

1.D Goal Progress

Guiding Question: Are the programs, practices and strategies implemented by the Harford County Public Schools achieving their intended effect of improving student performance and eliminating achievement gaps?

In this section, the Harford County Public Schools reports on the progress and challenges related to performance standards, additional State requirements, and local goals, as applicable. In responding to the analyzing prompts from the Maryland State Department of Education, HCPS is asked to:

- Address student performance in terms of grade band(s) and subgroup(s),
- Include professional development opportunities,
- Include changes or adjustments that will be made,
- Include timelines where appropriate, and
- Include corresponding resource allocations.

The alignment of resources with Master Plan priorities is denoted throughout this report. Resources have been allocated through a number of avenues: increases in revenues, redistributed funds, retargeted resources (a shift in focus), and/or the continuation of initiatives and programs. Throughout each section, all school systems are asked to share how the school system plans to allocate resources to support continued progress and overcome challenges.

I.D.i Maryland School Assessment/High School Assessments

No Child Left Behind Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 1.1: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the state's assessment.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 1.2: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the state's assessment.

As required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Maryland has established continuous and substantial growth targets, or Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), for 100% of students to reach proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014.

NCLB requires that states test students in science at least once annually in grades 3-5, grades 6-9, and grades 10-12. Additionally, Maryland requires all students who entered ninth grade in or after 2005 to pass the High School Assessments (HSAs) or achieve a total score of 1602 across the HSAs in order to graduate.

I.D.i

Maryland School Assessment/High School Assessments

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

Reading and Mathematics

Within the reading and mathematics content areas, local school systems should address the performance of elementary and middle school students using Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) proficiency data through 2009.

LSSs should address the performance of high school students using AYP proficiency data for English and Algebra/Data Analysis through 2008. Additionally, LSSs should address the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment Results for English and Algebra/Data Analysis for 2008, and local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June, 30, 2009.

Science

Under NCLB, local school systems are required to administer annual science assessments at least once at the elementary level, once at the middle school level, and once at the high school level.

For the science content area, LSSs should address the performance of students in Grade 5 and students in Grade 8 using the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) data for 2008. Additionally, LSSs should address the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment Results for biology for 2008, as well as local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June, 30, 2009.

Government

For the government content area, LSSs should address the performance of high school students using the HSA Assessment Results for government for 2008, as well as local data on juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the graduation requirement as of June, 30, 2009.

HCPS NOTE: The responses in this section are linked explicitly to the following Harford County Public Schools documents:

- **HCPS Special Education Initiatives; Intervention Programs; LRE and the IDEA (Appendix F)**
- **HCPS Programs & Initiatives (Appendix G)**
- **BTE Master Plan Goals & Strategies (Appendix H)**

Maryland School Assessment Reading

Based on the Examination of AYP Reading Proficiency Data for Elementary Schools (Table 2.1) and Middle Schools (Table 2.2):

Table 2.1: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Reading - Elementary												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009*		
	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested
All Students	7437	85.0%	8752	7417	85.7%	8651	7561	89.9%	8409	7506	89.8	8362
American Indian/Alaskan Native	49	86.0%	57	53	86.9%	61	36	90.0%	40	42	89.4	47
Asian/Pacific Islander	217	88.9%	244	232	91.3%	254	232	93.5%	248	259	93.5	277
African American	1066	71.4%	1493	1150	71.1%	1618	1295	79.7%	1625	1263	77.8	1624
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	5885	88.0%	6684	5766	89.5%	6446	5752	92.6%	6209	5699	93.1	6123
Hispanic	220	80.3%	274	216	79.4%	272	246	86.0%	286	243	83.5	291
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	1391	70.7%	1967	1371	71.6%	1914	1554	79.0%	1966	1628	78	2086
Special Education	901	61.8%	1459	926	62.9%	1472	981	72.1%	1360	1090	73.6	1481
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	76	64.4%	118	102	78.5%	130	114	78.1%	146	142	79.3	179

Table 2.2: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Reading - Middle												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009*		
	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested
All Students	7254	79.6%	9113	7103	80.0%	8883	7567	85.4%	8857	7628	86.9	8782
American Indian/Alaskan Native	30	71.4%	42	36	72.0%	50	40	80.0%	50	43	91.5	47
Asian/Pacific Islander	180	91.8%	196	181	90.0%	201	224	94.5%	237	237	92.6	256
African American	1026	60.7%	1691	1052	62.8%	1676	1232	73.3%	1680	1247	75.2	1658
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	5836	84.2%	6930	5650	84.3%	6706	5848	88.6%	6604	5850	89.7	6520
Hispanic	181	71.5%	253	184	73.6%	250	223	78.0%	286	251	83.4	301
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	1253	61.4%	2040	1155	61.3%	1883	1369	71.4%	1918	1472	74.6	1974
Special Education	681	48.2%	1412	670	48.8%	1372	698	55.0%	1269	885	60.5	1462
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	33	57.9%	57	38	52.8%	72	54	64.3%	84	69	67	103

*2009 data on Tables 2.1 and 2.2 are preliminary data as of August 25, 2009

- Describe where progress is evident. In your response, identify progress in terms of grade band(s) and subgroup(s).

HCPS Response:

Elementary

- About 90% of all elementary students scored as proficient or advanced. Although this is the same as the 2008 percent proficient, it is well above the 2009 AMO of 76.5.
- The special education and LEP subgroups made slight gains in proficient from 2008 to 2009.

Maryland School Assessment Reading

Middle

- Nearly 87% of our middle school students scored as proficient or advanced. This is well above the 2009 AMO of 75.9.
- The percent proficient for 'All Students' has increased each year since 2005.
- Gains were made in the percent proficient for all subgroups except Asian/Pacific Islander in 2009 as compared to 2008.

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies to which you attribute the progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- At the middle level, schools continued to use assessment data to identify student needs, monitor student progress, and align appropriate instructional strategies with identified student needs. (2.2a.2; 2.2b.3)
- At the middle school level, differentiated pacing guidelines were revised based on feedback from teachers and distributed at the beginning of the school year to support the use of instructionally appropriate texts and encourage an increase in the quantity of reading. (2.2a.8)
- At the middle and high school levels, teachers continued to use county designed midterms to diagnosis students' needs. (2.2a.2, 2.2a.10, 2.2b.3)
- In the summer of 2008, middle schools provided a four week summer school program in reading for identified students. Transportation was provided to increase attendance. (2.1a.3)
- Extended day programs were in place at all middle schools (2.1a.3)
- Corrective Reading was implemented in all middle schools in sixth grade for students performing significantly below grade level in reading. (2.1a.3)
- Implementation of the Fast Track reading intervention program in all middle schools (2.1a.3)
- Technical support was provided for intervention programs through the Coordinator of Reading Intervention. (2.1b.26)
- The READ 180 intervention program was implemented at the HCPS middle school that was identified for improvement and was involved in restructuring planning in 2007-08. (2.1a.3)
- The county intervention team visited identified schools to review and analyze data with school-based instructional leadership teams. (2.1b.26; PI-20)

3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, identify challenges in terms of grade band(s) and subgroup(s).

