 Definitions.

A. In this chapter, the following terms have the meanings indicated.

B. Terms Defined.

(1) "Accountability measures" means those Maryland accountability framework indicators in place to guarantee oversight of opportunities, resources, and educational rigor that will lead to achievement for all students.

(2) "Educational equity" means that every student has access to the opportunities, resources, and educational rigor they need throughout their educational career to maximize academic success and social/emotional well-being and to view each student's individual characteristics as valuable.

(3) "Educational opportunities" means all students have access to rigorous, well-rounded academic programs and experiences that enrich their educational career and prepare them for academic and career success.

(4) "Equity lens" means that for any program, practice, decision, or action, the impact on all students is addressed, with strategic focus on marginalized student groups.

(5) "Individual characteristics" means the characteristics of each individual student, which include but are not limited to:

- (a) Ability (cognitive, social/emotional, and physical);
- (b) Ethnicity;
- (c) Family structure;
- (d) Gender identity and expression;

- (e) Language;
- (f) National origin;
- (g) Nationality;
- (h) Race;
- (i) Religion;
- (j) Sexual orientation; and
- (k) Socio-economic status.

.04 Requirements — Educational Equity in Maryland.

A. The Maryland State Department of Education shall establish systems of structure and support for school systems, students, teachers, and other stakeholders that ensure educational equity and excellence.

B. Each local school system shall develop an educational equity policy and regulations, to be reviewed every 3 years, with the goal of providing educational equity to all students.

C. The policy and regulations shall:

- (1) Be designed to create and maintain environments that are equitable, fair, safe, diverse, and inclusive;
- (2) Be based on the goal of providing educational equity for all students;
- (3) Direct the identification and utilization of resources to provide equitable access to educational opportunities and services, by among other steps, the use of disaggregated student data to analyze trends and identify gaps and equitable solutions;
- (4) Identify partnerships with the Maryland State Department of Education, local government agencies, and stakeholders to support educational equity;
- (5) Provide tailored and differentiated professional learning to build capacity for cultural responsiveness to address areas of inequity identified by the school system;
- (6) Ensure equitable access to effective teachers for all students;
- (7) Require that an equity lens be used in all staff recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion processes;
- (8) Require that an equity lens be used in reviews of staff, curriculum, pedagogy, professional learning, instructional materials, and assessment design;
- (9) Provide the access and opportunity for all students to successfully read on level by the end of grade 2;
- (10) Direct that equity be addressed in the Local Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated Strategic Plan;
- (11) Identify the school system's process for analyzing data to develop goals, objectives, strategies, and timelines for the implementation of equitable and culturally competent practices in each school;
- (12) Identify the method of evaluation to measure the effect of equitable practices in the school system and schools; and
- (13) Designate an individual responsible for the facilitation, monitoring, and implementation of the system equity initiatives within the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan.

.05 Monitoring and Reporting.

A. Each local school system shall:

- (1) Address implementation of the equity policy through its Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan;

(2) Beginning September 1, 2019, include its equity initiatives as an integrated component of its Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan; and

(3) Beginning September 1, 2020, and every 3 years thereafter, in its Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan, submit to the State Superintendent an analysis of the results of the accountability measures related to data collected on achieving equity goals and objectives that will be published and made accessible to the public.

B. The Maryland State Department of Education shall:

(1) Conduct needs assessments for the Department and local school systems;

(2) Convene the Network for Equity and Excellence in Education with representation from each local school system and other stakeholders to review statewide progress and to develop implementation and peer review guidelines for this chapter;

(3) Develop a guide for implementation of equity initiatives at the local level which includes sample components of high-quality equity policies, guidance around how to apply an equity lens within priority birth—age 21 focus areas as defined by the Department, and strategies on how to measure and evaluate the application of an equity lens; and

(4) Review and assess progress of the Department and local school systems on implementing the requirements of this chapter.

C. Beginning December 1, 2020, and every 3 years thereafter, the State Superintendent shall report progress on the implementation of this chapter to the State Board, publish the data, and make it easily accessible for public viewing.

D. Beginning in 2020 and annually thereafter, the State Board of Education and the Superintendent will recognize schools, school staff, and local school systems that demonstrate the most significant advances in promoting equity and excellence.

Administrative History:

Effective date: November 18, 2019 (46:23 Md. R. 1066)

[COMAR 13A.04.07 Gifted and Talented Education](#)

(Click the link above to access the Gifted and Talented Education regulation)

COMAR 13A.04.07.06 specifies that local school systems shall report the following information in their Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan.

1) The process for identifying gifted and talented students

The identification in Somerset County represents a three-pronged approach, which includes consideration of cognitive ability, achievement and behavioral characteristics.

The Somerset County Public Schools Gifted and Talented Identification Process follows the Maryland Identification Requirements as outlined in COMAR 13A.04.07.02 and represents a three-pronged approach, which includes consideration of cognitive ability, achievement and behavioral characteristics.

Multiple pieces of data are collected and analyzed from a variety of sources each year to identify students showing potential for performing at a remarkably high level of accomplishment as compared to other students their age.

Cognitive Ability:

All students will be administered the Naglieri Non-Verbal (NNAT-3) in the spring of their 2nd grade year. Additionally all students in Somerset County Public Schools take the NWEA-MAP as a Universal Screener in reading from Kindergarten through 10th grades and in math from Kindergarten through 5th grade.

Achievement:

Students who score at a Level 5 on the MCAP in **both** reading and math will be flagged as GT if not previously identified. Students who score at a Level 4 on the MCAP in either ELA or Math will be considered in relation to other data points collected and reviewed.

Students who receive English as a Second Language (ELL) services are expected to increase their WIDA levels by one level a year. If a student is advancing multiple levels in one year, he or she will be considered for GT services.

Behavioral Characteristics:

Students in PreK-Grade 1 will participate in a series of Primary Talent Development lessons to develop talent and to spot students who are exhibiting characteristics well above that of their peers. Teachers rate students on communication, inquisitiveness, persistence, creativity, resourcefulness, leadership and perceptiveness. A final behavioral scale (REPI Form) is tallied at the end of the first grade.