Maryland School Assessment Reading

HCPS Response:

Elementary

- The overall percent proficient in reading from 2008 to 2009 remained the same.
- The following subgroups showed a slight, although not a significant, decline in percent proficient from 2008 to 2009: American Indian/Alaskan Native, African American, Hispanic, and FARMS.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations, and incorporate timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

The following strategies/practices/programs are in place and are intended to address identified challenges:

- Implementation of intervention reading programs for identified students (2.1a.3; 2.2b.3; PI-17; Appendix F)
- Monitor and support school improvement initiatives at schools identified as in need of assistance in reading performance (2.1a.9)
- Implementation of extended day and summer reading programs (2.1a.3)
- Utilize materials purchased to enhance emphasis on content literacy at the elementary level
- The SIPPS intervention program to be implemented in all Title I elementary schools and 17 other elementary schools (2.1a.3; PI-17)
- Continue regular professional development sessions with the elementary reading specialists (2.1b.2, 4.3c.8)
- Training to occur for the elementary intervention programs (2.1b.2)
- Adoption and training of the new Houghton Mifflin Harcourt *Storytown* reading program for general educators and special educators, grades 1-5 (2.2a.8)
- Training of the Writing Fundamentals Units of Study for general educators and special educators, grades 1-5
- Implementation of a new instructional framework for Elementary Integrated Language Arts that targets instruction specifically to students' needs and reading levels (2.1a.3)
- Adoption of Scantron pilot for electronic assessment (3.1c.10)
- Adoption of reading program and TPRI early reading assessment at the kindergarten level (2.1a.3)
- Revision of quarterly elementary benchmark reading assessments Grades 1-5 for implementation in fall 2010 (2.2a.10)
- Content-focused reading sessions for school-based instructional facilitators and mentor teachers (4.3c.8; 4.3c.9; 4.3c.10)
- At the E/M/H levels, continue to evaluate and analyze student assessment data to diagnose student needs and improve instruction. (2.2a.2; 2.2b.3)

Maryland School Assessment Mathematics

Based on the Examination of AYP Math Proficiency Data for Elementary Schools (Table 2.4) and Middle Schools (Table 2.5):

Table 2.4: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Math - Elementary												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009*		
	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested
All Students	7315	83.5%	8756	7388	85.4%	8653	7479	88.9%	8410	7432	88.9	8360
American Indian/Alaskan Native	48	84.2%	57	50	82.0%	61	35	87.5%	40	41	87.2	47
Asian/Pacific Islander	225	91.1%	247	244	96.1%	254	237	94.8%	250	269	97.1	277
African American	1039	69.6%	1492	1145	70.8%	1618	1265	77.8%	1625	1251	77.1	1622
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	5781	86.5%	6687	5726	88.8%	6447	5697	91.8%	6208	5629	91.9	6123
Hispanic	222	81.3%	273	223	81.7%	273	245	85.4%	287	242	83.2	291
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	1366	69.4%	1967	1378	72.0%	1915	1526	77.6%	1967	1612	77.3	2085
Special Education	822	56.4%	1458	881	59.8%	1473	905	66.5%	1361	1003	67.7	1481
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	86	71.1%	121	104	79.4%	131	121	81.8%	148	148	82.7	179

Table 2.5: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Math - Middle												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009*		
	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested
All Students	6004	65.9%	9112	6000	67.5%	8887	6383	72.1%	8849	6608	75.3	8779
American Indian/Alaskan Native	26	61.9%	42	29	58.0%	50	35	70.0%	50	35	72.9	48
Asian/Pacific Islander	175	89.3%	196	175	86.6%	202	218	91.6%	238	229	89.5	256
African American	683	40.3%	1693	737	44.0%	1676	851	50.8%	1675	960	57.9	1657
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	4975	71.8%	6928	4903	73.1%	6708	5101	77.3%	6599	5177	79.4	6517
Hispanic	145	57.3%	253	156	62.2%	251	178	62.0%	287	207	68.8	301
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	849	41.6%	2041	848	45.0%	1883	971	50.9%	1909	1116	56.6	1970
Special Education	457	32.4%	1412	470	34.3%	1372	464	36.6%	1269	628	43.1	1458
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	28	48.3%	58	36	49.3%	73	36	42.4%	85	58	56.3	103

*2009 data on Tables 2.1 and 2.2 are preliminary data as of August 25, 2009

1. Describe where progress is evident. In your response, identify progress in terms of grade band(s) and subgroup(s).

HCPS Response:

Elementary

- About 89% of all elementary students scored as proficient or advanced.
- In the four subgroups, American Indian/Alaskan Native, African American, White, Free/Reduced Meals, and Limited English Proficient, the difference between the 2008 and 2009 AYP Proficiency Data was less than one percent. The only subgroup with decreasing data greater than one percent was in the Hispanic subgroup, from 85.4% to 83.2%.

Maryland School Assessment Mathematics

Elementary (cont. from page 22)

- The largest increases occurred in the Asian/Pacific Islander subgroup, from 94.8% to 97.1%, followed by the Special Education subgroup, from 66.5% to 67.7%.

Middle

- Over 75% of our middle school students scored as proficient or advanced.
 - In all subgroups, except Asian/Pacific Islander, gains were made in the percent proficient. The decrease in the Asian/Pacific Islander subgroup was from 91.6% to 89.5% proficient, which shows that this group continues to perform well.
 - Increases occurred in the following subgroups:
 - Limited English Proficient with a gain of 13.9%,
 - African American with a gain of 7.1%
 - Hispanic with a gain of 6.8%
 - Special Education with a gain of 6.5%
 - Free/Reduced Meals with a gain of 5.7%
 - American Indian/Alaskan Native with a gain of 2.9%
 - Asian/Pacific Islander with a gain of 2.1%, and
 - White with a gain of 2.1%,
2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies to which you attribute the progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- Implementation of Math Recovery, Knowing Mathematics, and Ramp Up intervention mathematics programs for at-risk K-8 students (2.1a.3; PI-17)
- School-based mathematics intervention teachers or mathematics specialists at targeted elementary schools (2.1a.3; 2.1b.26)
- Monthly professional development for all mathematics intervention teachers and mathematics specialists.
- Professional development for the Math Recovery program is provided for all elementary math specialists (PI-17; 2.1b.2; 4.3c.8)
- System-wide professional development in mathematics for all first and second grade classroom teachers and special educators (2.1b.2; 4.3c.5)
- Third year of system-wide textbook adoption for elementary mathematics (K-5). (2.2a.8)
- Implementation of system-wide unit assessments for grades 1-5 (2.2a.2; 2.2a.10)
- Significant increase in the number of classroom teachers utilizing the county data collection system to record unit test data and analyze data to better meet the needs of students.
- Increase accountability in providing problem solving opportunities through open response questions.
- Increased opportunities for on-going classroom assessments through Recognizing Student Achievement options.
- In Title I schools, the family liaison, amid collaboration with the classroom teachers, provides families with strategies and resources to support mathematics learning in the home. (2.1b.16; PI-27)

Maryland School Assessment Mathematics

- Fifth year of system-wide textbook adoption for middle school mathematics (2.2a.8)
 - Implementation of system-wide mid-year and end-of-year assessments for grades 6-8 and algebra (2.2a.2; 2.2a.10)
 - Implementation of system-wide content pacing guidelines for grades 1- 8 (2.2a.8)
 - Year 3 of full day Kindergarten, doubling the amount of time for mathematics instruction (2.1b.14; PI-14)
 - Technical support of intervention programs through the Coordinator of Mathematics Intervention (2.1b.26; PI-20)
 - Instructional walkthroughs at middle and high schools (2.2a.3)
 - Professional development sessions for all middle school mathematics teachers and special educators (2.1b.2)
 - Professional development for all high school algebra teachers (2.1b.2)
 - Content-focused mathematics workshops for secondary special education teachers (4.3c.5)
 - Content-focused mathematics sessions for school-based instructional facilitators and mentors (4.3c.8; 4.3c.9; 4.3c.10)
 - Extended day programs at targeted elementary, middle, and high schools (2.1a.3)
 - Summer school mathematics at all middle school and regional elementary schools (2.1a.3)
 - Remediation classes for algebra mastery at targeted high schools (2.1a.3)
 - Continued collaboration between the itinerant ESOL staff and the mainstream classroom teachers (2.1b.8; PI-7)
 - Continue to include the ESOL staff in systemwide professional development in the area of mathematics. (4.3c.5; PI-7)
 - Direct support to teachers via LRE Math Interventionists at the elementary and secondary levels. (2.1b.26; Appendix F)
 - Continued support of elementary special educators in the use of Everyday Mathematics (2.1b.2; 4.3c.6)
 - Co-Teaching Seminars to enhance and refine co-teach instruction at all grade levels (4.3c.6)
 - New Teacher PLC to enhance the planning and implementation of effective mathematics practices including the use of alternate strategies (4.3c.2; PI-3)
3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, identify challenges in terms of grade band(s) and subgroup(s).

HCPS Response:

Elementary

- The Special Education, FARMS, and African American subgroups continue to score well below the Harford County proficiency percent.

Middle

- The LEP, Special Education, FARMS, Hispanic, and African American subgroups scored well below the Harford County proficiency percent.

Maryland School Assessment Mathematics

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations, and incorporate timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

- Implementation of intervention mathematics programs for all at-risk students at all levels (2.1a.3; 2.2b.3; PI-17; PI-20; Appendix F)
 - Early identification of at-risk students
 - Time within the school day
 - Staffing and related professional development needs
 - Transportation for students beyond the school day
- Informational meetings and professional development for all stakeholders (4.3c.5; 4.3c.8; 4.3c.9; 4.3c.10; PI-2 through PI-5)
- Continue to utilize the resources of the Intervention Committee, including the Least Restrictive Environment teacher specialists, to support students in the least restrictive environment. (2.1b.26; Appendix F; PI-20)
- Develop and implement IEP goals and lesson plans/instructional strategies which align with the VSC (2.1b.6; 2.2a.12; PI-7)
- Continue to evaluate and analyze student assessment data to diagnose student needs and improve instruction. (2.2a.2; 2.2b.3)
- Continue to provide professional development opportunities to educators serving students with disabilities. (4.3c.6)
- Collaboration with content personnel to explore the implementation of additional Math supports targeted to diverse learners. (2.1a.3)
- Four middle schools in HCPS have mathematics coaches. Each mathematics coach receives at least twelve 6-hour blocks of training per year. (PI-22)

Maryland School Assessment Science

Based on the Examination of 2008 Maryland School Assessment Science Data for Grade 5 (Table 2.7) and Grade 8 (Table 2.8):

Table 2.7: Maryland School Assessment - Science - Elementary (Grade 5)*						
Subgroup	2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	2922	2156	73.8%			
African American	583	326	55.9%			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	15	12	80.0%			
Asian/Pacific Islander	84	70	83.3%			
Hispanic	104	63	60.6%			
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	2136	1685	78.9%			
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	685	360	52.6%			
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	36	12	33.3%			
Special Education	452	187	41.4%			

Table 2.8 Maryland School Assessment - Science - Middle (Grade 8)*						
Subgroup	2008			2009		
	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	3010	2170	72.1%			
African American	605	284	46.9%			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	15	11	73.3%			
Asian/Pacific Islander	75	64	85.3%			
Hispanic	99	56	56.6%			
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	2216	1755	79.2%			
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	634	317	50.0%			
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	21	4	19.0%			
Special Education	367	130	35.4%			

- 2009 Science data unavailable at time of report.

1. Describe your school system's results. In your response, identify the successes in terms of grade level(s) and subgroup(s).

HCPS Response:

- At grade 5, 73.8% of the student population met with proficiency as measured by the Science MSA (9.1% Advanced, 64.7% Proficient, 26.2% Basic).
 - In comparison to state wide percentages, Harford County students scored 9.7% points higher in the aggregate.
 - With the exception of the white subgroup, all other subgroups in grade 5 scored higher on average than did the same subgroups at the state level.
- At grade 8, 72.1% of the student population met with proficiency as measured by the Science MSA (4.1% Advanced, 68% Proficient, 27.9% Basic).
 - In comparison to state wide percentages, Harford County students have scored 10.6% points higher in the aggregate.

Maryland School Assessment Science

- With the exception of the white subgroup, all other subgroups in grade 8 scored higher on average than did the same subgroups at the state level.
2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies that are designed to ensure progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

Grade 5

- Each elementary school has a Science Facilitator whose role is to serve as a liaison between the Office of Science and the school. Resources have been provided to support partial day professional development meetings throughout the 2009-2010 school year. A portion of this time will be dedicated to the ongoing reflection of MSA data and instructional practices associated with high quality science instruction. (2.2a.2, 4.3c.5)
- During the 2008-2009 school year, professional development was provided to all third grade teachers. This time was used to further enhance a teacher's comfort with science content and pedagogy. Professional development is slated to again be provided to an additional grade level during the 2009-2010 school year. (2.1b.2, 4.3c.5)
- Curriculum teams at the elementary level continue to work to ensure alignment between the VSC and HCPS Elementary Science Curriculum Guides. Additional attention is being given to the enhancement of our existing end of unit assessments. Each benchmark assessment is intended to provide teachers with standards-based data to support refinements to the teaching and learning process, as a proactive MSA measure. (2.2a.1, 2.2a.10)
- Throughout the 2008-2009 school year, professional development with regard to the "Indicators of High Quality Science Instruction" was provided to all elementary school Instructional Leadership Teams. This includes principals, instructional facilitators, assistant principals, and mentor teachers. Each team was engaged in a variety of learning opportunities designed to support their knowledge base and capacity as all engage in the observation and evaluation of teachers of science. Individualized support will continue be provided to schools during the 2009-2010 school year. (4.3c.10)

Grade 8

- The middle school science curriculum is currently undergoing final revisions. Revisions to each curriculum guide (6-8) are intended to ensure VSC alignment while modeling exemplary science instruction. Curriculum maps are also being developed as an alignment and communication tool, enhancing the manner in which core content is unpacked. Additionally, benchmark/end of unit assessments are being developed with program alignment in mind. Each benchmark assessment is intended to provide teachers with standards-based data to support refinements to the teaching and learning process, as a proactive MSA measure. Professional development will also be provided to middle school teachers focusing on the utilization of data to inform instruction. With regard to resources, curriculum and assessment teams have been fully funded to accomplish these goals which are intended to ensure progress. (2.2a.1, 2.2a.10)
- School-based Department Chairs will meet with Science Supervisory personnel for three full days throughout the 2009-2010 school year. A portion of this time will be dedicated to