At the end of Grade 2, each teacher will complete a modified version of the Renzulli Behavioral Rating Scale on each child that she has taught over the course of the year. Characteristics such as learning, creativity, motivation, artistic ability, leadership, and communication are rated and calculated.

Admittance Meetings:

Elementary Level:

Each summer, school based teams will meet to review and approve the admission of 3rd-5th grade students who have demonstrated targeted scores on the End of Year Data collection forms, individually completed

for each child. School based committees will include the Principals, Vice Principals, the coach and facilitators in the building, if they exist, and other leadership team members that the principal designates to be part of the process.

Identified students for GT services in grades 3rd-5th, once approved by the Supervisor of GT at the District Office, will be flagged in Power School and will remain flagged until they no longer are in the top 10% of their class or fail to perform at an academically high level.

Middle School Level:

Each fall the Supervisor of GT, along with the leadership team at the middle school, will rescreen all of the students to identify those students who are in the top 10% of their class academically or demonstrating exceptional academic ability in either ELA or Math as determined by the Maryland State Assessment as well as other academic indicators. Students are flagged in Power School accordingly.

High School Level:

Each fall, the Supervisor of GT, along with the leadership team at each of the two high schools, will rescreen all 8th-12th grade students to identify those students who are in the top 10% of their class academically. If students demonstrate exceptional academic ability in either ELA or Math, as determined by the MCAP, in conjunction with other academic indicators, the students will be flagged as GT in Power School.

Changes made to the identification process during the pandemic

- Students who opted to remain virtual were unable to take the MAP assessment in reading and math as well as the NNAT 3 at the end of Grade 2. Their inability to participate in the online testing was not held against them during the selection process.
- Primary Development Units (PTD) normally are taught in April or May of each year. Due to the shut down in March of 2020, students in Pre-K through 2nd grade did not participate in their grade level unit for that year so this piece of data was not a consideration for GT identification, except for lagging data from previous years of participation for students in K-2nd grade.
- Any student struggling to maintain satisfactory grades during the virtual learning that took place during the pandemic were **not** removed from their designation as GT in Power School.
- MCAP was not administered in the spring of 2020, as planned due to the shutdown. Some high school students were able to test in the fall; however, no elementary students had state assessment data to use during the rescreening process over the summer.

2) The number of gifted and talented students identified in each school*

*The number of GT students in each school and local school system will be derived from 2020-21 Attendance Data Collections provided to the MSDE Office of Accountability

*The local school system does not need to include any information in this cell.

3) The percentage of gifted and talented students identified in the local school system in 2020-21*

In June of 2021, there were 296 students identified as Gifted and Talented in grades 3-12. The total enrollment in grades 3-12 was 1752 so the percentage of GT students **at the end** of 2021 was 16.89%. Students are formally identified at the end of 2nd grade so students in PreK-2nd grade were NOT included in the calculation, only the 1752 students in 3rd-12th grades. The exempted schools listed in question 4 were not included in the total number of students except for Ewell, which had four students above, 2nd grade enrolled at the end of the year.

4) The schools that have been exempted from the identification of a significant number of gifted and talented students and the rationale in 2020-21

There are three schools that are exempt:

1. **Somerset Technical High School:** There are no students who have this school designated as their home school. Students come from one of the two high schools to attend classes at SCTHS during the day. Students in grades 8 through 12th grade are either counted with Washington Academy and High School or Crisfield Academy and High School.

2. **Princess Anne Elementary:** Students who attend PAE are in grades Pre-K-3-1st grade and we do not begin formally identifying students until the end of 2nd grade.

3. **Ewell School:** This school has a population of 5 students, 4 of which are in grade level above 2nd grade.

5) The continuum of programs and services

The elementary program utilizes the Launch Program published by Project Lead the Way. This program empowers students to adopt a design-thinking mindset through compelling activities, projects, and problems that build upon each other and relate to the world around them. Students engage in hands-on activities in engineering and biomedical science, as they become creative, collaborative problem solvers ready to take on any challenge.

Additionally, our early childhood teachers in Pre-K through 2nd grade teach one unit from the Primary Talent Development Curriculum published on the Open Education Resource website. This will enable them to capture early evidence of gifted and talented behaviors, which will be utilized during the identification process at the end of grade 2.

Elementary

Pre-K: Project Lead the Way & PTD Units

- Living & Non Living
- Sink and Float
- Healthy Habits
- Making Sense of Our World: PTD

Kindergarten: Project Lead the Way & PTD Units

- Push & Pulls
- Structure & Function: Human Body
- Structure & Function: Exploring Design
- All About Attributes: PTD

Grade 1: Project Lead the Way & PTD Units

- Animal Adaptations
- Light & Sound
- Moon & Stars
- Thinking Big: PTD

Grade 2: Project Lead the Way & PTD Units

- The Changing Earth
- Properties of Matter
- Form and Function
- Tremendous Trees: PTD

Grade 3: Project Lead the Way Units

- Science of Flight

- Forces and Interactions
- Variations of Traits

Grade 4: Project Lead the Way Units

- Collisions
- Energy & Conversion
- Input/Output Computer Systems

Grade 5: Project Lead the Way Units

- Infection Detection
- Robotics Systems Part 1
- Robotics Systems Part 2

In grades K-5th, students have the Exact Path Program, a computer adaptive program that enables students to work on their own individualized lessons.

Middle School

Grade 6: STEM Applications

Grade 6 and 7: PLTW Medical Detectives

Students at the middle school level also had access to a computer adaptive program in math, ALEKS. This program allows them to work above their grade level if they are ready and able to do so.

High School

Advanced Placement courses are offered in a variety of subject areas. Advanced Placement courses are challenging and rigorous studies comparable to college-level work. They provide opportunities for students to take national exams and receive advanced placement in college, college credit, or both.

Career and Completer Courses: Programs including Biomedical Science, Pre-engineering, Interactive Media Production among others are offered to students with opportunities to obtain college credits.