Maryland School Assessment Science

ongoing reflection of MSA data and practices designed to enhance the impact of high quality science instruction. (2.2a.2, 4.3c.8)

- During the 2008-2009 school year, professional development was provided to all middle school teachers focusing on instructional technology. Additionally, high quality instructional tools and strategies were highlighted. Attention will continue to be given to these areas during the 2009-2010 school year to ensure progress. (4.3c.5)
- Throughout the 2008-2009 school year, professional development with regard to the “Indicators of High Quality Science Instruction” was provided to all secondary school Instructional Leadership Teams. This includes principals, instructional facilitators, assistant principals, and mentor teachers. Each team was engaged in a variety of learning opportunities designed to support their knowledge base and capacity as all engage in the observation and evaluation of science teachers. Individualized support will continue be provided to schools during the 2009-2010 school year. (4.3c.10)

3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, identify challenges in terms of grade level(s) and subgroup(s).

HCPS Response:

- Although HCPS students on the whole perform above the state average on the 5th grade and 8th grade Science MSA, there are achievement gaps with historically underachieving subgroups. These subgroups include Limited English Proficient, Special Education, Free and Reduced Meals, African American, and Hispanic students. The most significant gap and resulting challenges exist with LEP and Special Education students (for both 5th and 8th grade).
- Identifying additional professional development time in order to enhance the capacity of teachers to effectively address student needs.
- Securing additional data streams necessary in order to effectively monitor the success of all students, particularly those within the identified gap subgroups.
- Performance data clearly indicates that the majority of HCPS students (5th and 8th grade) fall within the “proficient” category. An additional challenge is represented by the need to ensure that learning is accelerated in order to decrease the number of proficient students, as reflected by an increase in the percentage of “advanced” students.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations, and incorporate timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

- Middle school benchmark assessments are being developed with the goal of engaging select teachers in a 2009-2010 pilot. Standardized data will be generated and reported down to the sub-group level. Special attention will be given to the identified underachieving subgroups. (2.2a.10)
- Attention will continue to be targeted to ensure alignment between the taught and tested curriculum at both the elementary and middle school levels. (2.2a.1)
- Class sets of the science reference book, *ScienceSaurus*, will be purchased and utilized as a tool to support the instructional environment at grades four and five. (2.2a.8)

High School Assessments (HSA) English

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

Table 2.3: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Reading - High (English II)												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009*		
	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	1845	61.3%	3009	2273	79.4%	2863	2247	86.2%	2606			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	11	78.6%	14	15	88.2%	17	15	83.3%	18			
Asian/Pacific Islander	44	66.7%	66	83	80.7%	67	66	84.6%	78			
African American	216	43.4%	498	319	61.3%	520	308	71.1%	433			
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	1536	65.1%	2360	1829	83.8%	2182	1816	89.5%	2028			
Hispanic	38	53.5%	71	43	70.5%	61	42	85.7%	49			
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	164	38.2%	429	255	60.7%	420	253	72.1%	351			
Special Education	62	19.6%	316	122	40.0%	305	128	55.7%	230			
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	3	37.5%	8	4	33.3%	12	1	20.0%	5			

- 2009 High School English II data unavailable at the time of this report.

1. Describe where progress is evident. In your response, identify progress in terms of subgroups.

HCPS Response:

- 86% of all high school students scored as proficient on the 2008 HSA. This was a significant increase from the 2007 percent proficient of 79%.
- The percent proficient for 'All Students' has increased each year since 2006.
- In all subgroups, except American Indian/Alaskan Native and LEP, gains were made in 2008 as compared to 2007.
- Significant increases are noted in our African American, Hispanic, FARMS, and Special Education subgroups.

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies to which you attribute the progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- At the high school level, schools continued to use assessment data to identify student needs, monitor student progress, and align appropriate instructional strategies with identified student needs. (2.2a.2; 2.2b.3)
- At the high school level, differentiated pacing guidelines were revised based on feedback from teachers and distributed at the beginning of the school year to support the use of instructionally appropriate texts and encourage an increase in the quantity of reading. (2.2a.8)
- At the high school level, teachers continued to use county designed midterms to diagnosis students' needs. (2.2a.2; 2.2a.10; 2.2b.3; PI-9)
- Purchase of the *Write Source* textbook in secondary language arts classes. (2.2a.8)

High School Assessments (HSA) English

- Collect county wide writing anchor papers for response to literature exemplars.
 - Continue ongoing efforts to increase the quantity of reading at all levels and in all disciplines supported by efforts to adopt award winning engaging young adult literature in English classes.
 - Intentional focus on content literacy as a county initiative for all secondary schools
3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, identify challenges in terms of subgroups.

HCPS Response:

- The following subgroups showed a decline in percent proficient from 2007 to 2008: American Indian/Alaskan Native and LEP.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations, and incorporate timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

- The Office of World Languages will continue to promote the addition of during/beyond the school day intervention tutors for the benefit of providing ELLs additional content area support/encouragement/instruction. In one school community where AYP attainment continues to pose a hurdle, once a week ELL parental education is being offered in conjunction with twice a week beyond the school day tutorials being provided for the ELLs.
- The elementary and secondary schools continue to take increasing ownership of English Language Learners. The Office of World Languages uses Title III funding to provide either during the day or beyond the school day intervention tutors for ELLs, as well as providing outreach to the parents of these children. Additionally, the Office of World Languages offers 4 professional development modules for schools to take advantage.
- Harford County Public Schools has initiated a deliberate outreach educational program to ELL students in the two school communities whose schools did not reach AYP due to ELLs. In conjunction with this outreach, a parental outreach component will be offered as well, in order to further impact positively the cognitive learning concepts which are being instructionally delivered in the classrooms.

High School Assessments (HSA) English

Based on the Examination of 2008 High School Assessment (HSA) Results for English (Tables 3.1 and 3.2):

Table 3.1: HSA Test Participation and Status - English 2008							
Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2627	78.9	2073	21.1	554	6.3	176
American Indian/Alaskan Native	9	77.8	7	22.2	2	10	1
African American	426	60.6	258	39.4	168	13.8	68
Asian/Pacific Islander	75	86.7	65	13.3	10	3.8	3
White (non-Hispanic)	2044	82.9	1695	17.1	349	4.5	96
Hispanic	73	65.8	48	34.2	25	9.9	8
Special Education	257	35.4	91	64.6	166	8.2	23
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1	100	1	0	0	87.5	7
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	389	59.4	231	40.6	158	15.3	70

Table 3.2: HSA English: Test Participation and Status – (as of May 31, 2008)							
Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2588	86.5	2239	13.5	349	1	26
American Indian/Alaskan Native	18	83.3	15	16.7	3	5.3	1
African American	424	71.5	303	28.5	121	2.5	11
Asian/Pacific Islander	78	84.6	66	15.4	12	0	0
White (non-Hispanic)	2019	89.8	1813	10.2	206	0.6	13
Hispanic	49	85.7	42	14.3	7	2	1
Special Education	221	56.6	125	43.4	96	1.8	4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	5	20	1	80	4	28.6	2
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	344	72.7	250	27.3	94	3.9	14