Internships: Pre-professional students may participate in a variety of possible positions in their junior and senior year.

Dual Enrollment: Students earn both high school and college credits by enrolling in dual enrollment courses offered at both high schools. Certain restrictions may apply. Program information is available from high school counselors.

Completer Courses at the New Technical High School

Distance Learning Opportunities

Early Admission to College

Changes made to the continuum of programs and services during the pandemic

Elementary: Due to social distancing protocols and being virtual for a large portion of the year, GT students were unable to participate in GT small group instruction in grades 3-5. Classroom teachers differentiated the lessons for GT students. Primary Talent Development units were taught, as best as they could be in Pre K through 2nd grade but many students did not have scores due to absences or in the event that they chose to remain virtual.

Middle: In 6th and 7th grades, selected students participated in the Project Lead the Way course, Medical Detectives. Students in 8th grade, identified as gifted in mathematics, had the option of taking Algebra I with the possibility of earning a high school credit if they passed the course with an A or B. This was a change from previous years, in that students did not have to achieve a performance level of 4 or 5 on the MCAP assessment due to it not being administered as planned.

High School: Advanced students in high school were given the opportunity to participate in acceleration opportunities through Dual Enrollment Courses (Wor Wic Community College) or by taking Advanced Placement (AP) courses. Fewer students took the end of course assessment due to the interruption of their education over the course of the year. Additionally, internship opportunities were limited over the course of the year.

6) Data-informed goals, targets, strategies, and timelines for 2021-22.

Goals must be established using the equity lens as defined in COMAR 13A.01.06, Educational Equity. Consult with your local school system equity point of contact.

Goal: Increase the number of minority GT students taking advanced level courses at the secondary level for the 21-22 school year.

Target(s)	Strategy(ies)	Timeline(s)
Minority students identified as GT in grades 9-12	Staff at our two high schools will meet with minority students who are currently designated as GT to ensure that they are enrolled in challenging courses for the year.	Fall 2021

Goal: To improve upon the opportunities provided to secondary gifted and talented students beginning at the middle school level.

Target(s)	Strategy(ies)	Timeline(s)
Students identified at GT in grades 6-12	Meet with guidance counselors and administrators at the middle and high school level to ensure that all GT students are rescreened and offered	Sept. 2021-June 2022

	advanced opportunities beyond their regular core courses.	
Target(s) Students identified at GT in grades 6-12	Strategy(ies) Research additional opportunities for enrichment for secondary GT identified students.	Timeline(s) Fall 2021
Goal: To improve upon the collection of data for primary age students leading up to formal identification at the end of grade 2.		
Target(s) Pre K-2 nd Grade	Strategy(ies) Meet with primary teachers to review how to collect, store and house the appropriate artifacts for the units they teach.	Timeline(s) February-March 2022

[COMAR 13A.07.01 Comprehensive Teacher Induction and Mentoring](#)
(Click the link above to access the Teacher Induction and Mentoring Education regulation)

**Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program
Title 13A STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Subtitle 07 SCHOOL PERSONNEL**

Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program

Section A- Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program (CTIP) Team Members

1. Please list the supervisor(s) of your CTIP. Include the names, positions, and responsibilities of those individuals.
2. Please provide information on your mentors.

Type of Mentor	Amount
Full Time Mentors	2
Part Time Mentors	None
Full Time Teachers	None
<i>Total Number of Mentors</i>	2

3. Please provide the total number of probationary teachers being served by your CTIP. Currently, there are 43 first year teachers, 20 second year teachers, and 25 third year teachers totaling 88 new/non-tenured teachers.
4. Please provide the average mentee to mentor ratio (example: 15:1). The mentee to mentor ratio in Somerset County Public Schools is 45:1.

Section B- Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program Training and Supervision

1. Please describe the training that your mentors receive before and during their tenure as a mentor. When does this training occur? What is the content?

Currently, our two district-based teacher mentors are taking a Mentoring 101 course designed by the Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring. This “course” is completed in the Fall and follows a syllabus and bi-weekly meetings to discuss course content. The selected text is *The 21st Century Mentor’s Handbook: Creating a Culture for Learning* by Paula Rutherford.

The SCPS Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring, two district-mentors, and 14 instructional coaches/facilitators have signed up to take the two MSDE courses being offered in 2021-2022. The first course, Supporting Teachers: A Primer for New Mentors and Coaches, is for recently-appointed mentors and coaches who are looking to build their capacity to effectively support their teachers. Topics addressed in the course include: coaching roles, coaching vision, components of trust, coaching stances, and coaching cycles. The second course, Shrinking the Change:

Leveraging Feedback to Improve School Culture explores the neuroscience behind the human's response to feedback, reflect on their own coaching beliefs, implement new feedback strategies, and analyze their school's feedback culture.

Meetings will be held at the end of each week between the Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring and the two district mentors. The contents of these meetings include walkthrough data and information about new/non-tenured teachers' progress including instructional strengths and areas of need. Articles and publications pertaining to the art/science of coaching from sources including ASCD, Edutopia, NEA, and universities is shared and discussed so that mentors have a variety of coaching ideas and strategies to work with each individual new/non-tenured teacher.

At the time of this writing, the Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring is submitting a teacher collaborative grant proposal. The grant proposal includes a partnership with the University of Maryland Eastern Shore to design virtual mentoring modules that can be used to train current and future mentors. The grant proposal also includes a partnership with Salisbury University to provide mentors with professional development on the teacher inquiry paradigm. Both of these professional development opportunities will provide SCPS mentors with the mentoring methods and approaches used at the two local universities.

2. Please describe how school system administrators are trained on the roles and responsibilities of mentors. When does this training occur? What is the content?

A short presentation is given to system administrators during the district summer administrators and supervisors meeting. The mentor teacher memo detailing their roles and responsibilities is distributed and reviewed at the meeting so that all county leaders are aware of the roles that mentor teachers assume. Below is snapshot of the information covered:

Mentors should be tenured, exemplary, veteran educators trained and willing to assume the responsibility of supporting colleagues. The key to this relationship is meeting the needs of the new educators without compromising mentor effectiveness. Below is a list of mentor expectations and guidelines for the 2021-2022 school year.

- Mentors should work 7:15am-2:45pm or 8:15am-3:45pm. If a mentor is absent from work s/he should call/text/email the Supervisor of Instruction & Mentoring at 443-365-4632 by 6:30am and put his/her absence into AESOP. Mentors should also communicate their absence with any new teachers [and other staff] who the mentor was scheduled to meet with on the day of absence.
- Mentors should maintain a mentor log on the 2021-22 Mentor Excel Log.
- The mentor log summarizes the daily contacts and documents the time spent in mentoring activities, the type of activities, and the type of support needed/given during the mentoring relationship.
- Mentors should submit their Excel logs on a quarterly basis.
- Mentors should consider keeping a running narrative or summary of their meetings with mentees. This can be done on a word document or in a google document.
- Mentors will be trained. Training will include a locally run semester long course titled "Mentoring 101" utilizing the resource *21st Century Mentor's Handbook* by Paula Rutherford with bi-weekly classes held from 1:00-2:45pm.

- The responsibility for the mentoring relationship should not be placed on the shoulders of the educator new to SCPS. Mentors should initiate and maintain weekly/monthly contact with the 1st-3rd year educators.
- The expectation is that mentors should spend, at the minimum:
 - one hour every TWO (2) weeks with all 1st year educators;
 - one hour every MONTH with all 2nd year educators; and
 - one hour every quarter with all 3rd year educators.
- These hours may vary by time of year and needs of each new educator; however, weekly or bi-weekly contact is strongly recommended.
- Mentors and their new educators need dedicated time together. Mentors are expected to find creative ways of providing this time.
- Mentor and new educator professional development workshops also are offered quarterly during the year from 3:30pm-6:30pm on the following dates:
 - Monday, September 27, 2021
 - Monday, December 13, 2021
 - Monday, February 28, 2022
 - Monday, May 23, 2022
- Mentors are asked to encourage their mentee to participate in professional development workshops that are offered throughout the year.
- Mentors are advised not to discuss aspects of the mentor relationship with anyone. Even positive remarks about the mentor relationship could break the bond of confidentiality/trust between mentor and mentee.
- Mentors should assess the different needs of each mentee.
- New educators come to SCPS with a variety of backgrounds and needs. Many teachers new to SCPS have extensive classroom experience, some have limited experience elsewhere, and some are new to SCPS and are new to teaching. Mentors should be aware of these differences and address the different needs of each individual.
- The mentor may serve as a coach and may do informal observations, but this should not replace the role of administrators, supervisors, or facilitators in providing support to new staff. The mentor relationship complements these roles and is an additional avenue for the support of new teachers. The mentor teacher does not have a role in the evaluation of the new teacher.
- Mentors should provide curriculum support.
- The mentor is encouraged to provide information to new educators on current best practices in teaching, classroom management and discipline, culture of the school/system, and information on how to access other county supports. Mentors should utilize resources provided for them.
- The following are all resources available to SCPS school-based mentors:
 - Support of the school administration
 - Utilization of math/reading facilitators

- Ongoing training sessions for mentors through SCPS quarterly professional development
- Arranging collaborative walkthroughs with mentees, facilitators, and mentors
- Classroom visits including:
 - New educator visits the mentor teacher's classroom;
 - Mentor arranges for the new educator to visit another exemplary teacher;
 - Mentor and new educator together visit the classroom of another exemplary teacher;
 - Mentor visits the new educator's classroom; and/or
 - Mentor and new educator visit another school.

Note: Demonstration teacher, mentor, and new educator should agree on the logistics of the visit, decide on a focus, and identify a time for debriefing and reflection.

3. Who evaluates the efficacy of individual mentors? What are the criteria and how is the data collected?

The Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring formally evaluates the two mentor-teachers at the end of the year. The Supervisor of Mentoring uses different data points to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher mentors. First, surveys are sent to the new/non-tenured teachers at the end of semester 1 and semester 2 to gather qualitative evidence. This evidence will provide insight on new/non-tenured teachers' perceptions of the quality of the teacher mentoring program and the efficacy of the teacher mentors' assistance. This information will be shared with the teacher mentors at the time of the evaluation. Second, formal observations of mentor-mentee conferences/meetings will be conducted by the Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring. A rubric will be used and a number of indicators will be identified. These indicators include the meeting's purpose, objectivity, followed a set of ground rules, collaborative and respectful conversations, tone, and other indicators. Finally, specific domains and indicators from the Danielson Framework for Teaching will be identified for each new/non-tenured teacher. As mentioned previously, the Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring will identify indicators within this rubric to communicate with building administration where new/non-tenured teachers need assistance. Once these domains and indicators are identified, they can be tracked to see if improvements are made over the course of the year due to support being given by teacher mentors, instructional coaches, and building administration.

Section C- Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program Overview

1. Please describe your initial orientation process and the ongoing professional learning that is offered to probationary teachers throughout the school year.

In August, all new teachers are on boarded during a three-day teacher induction program. On the first day of the program, new teachers receive a welcome from the executive leadership team and all county supervisors. New teachers meet with the Supervisor of Instruction and Mentoring and with their two-district based teacher mentors. Time is allocated to review the teacher observation and evaluation tools, student learning objectives, and standards-based lesson planning with a focus on backwards design. They have lunch with their principals and receive a welcome message from the SCPS Teacher of the Year. New teachers meet at their respective schools with their school-based instructional leadership team to tour their schools, review the student and staff handbooks, get an overview of the school culture and begin working in their classrooms.

On the second day of the induction program, new teachers receive training in trauma-informed practices, ACES, and mental health. Attention is also placed on learning supports for students and the policies and practices pertaining to mandated reporting. The Human Resource

department reviews a plethora of information including how to operate the absence management system, specific district policies, direct deposit payments, withholdings, and investments, and the employee wellness program. The Somerset Education Association shares information about union membership and provides lunch to our new teachers. New teachers finish their day taking bus tours of the communities in which the schools exist.