1. Identify any additional challenges that are evident.

HCPS Response:

Based on the 2008 English HSA data chart 3.1, the following challenges are evident:

- 64% of special education students at grade 10 were not proficient on the 2008 English HSA
- 39% of African American students were not proficient
- 40 % of FARMS students were not proficient

Based on the 2008 data chart 3.2, the following challenges are evident:

- 43% special education students were not proficient

High School Assessments (HSA) English

2. Describe the interventions that the school system has in place to support students in passing the English HSA. How effective are they? What evidence do you have of their effectiveness? Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

The following reading intervention programs are in place in all ten high schools (2.1a.3; PI-17):

Strategic Reading: This intervention program is for delayed readers in grade 9. *Strategic Reading* aims to give students reading two or more years below grade level an opportunity to accelerate their reading in an age-appropriate, motivational, and innovative classroom. *Strategic Reading* uses a balanced-literacy approach where students move through four timed components in a daily 90 minute instructional block. These components include: reading showcase, focus lessons, student team literature, and self-selected centers. These components allow students to practice a variety of skills and strategies in order to be successful when they enter their required English 1 class in the second semester.

Reading and Writing in Your Career: This course aims to give students reading two or more years below grade level and opportunity to accelerate their reading in an age-appropriate, motivational, and innovative classroom. Under this program, students take a daily 90 minute reading class designed to develop reading and fluency skills. By using daily mini-lessons on reading strategies; verbal modeling of reading and thinking skills; cooperative learning teams for text discussion; and extensive independent reading, this course assists students in improving overall reading comprehension and fluency.

Students are assessed in the fall and spring of the course using a standardized reading measurement such as the GATES or Scantron Performance Series test. For the 2007-2008 school year, 27% of the students enrolled in the reading course showed 1 or more years growth in reading and 21% of the students showed 2 or more years' growth in reading.

3. Describe what, if anything, the school system will do differently than in past years to address the challenges identified. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- Continue to monitor the program effectiveness for individual students and teachers' effectiveness in delivering the program. (2.2b.1)
- Advocate for additional secondary reading coaches in order to provide support and the clinical supervision model for teacher support.
- Form HCPS Task Force "Developing Cultural Proficiency to Eliminate the African-American Male Achievement Gap". Appoint a consultant for middle schools to assist in the analysis of student achievement data in efforts to narrow the focus and create a strategic plan for addressing identified teaching and learning needs. (2.1b.5a; PI-6)
- Continue to request funding to employ high school HSA intervention teachers to provide professional development to improve classroom instruction and to coordinate direct student intervention and remediation services. (2.1a.3)

High School Assessments (HSA)

Algebra/Data Analysis

Based on the Examination of AYP Proficiency Data for Algebra/Data Analysis (Table 2.6):

Table 2.6: Maryland School Assessment - AYP Proficiency Data - Math - High (Algebra/Data Analysis)												
Subgroup	2006			2007			2008			2009*		
	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.	# Tested	# Tested	# Prof.	% Prof.
All Students	2586	72.8%	3553	3080	81.4%	3785	2401	92.9%	2584			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	12	50.0%	24	17	77.3%	22	14	82.4%	17			
Asian/Pacific Islander	74	85.1%	87	93	86.9%	107	72	96.0%	75			
African American	376	52.4%	717	474	64.1%	739	355	83.1%	427			
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	2066	78.3%	2637	2412	85.9%	2808	1915	94.9%	2017			
Hispanic	58	65.9%	88	84	77.1%	109	45	93.8%	48			
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	352	57.4%	613	455	68.8%	661	292	84.1%	347			
Special Education	101	29.8%	339	264	53.3%	495	163	72.4%	225			
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	6	85.7%	7	12	75.0%	16	4	66.7%	6			

- 2009 data for Table 2.6 unavailable at time of report

1. Describe where progress is evident. In your response, identify progress in terms of subgroups.

HCPS Response:

- About 93% of students scored as proficient on the 2008 administration of Algebra/Data Analysis.
- In all subgroups, except Limited English Proficient, gains were made in 2008 as compared to 2007.
- The significant increases occurred in the following subgroups:
 - American Indian/Alaskan native with a gain of 5.1%
 - Asian/Pacific Islander with a gain of 9.1%
 - African American with a gain of 19%
 - White with a gain of 9%
 - Hispanic with a gain of 16.7%
 - Free/Reduced Meals with a gain of 15.3%, and
 - Special Education with a gain of 19.1%

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies to which you attribute the progress. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- Technical support of intervention programs through the Coordinator of Mathematics Intervention (2.1b.26; PI-20)
- Instructional walkthroughs at middle and high schools (2.2a.3)

High School Assessments (HSA)

Algebra/Data Analysis

- Professional development sessions for all high school mathematics teachers and special educators (2.1b.2)
 - Professional development for all high school algebra teachers (2.1b.2)
 - Content-focused mathematics workshops for secondary special education teachers (4.3c.5)
 - Content-focused mathematics sessions for school-based instructional facilitators and mentors (4.3c.8; 4.3c.9; 4.3c.10)
 - Extended day programs at targeted high schools (2.1a.3)
 - Summer school mathematics at all high schools (2.1a.3)
 - Remediation classes for algebra mastery at targeted high schools (2.1a.3)
 - Continued collaboration between the itinerant ESOL staff and the mainstream classroom teachers (2.1b.8; PI-7)
 - Continue to include the ESOL staff in systemwide professional development in the area of mathematics. (4.3c.5; PI-7)
 - Direct support to teachers via LRE Math Interventionists at the elementary and secondary levels. (2.1b.26; Appendix F)
 - Co-Teaching Seminars to enhance and refine co-teach instruction at all grade levels (4.3c.6)
 - New Teacher PLC to enhance the planning and implementation of effective mathematics practices including the use of alternate strategies (4.3c.2; PI-3)
3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, identify challenges in terms of subgroups.

HCPS Response:

10th Grade Students

- Not all at-risk students have taken the Algebra/Data Analysis HSA.
- The Limited English Proficient, Special Education, FARMS, and African American subgroups continue to score well below the Harford County proficiency percent.