On the third day of the induction program, new teachers receive training from the student information coordinator on all the different facets of PowerSchool including how to take attendance, put grades in their gradebook, and accessing student demographic data. New teachers are exposed to issues of equity and unconscious bias from our county equity coordinator and discuss a variety of topics related to multi-cultural approaches to planning lessons and presenting sensitive topics. New teacher end their induction with a discussion with a teacher panel consisting of master teachers and more novice teachers who have experienced a lot of success.

New teachers also receive additional formal professional development four times throughout the school year (once per quarter). In 2021-22, topics that will be covered include: 1) IEPs/504s/LST and differentiated instruction; 2) Student Engagement; 3) Student Assessment and Achievement; and 4) Student Voice and Autonomy. Ongoing, informal professional development is differentiated to meets the needs of each individual new/non-tenured teacher.

2. Please describe what opportunities probationary teachers have for observation, informal feedback, and co-teaching with his/her mentor or peers.

Currently, each probationary teacher is assigned a district-based mentor. The district-based mentor to probationary teacher ratio is 44:1 making it challenging for mentors to service their caseload of probationary teachers daily. However, the two district-based mentors, and the Supervisor of Mentoring, keep weekly schedules to ensure that all probationary teachers have allocated time to meet, co-plan, co-teach, and be observed. Personal, face-to-face contact is made with all first year teachers once a week. All second year teachers see their mentors once every two weeks. All third year probationary teachers see their mentors once every three weeks. Furthermore, the two district-based mentors employ a non-evaluative walk through form providing objective feedback to probationary teachers. Follow up conferences are held after mentors conduct their walkthroughs. Conversations are organic and suggestions are offered when appropriate.

Each SCPS school employs two instructional facilitators/coaches- one for ELA/Social Studies and one for Math/Science. These individuals are trained in student centered coaching and work with all teachers in mini- and full-coaching cycles where co-planning and co-teaching occur. Coaching cycles require that planning occur to unpack standards of learning, construct student-friendly learning targets, co-teach, and assess student learning. This is a service that is provided to all probationary teachers in addition to the mentoring services they receive from their district-based mentor. In our elementary and middle schools, teachers plan together on teams or within their content department which provides further supports for our probationary teachers. Team and department leaders often serve as quasi-mentors who assist probationary teachers with specific day-to-day questions and needs.

3. How are the needs and concerns of new teachers assessed and addressed through ongoing supports, informal feedback, and follow-up?

Informal observations during walkthroughs and learning walks help mentors generate a starting point for addressing the needs and concerns of new teachers. Conversations with instructional coaches/facilitators who are in the buildings with the new/non-tenured teachers also provides additional information that can be used to isolate key areas where new/non-tenured teachers may need assistance. New/non-tenured teachers are also sent quarterly surveys to “check the temperature” and drill down what each individual teacher is concerned about or needs assistance with.

As a tool for professional learning, new teachers benefit from observing the instructional process in other classrooms throughout the school and county. District-based mentors schedule a pre-observation conference to determine the needs of each new/non-tenured teacher. The Mentor will then have an idea and a colleague can be selected that would best suit the needs of the new teacher. The Mentor coordinates with the instructional coach/facilitator and the building level administrator in charge of substitutes to arrange coverage during the peer classroom visits. The Mentor then accompanies the new/non-tenured teacher during the peer visit pointing out valuable observations for application.

After the observation the Mentor leads a post conference meeting discussing what was observed and plans for next steps and implementation of practices observed.

The Mentor oversees the progress of the new teacher by making daily and weekly informal check-ins, learning walks, and classroom “observations with feedback to assist in improving instruction. The feedback is clearly defined through the content standards, instructional best practices which will include all county professional learning initiatives. The Mentor is dedicated to increasing equitable instructional practices that will increase student achievement.

4. Please describe how your district uses action plans and relevant data to improve the instructional practice of your probationary teachers.

Below are the needs, goals, objectives, and strategies to improve the instructional practice of our probationary teachers. The information below has been extracted from the Somerset PDS Project that is being created, in part, to assist new/non-tenured teachers.

Need to be addressed: With the current teaching shortage, there are not enough teachers to fill the vacancies in Somerset County. Often-times, substitutes, full-time substitutes, and paraprofessionals are put into classrooms to deliver instruction. These individuals are not certified, do not hold degrees, and lack training in basic pedagogy. These individuals need support from district- and school-based leadership. They need professional development in topics like: lesson planning; classroom management; and student privacy.
Goal #1 (related to need): By June 2024, 45% of SCPS teachers, new/non-tenured teachers, support staff, and teacher candidates will be participating in one or more components of the Somerset PDS Project (21st Century Practicum, Professional Development Program, and/or Peer Assistance and Review Program).
Objective (marking progress toward Goal #1): 1.2 Each year, an increase of 15% of SCPS teachers, new/non-tenured teachers, and support staff will participate in the Somerset PDS Project’s Professional Development Program by June 2022.
Strategy #5 (supporting Goal #1): 1.4 SCPS will provide teachers, paraprofessionals, and other support staff advancement and professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on leadership opportunities, multiple career paths, and pay differentiation. This is