11th Grade Students

- Not all at-risk students have taken the Algebra/Data Analysis HSA.
- The Limited English Proficient, Special Education, FARMS, and African American subgroups continue to score well below the Harford County proficiency percent.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress. Include a discussion of the corresponding resource allocations, and incorporate timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

- Implementation of intervention mathematics programs for all at-risk students at all levels (2.1a.3; 2.2b.3; PI-17; PI-20; Appendix F)
 - Early identification of at-risk students
 - Time within the school day
 - Staffing and related professional development needs
 - Transportation for students beyond the school day

High School Assessments (HSA)

Algebra/Data Analysis

- Identify at-risk students using past MSA scores, prior HAS administration data, mid-term and end-of-year examinations, course grades, attendance record, disciplinary records, and teacher recommendation (2.2a.2; 2.2b.3)
- Informational meetings and professional development for all stakeholders (4.3c.5; 4.3c.8; 4.3c.9; 4.3c.10; PI-2 through PI-5)
- Continue to utilize the resources of the Intervention Committee, including the Least Restrictive Environment teacher specialists, to support students in the least restrictive environment. (2.1b.26; Appendix F; PI-20)
- Continue to evaluate and analyze student assessment data to diagnose student needs and improve instruction. (2.2a.2; 2.2b.3)
- Continue to provide professional development opportunities to educators serving students with disabilities. (4.3c.6)
- Collaboration with content personnel to explore the implementation of additional Math supports targeted to diverse learners. (2.1a.3)

High School Assessments (HSA)

Algebra/Data Analysis

Based on the Examination of 2008 High School Assessment Results for Algebra/Data Analysis (Tables 3.3 and 3.4):

Table 3.3: HSA Test Participation and Status - Algebra/Data Analysis 2008							
Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2669	90.2	2408	9.8	261	4.4	123
American Indian/Alaskan Native	8	87.5	7	12.5	1	20	2
African American	444	75	333	25	111	9.2	45
Asian/Pacific Islander	69	92.8	64	7.2	5	11.5	9
White (non-Hispanic)	2073	93.7	1943	6.3	130	2.9	62
Hispanic	75	81.3	61	18.7	14	6.3	5
Special Education	260	65.4	170	34.6	90	7.1	20
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	7	14.3	1	85.7	6	22.2	2
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	425	78.4	333	21.6	92	7	32

Table 3.4: HSA Test Participation and Status - Algebra/Data Analysis 2008							
Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2570	93.1	2392	6.9	178	0.9	24
American Indian/Alaskan Native	17	82.4	14	17.6	3	5.6	1
African American	420	83.8	352	16.2	68	3	13
Asian/Pacific Islander	75	96	72	4	3	0	0
White (non-Hispanic)	2010	95	1909	5	101	0.5	10
Hispanic	48	93.8	45	6.3	3	0	0
Special Education	218	72.9	159	27.1	59	3.1	7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	6	66.7	4	33.3	2	14.3	1
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	343	84.5	290	15.5	53	4.2	15

1. Identify any additional challenges that are evident.

HCPS Response:

As the percent of students who pass the Algebra/Data Analysis increases, each student who passes the assessment becomes an individual case. For some schools, all students reach that goal by Grade 10 and other schools have larger cohorts of students requiring special attention. Balancing resources and supporting individual student circumstances had become a challenge.

High School Assessments (HSA)

Algebra/Data Analysis

2. Describe the interventions that the school system has in place to support students in passing the Algebra/Data Analysis HSA. How effective are they? What evidence do you have of their effectiveness? Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

The following interventions are in place to support students required to pass the HSA in order to graduate:

HCPS has implemented the following interventions for students who have not passed one or more of the High School Assessments: (2.1a.3)

Students who fail the course and fail the assessment:

- Repeat the course

Students who pass the course, but fail the assessment are assigned one or more of the following:

- Enroll in a remediation class
- Enroll in summer school
- Participate in study beyond the school day
- Complete independently, a learning packet designed to address student deficiencies
- Complete an online assistance course during or after-school under the supervision of school staff
- Meet and study with an advisor
- Participate in the Bridge Plan (for those students who meet all criteria as outlined by MSDE)

HCPS has also established summer school for identified at-risk incoming Grade 9 students.

The continuing improvement in the percent of students who pass the Algebra/Data Analysis HSA supports the effectiveness of the initiatives.

3. Describe what, if anything, the school system will do differently than in past years to address the challenges identified. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- Change the criteria for students to enroll in Ramp Up to Algebra so more students have the opportunity for intervention in high school.
- Encourage more students to enroll in summer school and make that offer earlier in the school year, so students and parents can better plan their summer.

High School Assessments (HSA)

Biology

Based on the Examination of 2008 High School Assessment Results for Biology (Tables 3.5 and 3.6):

Table 3.5: HSA Test Participation and Status - Biology 2008							
Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2662	85.3	2271	14.7	391	4.9	138
American Indian/Alaskan Native	9	88.9	8	11.1	1	10	1
African American	444	64.2	285	35.8	159	9.8	48
Asian/Pacific Islander	72	94.4	68	5.6	4	8.9	7
White (non-Hispanic)	2064	89.5	1848	10.5	216	3.5	75
Hispanic	73	84.9	62	15.1	11	8.8	7
Special Education	249	58.6	146	41.4	103	11.1	31
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	2	100	2	0	0	77.8	7
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	402	70.4	283	29.6	119	12.4	57

Table 3.6: HSA Test Participation and Status - Biology 2008							
Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2579	90.4	2331	9.6	248	1.2	32
American Indian/Alaskan Native	18	72.2	13	27.8	5	5.3	1
African American	420	77.9	327	22.1	93	3.4	15
Asian/Pacific Islander	77	88.3	68	11.7	9	0	0
White (non-Hispanic)	2015	93.3	1880	6.7	135	0.7	15
Hispanic	49	87.8	43	12.2	6	2	1
Special Education	222	68.5	152	31.5	70	1.8	4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	4	50	2	50	2	42.9	3
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	340	79.7	271	20.3	69	5	18

1. Identify the challenges that are evident.

HCPS Response:

A clear achievement gap exists with both the African American and Special Education subgroups. This indicates a need and a challenge to further identify differentiated instructional strategies supporting the variety of needs presented by learners within the African American and Special Education subgroups. Additional challenges are in identifying additional professional development time in order to enhance the capacity of teachers to effectively address student needs as well as securing additional data streams necessary in order to effectively monitor the success of all students, particularly those within the identified gap subgroups.

High School Assessments (HSA)

Biology

2. Describe the interventions that the school system has in place to support students in passing the Biology HSA. How effective are they? What evidence do you have of their effectiveness? Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- Biology Revisited is a remediation program designed to support students who have not passed the Biology HSA. This during-the-day class is taught by a biology teacher. Students are afforded multiple opportunities to retake the HSA. Program effectiveness is based upon the relative degree of student success within the program as compared to HSA results. (2.1a.3)
 - For students with IEPs who are identified as at-risk of failing the Biology HSA due to identified learning disabilities, instruction takes place in a cooperative/collaborative classroom with a general educator and a special educator. Teachers monitor progress via a variety of assessment tools and conferences with students and parents are conducted as needed. (2.1a.3)
 - BRIDGE Plan courses of study are available for students meeting the BRIDGE requirements. Identified teachers from schools work closely with the Supervisor of Science, Intervention Coordinator, School-Based Administration, and the School Counselor to provide students with maximum opportunities to fulfill the BRIDGE requirements. Identified students also have the opportunity to participate in the Summer BRIDGE program sponsored by the Intervention Coordinator and the Coordinator for School Improvement. The Office of Special Education supported the Summer BRIDGE program utilizing MSDE discretionary grant funding. Funding supplemented professional development training, instructional resources, student transportation and salaries for instructional teams. Effectiveness is measured by students successfully completing the BRIDGE requirements. All twelfth grade students met the requirement and the Harford County Public Schools (HCPS) did not have one student fail to graduate in the 2008-2009 school year because of failure to meet the High School Assessment requirement.
3. Describe what, if anything, the school system will do differently than in past years to address the challenges identified. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- Biology Revisited teachers will assemble during the 2009-2010 school year to address the program and identify needed enhancements. Substitute teacher coverage will be provided to designated teachers. (4.3c.5)
- The Office of Science will collaborate with the Office of Special Education in a grant funded project designed to enhance the use of differentiated instructional strategies. Specifically, content enhancement routines will be embedded into the existing curriculum in order to better meet the needs of all students. Professional development time as well as team planning time will be provided via the grant. (2.1a.3)
-