supported through the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), Maryland Education Article 6-123, Maryland House Bill 1300 Blueprint for Maryland's Future, and the Teacher Collaborative Grant Program.
Activity #1 (supporting Strategy #5): SCPS will offer professional growth opportunities for long-terms substitutes, paraprofessionals, new/non-tenured and tenured teachers by offering credit-bearing undergraduate and graduate level courses on SCPS campuses to different staff looking to obtain coursework for professional advancement. By offering courses on SCPS campuses, we anticipate more staff interest due to the limited commute time.
Milestones to document progress toward Goal #1: 1.4.1 Each year, an increase of 5% of SCPS teachers will enroll in professional development courses taught by SU faculty at the Somerset Technical High School. 1.4.2 Each year, an increase of 5% of SCPS new/non-tenured teachers will enroll in professional development courses taught by SU faculty at the Somerset Technical High School. 1.4.3 Each year, an increase of 5% of SCPS support staff will enroll in professional development courses taught by SU faculty at the Somerset Technical High School.
Need to be addressed: With the current teacher shortage, there are not enough teachers to fill the vacancies in Somerset County. Often-times, substitutes, full-time substitutes, and paraprofessionals are put into classrooms to deliver instruction. These individuals are not certified, do not hold degrees, and lack training in basic pedagogy. These individuals need support from district- and school-based leadership. They need professional development in topics like: lesson planning; classroom management; and student privacy.
Goal #1 (related to need): By June 2024, 45% of SCPS teachers, new/non-tenured teachers, support staff, and teacher candidates will be participating in one or more components of the Somerset PDS Project (21st Century Practicum, Professional Development Program, and/or Peer Assistance and Review Program).
Objective (marking progress toward Goal #1): 1.5 By 2024, SCPS will decrease new/non-tenured teacher attrition rates by 9%.
Strategy #6 (supporting Goal #1): 1.5 SCPS will provide teacher candidates, new teacher, principal, or other school leader induction and mentoring programs that are designed to improve classroom instruction and student learning and achievement; and increase the retention of effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.
Activity #1 (supporting Strategy #5): SCPS will offer professional growth opportunities for long-terms substitutes, paraprofessionals, new/non-tenured and tenured teachers by offering credit-bearing undergraduate and graduate level courses on SCPS campuses to different staff looking to obtain coursework for professional advancement. By offering courses on SCPS campuses, we anticipate more staff interest due to the limited commute time.
Milestones to document progress toward Goal #1: 1.3 SCPS will conduct a three day teacher induction program over the summer. Additionally, SCPS will conduct four (quarterly) after-school professional development sessions for all new/non-tenured teachers and administrators. Teacher candidates will be invited to participate in the induction program and after-school professional development.

Section D- Comprehensive Teacher Induction Programmatic Evaluation

1. Please explain how the efficacy of your mentoring program will be evaluated. Be sure to include how you plan to use teacher evaluation data, teacher perception data, and new teacher retention data.

Below are a series of evaluation questions that have been drafted for 2021-2022. The evaluation questions are designed to address the SCPS Induction Program's efficacy and the professional development that is scheduled to be conducted this year.

Evaluation Questions:

1. To what extent do new/non-tenured teachers participating in the Somerset PDS Project's Professional Development Program?
2. To what extent do new/non-tenured teachers participate in the Somerset PDS Project's Peer Assistance and Review Program?
3. To what extent did SCPS reduce the attrition rate for new/non-tenured teachers?
4. Are outcomes, objectives, and goals achieved?
5. Are objectives above being met? If so, how? If not, why not?
6. Are activities conducted with the target population (new/non-tenured teachers)?
7. Are there other populations SCPS should be working with to develop potential teachers?
8. Is the target population (new/non-tenured teachers) adequately reached by and involved in activities?
9. How does the target population (new/non-tenured teachers) interact with the program?
10. What do they think of the services? Are they satisfied?
11. How is the induction program functioning from administrative, organizational, and/or personnel perspectives?
12. Are the project/program services/activities beneficial to the target population (new/non-tenured teachers)?
13. Do they have negative effects (e.g. Is the target population (new/non-tenured teachers) affected by the program equitably or according to the evaluation plan)?
14. Is the problem that the program intends to address alleviated?

To assess the overall efficacy of the program, several data points will be taken:

- Quarterly surveys of new/non-tenured teachers' needs and perceptions;
- End-of-year surveys of new/non-tenured teachers' perceived benefits from the teacher induction program;
- End-of-year surveys of building level principals' perceptions of the teacher induction program's ability to assist; support; and retain new/non-tenured teachers;
- Retention Data from Human Resources Department;
- New/non-tenured professional development SANE documents;
- Isolated domains and indicators (e.g. classroom management, lesson coherency, student assessments, etc.) from the Danielson Teaching Framework observation rubric;
- Student performance data and suspension rates; and
- Teacher attendance rates.

The information data will be collected, analyzed, and reported to all district stakeholders.

Appendices

- Appendix A: Title I, Part D
- Appendix B: Title I, Part D Cover Letter
- Appendix C: Title I, Part D Application
- Appendix D: Title II, Part A Application
- Appendix E: Title III, Part A Application
- Appendix F: Title IV, Part A Application
- Appendix G: Fine Arts Application
- Appendix H: Equitable Services to Private Schools Under ESSA Section
- Appendix I: Contact Information for MSDE Program Managers
- Appendix J: SY 2020-2021 Network for Equity and Excellence in Education
- Appendix K: Posting and General Submission Procedures
- Appendix M: Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan Points of Contact

Appendix H: Equitable Services to Private Schools under ESSA

This section applies to Title I, Part A and programs covered Title VIII, including:

- Title I, Part A Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies
- Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program
- Title II, Part A: Preparing, Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers, Principals and Other School Leaders
- Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

EQUITABLE SERVICES TO STUDENTS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Services and other benefits to private school students must be secular, neutral, and non-ideological (Sec. 8501(a)(2)), must be provided in a timely manner, and must be equitable in comparison to services and other benefits for public school children, teachers, and other educational personnel (Sec. 8501(a)(3)(A)). To ensure equity and opportunities for participation of nonpublic schools, the Maryland State Department of Education's Equitable Services Ombudsman is responsible for monitoring and enforcing the requirements relating to the participation of children in private schools.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED IN APPENDIX H:

X Consultation timeline

X Signed Affirmation of Consultation Forms

X Complaint procedures/dispute resolution process for covered programs under ESSA

EQUITABLE SERVICES ALLOCATIONS:

Under sections 1117(a)(4)(C) and 8501(a)(4)(C) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, an SEA is required to annually provide notice of the amount of funds each LEA has determined are available for equitable services under applicable ESEA programs. Please enter each allocation based on the individual federal program for the current fiscal year.

Equitable Services Allocations:	Title I-A	Title I-C	Title II-A	Title III-A	Title IV-A	Title IV-B
FY 22 Allocations:	0	0	0	0	0	0

ATTESTATIONS - EQUITABLE SERVICES (Sec. 8501(a)):

X All documents are included in Appendix H for Title I-A, Title I-C, Title IIA, Title III, and Title IVA-B.

☐ Consultation timeline for each program

☐ Signed Affirmation of Consultation Forms

☐ Complaint procedures/dispute resolution process for covered programs under ESSA

X The LEA provided the equitable share allocation for each federal program as applicable.

X The LEA maintains records regarding the schools that participate each year and number of participants.

X The LEA ensures that private schools are provided with timely and meaningful consultation to participate in equitable services.

X The LEA ensures that all participating private schools are **not-for-profit** private schools, church-exempt schools, and/or publicly funded schools and verified on [MSDE's Nonpublic Schools Approval Webpage](#).

LEA Equitable Services Point of Contact
(please type or print)

Title

Local Educational Agency

Email Address

**Appendix I: Title I, Part A
2021-2022 MSDE Grant Program Managers**

Supervisor and School System	Program	School System	Name	E-mail
Shanna Edmonds	Title I, Part A	Anne Arundel	Melissa Surgeon	melissa.surgeon@maryland.gov
ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY		Frederick		
FREDERICK COUNTY		Charles		
		Dorchester		
		Somerset		
		Wicomico		
		Worcester		
CHARLES COUNTY		Title I, Part A		
	Harford			
	Garrett			
	Harford			
	Howard			
	Queen Anne’s			
	Charles	Hazar Biddle	hazar.biddle@maryland.gov	
Migrant Education	Charles	Tiffany Knight	tiffany.knight@maryland.gov	
Gail Dickson	Title I, Part A	Allegany	Luke Millon	luke.dillon@maryland.gov
CALVERT COUNTY		Cecil		
		Washington		
		MONTGOMERY COUNTY	Baltimore	Barbara Scherr
Caroline				
Garrett				
Talbot				
Prince George’s			Tricia Crafton	
Kent County				
The SEED School				
Baltimore City				
ST.MARY’S COUNTY	Early Literacy	St. Mary’s	Devorah Nathan	devorah.nathan@maryland.gov

Appendix J – SY 2020-2021 Network for Equity and Excellence in Education

Local School System	Name	E-mail
Allegany County	John Logsdon, Jr.	John.logsdonjr@acpsmd.org
Allegany County	Sarah Welsh	Sarah.welsh@acpsmd.org
Anne Arundel County	Lorenzo Hughes	lhughes@aacps.org
Anne Arundel	Meisha Walker	mtwalker@aacps.org
Baltimore City	Tracey Durant	tldurant@bcps.k12.md.us
Baltimore County	Jennifer Audlin	jaudlin@bcps.org
Calvert County	Sandy Walker	walkers@calvertnet.k12.md.us
Caroline County	Nicole Fisher	fisher.nicole@ccpsstaff.org
Carroll County	Judith Jones	jijones@carrollk12.org
Cecil County	James Zimmerman	jzimmer@ccps.org
Charles County	Kimberly Hairston	khairston@ccboe.com
Dorchester County	Regina Teat	teatr@dcpsmd.org
Frederick County	Toby Heusser	Tobin.Heusser@fcps.org
Frederick County	Eric Louers-Phillips	Eric.Phillips@fcps.org
Garrett County	Brooks Elliot	brooks.elliott@garrettcountyschools.org
Harford County	Paula Stanton	paula.stanton@hcps.org
Howard County	Kevin Gilbert	kevin_gilbert@hcpss.org
Howard County	Razia Kosi	razia_kosi@hcpss.org
Kent County	Angela Holocker	aholocker@kent.k12.md.us
Montgomery County	Troy Boddy	Troy_Boddy@mcpsmd.org
Prince George's County	David Reese, Jr.	david.rease@pgcps.org
Prince George's County	Jerenze Campbell	jcampbel@pgcps.org
Queen Anne's County	Matt Evans	matt.evans@qacps.org
St. Mary's County	Adrianne Dillahunt	amdillahunt@smcps.org
St. Mary's County	Kelly Hall	kmhall@smcps.org
St. Mary's County	Wauchille Adams	wdadams@smcps.org
St. Mary's County	Charlottis Woodley	cmwoodley@smcps.org
Somerset County	Tom Davis	tdavis@somerset.k12.md.us
Somerset County	Tracey Cottman	tcottman@somerset.k12.md.us
Talbot County	Helga Einhorn	heinhorn@talbotschools.org
Washington County	Allison Smith	SmithAll@wcps.k12.md.us
Wicomico County	Ruby Brown	rubrown@wcboe.org
Worcester County	Michael Browne	MLBrowne@worcesterk12.org

Appendix K – Contact information for MSDE Program Managers

Program	Contact	Telephone	E-Mail
Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan Requirements	Michelle Daley	410-767-0359	michelle.daley@maryland.gov
Title I, Part A- Improving Basic Programs	Paula Harris	410-767-0321	paulam.harris@maryland.gov
Title I, Part D - Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk	Melissa Surgeon	410-767-0300	melissa.surgeon@maryland.gov
Title II, Part A - Preparing, Training and Recruiting High-Quality Teachers and Principals	Cecilia Roe	410-767-0574	cecilia.roe@maryland.gov
Title III, Part A English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement	Ilhye Yoon	410-767-0714	ilhye.yoon@maryland.gov
	Heather Sauers	410-767-0871	Heather.sauers@maryland.gov
Title IV, Part A Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants	Jonathan Turner	410-767-0288	Jonathan.turner@maryland.gov
Fine Arts	Lillian Jacobs		lillian.jacobson1@maryland.gov
	Alysia Lee	410-767-0352	alysia.lee@maryland.gov
Equitable Services	Barbara Scherr	410-767-0291	barbara.scherr@maryland.gov
Special Education Programs	Anne Wheeler	410-767-0254	anne.wheeler@maryland.gov
Finance Requirements	Donna Gunning	410-767-0757	donna.gunning@maryland.gov
Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)	Mary Gable	410-767-0275	mary.gable@maryland.gov

Appendix L – General Submission Procedures Posting and Submission Procedures

The 2021 Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan is shared with the local school system points of contact via Google Drive. The Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan submission procedures include two submission options: Google Drive **OR** hard copy via U.S. mail.