High School Assessments (HSA)

Biology

- HCPS is slated to provide cooperative/collaborative teachers with professional development designed to support the co-teaching environment. (4.3c.3)
- The Biology curriculum is in its final editing stage. Attention continues to be given to ensure alignment with the core learning goals while integrating exemplary instructional strategies and tools. Curriculum maps are being developed as an alignment and communication tool, enhancing the manner in which core content is unpacked. (2.2a.1)
- A Biology assessment team has been established to develop pilot benchmark/end of unit assessments. Each benchmark assessment is intended to provide teachers with standards-based data to support refinements to the teaching and learning process, as a proactive HSA measure. Standardized data will be generated and reported down to the sub-group level. Special attention will be given to the identified underachieving sub-groups. As the pilot moves forward, professional development will be provided to teachers focusing on the utilization of data to inform instruction. Financial resources have been provided in order to fully support the development of benchmark assessments. (2.2a.10, 4.3c.5)
- School-based Department Chairs will meet with Science Supervisory personnel for three full days throughout the school year. A portion of this time will be dedicated to ongoing reflection of HSA data and practices designed to enhance the impact of high quality science instruction. Data associated with the Biology Revisited program will again be analyzed and correlations to HSA success identified. (2.2a.2, 4.3c.8)
- Throughout the 2008-2009 school year, professional development with regard to the “Indicators of High Quality Science Instruction” was provided to all secondary school Instructional Leadership Teams. This includes principals, instructional facilitators, assistant principals, and mentor teachers. Each team was engaged in a variety of learning opportunities designed to support their knowledge base and capacity as all engage in the observation and evaluation of science teachers. Individualized support will continue be provided to schools during the 2009-2010 school year. (4.3c.10)
- Middle schools have been provided with a resource of consultant/regional expert in the area of African-American Male learning. This consultant will assist schools in the analysis of student achievement data and other data streams to narrow the focus and create a strategic plan for addressing identified teaching and learning needs. HCPS is hopeful that this effort will result in improved achievement at the middle and high levels. (2.1b.5a; PI-6)

High School Assessments (HSA)

Government

Based on the Examination of 2008 High School Assessment Results for Government (Tables 3.7 – 3.8):

Table 3.7: HSA Test Participation and Status - Government 2008							
Population: All 10th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2748	92.2	2533	7.8	215	2	55
American Indian/Alaskan Native	10	90	9	10	1	0	0
African American	478	79.3	379	20.7	99	3	15
Asian/Pacific Islander	76	96.1	73	3.9	3	3.8	3
White (non-Hispanic)	2106	95.1	2002	4.9	104	1.6	34
Hispanic	78	89.7	70	10.3	8	3.7	3
Special Education	273	70.3	192	29.7	81	2.5	7
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	5	80	4	20	1	44.4	4
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	444	80.2	356	19.8	88	3.1	14

Table 3.8: HSA Test Participation and Status -Government 2008							
Population: All 11th Grade Students							
	Total Number Taken	% Taken and Passed	Number Taken and Passed	% Taken and Not Passed	Number Taken and Not Passed	% Not Taken	Number Not Taken
All Students	2618	95.5	2499	4.5	119	1.3	35
American Indian/Alaskan Native	17	88.2	15	11.8	2	10.5	2
African American	437	88.8	388	11.2	49	2.5	11
Asian/Pacific Islander	79	91.1	72	8.9	7	1.3	1
White (non-Hispanic)	2036	97.2	1979	2.8	57	0.8	16
Hispanic	49	91.8	45	8.2	4	9.3	5
Special Education	221	81.4	180	18.6	41	1.8	4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	5	40	2	60	3	28.6	2
Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)	350	89.1	312	10.9	38	4.1	15

1. Identify the challenges that are evident.

HCPS Response:

The most obvious challenge that remains is to work with students to achieve 100% passage overall and in all subgroups. The lowest performing subgroups are African Americans and Special Education, though there is steady progress in moving all students towards passage of the High School Assessment in Government.

2. Describe the interventions that the school system has in place to support students in passing the Government HSA. How effective are they? What evidence do you have of their effectiveness? Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

High School Assessments (HSA)

Government

HCPS Response:

Identified interventions designed to assist students in passing the High School Assessment in Government include:

- The Grade Nine Government Curriculum utilized by teachers was recently revised and will go into effect with the 2009-2010 school year. The revised guide incorporates the Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC) for American Government as its framework, includes revised Unit Assessments that test all VSC Standards and Indicators, and promotes the use of a differentiated textbook approach based on student ability and reading mastery. Effectiveness will be measured by student performance on county-wide benchmark assessments, overall county performance on High School Assessment, and through obtained teacher feedback.

Additionally, a team of government and special education teachers worked in June-July 2009 to adapt the revised curriculum using the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM). This grant funded professional development, led by a consultant trainer, adapted the revised curriculum to meet the needs of Special Education students in cooperative-collaborative classes. These adaptations will be piloted during the 2009-2010 school year and additional training will be provided to all Social Studies teachers teaching cooperative-collaborative classes. A subsequent evaluation of the success of these modifications will be done based on student performance on the High School Assessment in Government and teacher feedback.

- A county-wide Government Remediation Manual is available for teachers to use with students who have passed the Government course of study, but have not passed the High School Assessment. High Schools throughout Harford County have scheduled Government Remediation courses which are taught by certified Social Studies teachers. Remediation materials also include school-created review packets that use public release practice items as well as publisher produced review books [AMSCO, Barrons] purchased with Intervention funds. Students are provided the opportunity to take the October and January administrations of the High School Assessment in Government. Effectiveness is measured by student success in passing the High School Assessment which is demonstrated in Tables 3.7 and 3.8.
- BRIDGE Plan courses of study are available for students meeting the BRIDGE requirements. An identified teacher from the Social Studies department in each school works closely with the Supervisor of Social Studies, Intervention Coordinator, School-Based Administration, and the School Counselor to provide students with maximum opportunities to fulfill the BRIDGE requirements. Identified students also have the opportunity to participate in the Summer BRIDGE program sponsored by the Intervention Coordinator and the Coordinator for School Improvement. The Office of Special Education supported the Summer BRIDGE program utilizing MSDE discretionary grant funding. Funding supplemented professional development training, instructional resources, student transportation and salaries for instructional teams.

High School Assessments (HSA)

Government

Effectiveness is measured by students successfully completing the BRIDGE requirements. All twelfth grade students met the requirement and the Harford County Public Schools (HCPS) did not have one student fail to graduate in the 2008-2009 school year because of failure to meet the High School Assessment requirement.

3. Describe what, if anything, the school system will do differently than in past years to address the challenges identified. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

The biggest change will be the revised Grade 9 curriculum. Approximately \$250,000 in resource support, in the form of textbooks and interactive wall charts, have been purchased and will be used in the 2009-2010 school year. Additionally, reviews of the success of the Remediation Course and BRIDGE Course are ongoing through the Office of Social Studies and the Intervention Coordinator. Changes to both interventions include greater direction to teachers and project monitors (BRIDGE) as to the completion of requirements and paperwork.