General Submission Procedures

Date	2021 Submission Procedures
October 15 DRAFT SUBMISSION	<u>ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION</u>- Using Google Drive, local school systems may submit their 2021 Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan. This electronic submission should include the plan and the Excel workbooks containing Finance, and Data sections. <u>The Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan document should be submitted in PDF format. Excel workbooks should be submitted in Excel format.</u> Google Drive Submission Submit the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan using the local school system’s designated folder Google Drive. <u>The Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic should be submitted the plan in PDF format (in its entirety).</u> The Excel workbook containing the Finance and Data Section worksheets should be submitted as separate documents in Excel format. Signatures are not required for the draft October 15, 2021 submissions. Hardcopy ▪ Send two hardcopies, one original and one copy. Hard copies should be double-sided and three-hole-punched: <u>Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan, Finance Sections, and Data Sections.</u> ▪ Avoid sending documents in binders.

Date	2021 Submission Procedures
November 15 FINAL SUBMISSION	Google Drive Submission Submit the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan using the local school system's designated folder on Google Drive. ▪ The Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan should be submitted in PDF format (in its entirety). The Excel workbook containing the Finance and Data Section worksheets should be submitted as separate documents in Excel format. Each signed C125 should be attached at the end of each grant application. School systems may use <u>one</u> of the following options to sign their 2021 Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan and C125s. The required signed sections of the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan and C125s are accepted electronically using blue ink. The signing options are: 1. e-signature platform (e.g. Adobe Sign, DocuSign, etc.); 2. Email confirmation in lieu of an e-signature platform. If the local school system does not use an electronic signature platform, the signer must send an email to the MSDE grant POC indicating the appropriate person has approved the document); or 3. Manually sign required areas of the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan and C125s. If signed and scanned documents are not readily identifiable as an original signature, then electronic versions <u>cannot</u> be accepted. Original signatures are required for the final November 15, 2021 submission. Hardcopy ▪ Send two hardcopies, one original and one copy. Hard copies should be double-sided and three-hole-punched: <u>Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan, Finance Sections, and Data Sections.</u> ▪ Avoid sending documents in binders. <u>The final submission of the Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plans must contain original signatures in all areas where required (see signature requirement above).</u> • All Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan hard copies and signed original C-125s should be sent via U.S. mail to: Dr. Michelle Daley Division of Student Support, Academic Enrichment, and Educational Policy Maryland State Department of Education 200 West Baltimore Street (4th Floor) Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Appendix M- Local ESSA Consolidated Strategic Plan Points of Contact

Local Education Agency	Name	E-mail
Allegany County	Kim Green	kim.green@acpsmd.org
Anne Arundel County	Gail McCrary	gpmccrary@aacps.org
Anne Arundel	Sheila McEwan	smcewan@aacps.org
Baltimore City	Kasey L. Mengel	kmengel@bcps.k12.md.us
Baltimore County	Eric Minus	eminus@bcps.org
Baltimore County	John Staley	jstaley@bcps.org
Baltimore County	Christine Faya	cfaya@bcps.org christinefaya@gmail.com
Calvert County	Susan Johnson	johnsons@calvertnet.k12.md.us
Calvert County	Susan Johnson	johnsons@calvertnet.k12.md.us
Caroline County	Lindsey McCormick	mccormick.lindsey@ccpsstaff.org
Carroll County	Jason Anderson	jaander@carrollk12.org
Carroll County	Michelle Caples	mdcable@carrollk12.org
Carroll County	Drew Sexton	acsexto@carrollk12.org
Carroll County	Kendra Hart	kyhart@carrollk12.org
Cecil County	Wes Zimmerman	wzimmerman@ccps.org
Charles County	Amy Hollstein	ahollstein@ccboe.com
Dorchester County	Regina Teat	teatr@dcpsmd.org
Dorchester County	Michael Collins	collinsm@dcpsmd.org
Frederick County	Doreen Bass	doreen.bass@fcps.org
Frederick County	Natalie Gay	natalie.gay@fcps.org
Garrett County	Nicole Miller	nicole.miller@garrettcountyschools.org
Harford County	Sara Saacks	sara.Saacks@hcps.org
Howard County	Timothy Guy	tguy@hcpss.org
Kent County	Gina Jachimowicz	gjachimowicz@kent.k12.md.us
Montgomery County	Judy Averbach	judith_g_averbach@mcpsmd.org
Montgomery County	Stacy Gray	stacy_e_gray@mcpsmd.org
Prince George's County	Veronica Harrison	veronica.harrison@pgcps.org
Queen Anne's County	Julie Forbes	julie.forbes@qacps.org
Queen Anne's County	Renee Wolff	renee.wolff@qacps.org
Somerset County	Tom Davis	tdavis@somerset.k12.md.us
Somerset County	Tracie Bartemy	tbartemy@somerset.k12.md.us
Somerset County	Jill Holland	jholland@somerset.k12.md.us
St. Mary's County	Jeffrey Maher	jamaher@smcps.org
Talbot County	Helga Einhorn	heinhorn@tcps.k12.md.us
Washington County	Gary Willow	WilloGar@wcps.k12.md.us
Washington County	Michele Jakoby	jakobmic@wcps.k12.md.us
Wicomico County	Bonnie Ennis	bennis@wcboe.org
Worcester County	Natalie Bennett	nlbennett@worcesterk12.org

APPENDIX N: ADJUSTMENTS MADE TO FINAL SUBMISSION

Page	Addition/adjustment made
9	Explanation of Math ALEKS data 6-8 Executive Summary
10	EL Goals added to Executive Summary
12	SEL Program explanation added to Executive Summary
23-55	Added ALEKS data for Math grades 6, 7, and 8
79	Added new goals for SWD and African American students for Reading 3-5