Further study of the purchase of a data warehouse system is underway which would provide more timely data information to promote collaborative examination on the part of teachers. This data would be generated by the county-wide benchmark assessments that have been pre-existing (Midterms and Final Exams) as well as the recently revised Unit Assessments included in the revised curriculum.

- Middle schools have been provided with a resource of consultant/regional expert in the area of African-American Male learning. This consultant will assist schools in the analysis of student achievement data and other data streams to narrow the focus and create a strategic plan for addressing identified teaching and learning needs. HCPS is hopeful that this effort will result in improved achievement at the middle and high levels. (2.1b.5a; PI-6)

High School Assessments (HSA)

HSA Graduation Requirement

Class of 2009

Based on the Examination of Data for 2009 Graduates Who Met the High School Assessment Graduation Requirement by Option and Bridge Projects Passed (Tables 3.9 and 3.10):

Table 3.9 2009 Graduates Who Met the High School Assessment (HSA) Graduation Requirement by Option													
	Enrolled	HSA Graduation Requirement Options								Total			
		Passing Scores on Four HSAs		1602 Option		Bridge Projects		Waivers		Met		Not Met	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008-2009	2541	2041	80.3	433	17	45	1.8	22	0.9	2541	100	0	0

Table 3.10 Bridge Projects Passed					
	Algebra/Data Analysis	Biology	English	Government	Total
	#	#	#	#	#
2008-2009	43	41	38	20	142

- Describe your school system's results. In your response, please report on the implementation of the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation.

HCPS Response:

Harford County Public Schools had 97% of the senior population meeting the High School Assessment through passing the four tests or the combined 1602 option. Only 2% of the seniors met the requirement through the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation and less than 1% received a waiver. Likewise, no students in Harford County Public Schools failed to graduate solely because of not meeting the High School Assessment requirement. Administrators, teachers, and students worked extremely hard to ensure student success.

- Identify the strategies to which you attribute the results. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

All high schools in Harford County receive additional funding to support remediation services for students. All high schools received \$20,000 to utilize over the course of the year. Patterson Mill High School was an exception, as they received \$10,000 to support remediation because they

High School Assessments (HSA)

HSA Graduation Requirement

did not have a senior class during the 2008-09 school year. Some schools utilized these funds to support a retired/rehired teacher to be the project monitor, as well as employ substitutes during the day. Additionally, every high school designated a contact person at the school to support the project monitors and be a liaison with Central Office.

Many lessons were learned from the scoring of the Bridge Plan projects. After the first couple of scoring sessions, teachers had a better understanding of expectations of both the student and the monitor regarding the implementation of the Bridge Plan. Through these lessons learned, information was shared with schools after each Local Review Panel to ensure student and teacher success.

3. Describe where challenges were evident.

HCPS Response:

In March 2008, LEAs were told that students would have to complete the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation projects independently. In September 2008, the message from MSDE was the Bridge Plan was an academic intervention, and project monitors could indeed assist students. This created some confusion for teachers and administrators regarding how much assistance to provide students working on the Bridge Plan projects.

Additionally, scoring projects was a bit confusing at first. No student samples were available for teachers to utilize during training, but after the first two Local Review Panels, the scorers seemed to have more clarity regarding how to score the projects, the scoring tools, and what was expected of students. By the end of the year, several teacher leaders in each content area emerged and the trainer of trainer model was utilized to train additional scorers. Moreover, the scoring tools had errors which affected the scoring process.

Class of 2010

Based on the Examination of Data for Juniors (Rising Seniors) Who Have Not Yet Met the High School Graduation Requirement as of June 30, 2009 (Table 3.11):

Table 3.11 Rising Seniors Who Have Not Yet Met the Graduation Requirement													
	Enrolled #	Met # %		Not Yet Met								Total Not Met # %	
				Needing to Pass 4		Needing to Pass 3		Needing to Pass 2		Needing to Pass 1			
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
2009-2010	2672	2488	93.1	51	1.9	54	2.0	50	1.9	29	1.1	184	6.9

High School Assessments (HSA)

HSA Graduation Requirement

1. Identify the challenges that persist.

HCPS Response:

Although teachers have a much clearer picture of assisting students, thanks in part to MSDE's support, there still seems to be some concern regarding how much assistance is acceptable. Professional development and the Bridge Plan Project Monitor Guide should alleviate this issue.

Scoring tools still seem to be inconsistent in terms of accuracy, which may create inconsistencies during scoring, as well as throughout the state.

At this time, there are no other challenges that persist.

2. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made to support those juniors (rising seniors) who have not yet met the HSA graduation requirement in passing the High School Assessments. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations.

HCPS Response:

- Harford County Public Schools conducted a three-week summer school program for incoming seniors during the month of July 2009 to support students with the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation. During this time period:
 - 81 Students participated
 - 32 Students met the High School Assessment requirement through Bridge Plan
 - 279 Projects were scored
 - 208 Projects were accepted
 - 71 Projects were rejected
- For the 2009-10 school year, a Bridge Plan Project Monitor Resource Guide in all content areas has been created and will be distributed to Bridge Plan Monitors during a three-hour professional development session in early September. The guide contains lessons learned, Core Learning Goals, sample work, and resources to assist with the implementation of the Bridge Plan projects. Another professional development session will occur during February 2010.
- As for collection of data, a spreadsheet has been developed through the Office of Accountability to support Central Office and schools with tracking student performance. Additionally, collection protocols of the Bridge Plans from schools to and from Central Office have been created.
- All high schools will receive additional funding to support the implementation of Bridge Plan for the 2009-10 school year. These funds may be utilized during and after school to support student success.

I.D.ii Limited English Proficient Students

No Child Left Behind Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 2.2: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the state's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 2.3: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the state's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

This section reports the progress of Limited English Proficient students in developing and attaining English language proficiency and making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). School systems are asked to analyze information on Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs):

- AMAO I is used to demonstrate the percentages of Limited English Proficient students progressing toward English proficiency. For making AMAO I progress, Maryland uses a composite score obtained from the LAS Links assessment. The composite score is derived from equally weighted sub scores from each of the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Students are considered to have made progress if their overall test score on the LAS Links composite is 15 scale score points higher than the composite score from the previous year test administration. In order to meet the target for AMAO I for school year 2008-2009, 56% of ELLs will make progress in learning English.
- AMAO II is used to demonstrate the percentages of Limited English Proficient students attaining English proficiency by the end of each school year. For calculating AMAO II, Maryland uses a composite score obtained from the LAS Links assessment. The composite score is derived from equally weighted sub scores from each of the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. For the purpose of AMAO II (accountability), a composite cut score of 5 on the ELP assessment with a minimum cut score of 4 in each domain is used to determine proficiency level for each grade. The AMAO II target for school year 2008-2009 is 15% of ELLs will attain proficiency in English.
- AMAO III represents Adequate Yearly Progress of LSSs for the Limited English Proficient student subgroup.

Note: Where responses in this section are similar or linked to those provided under Section I.D.i or Attachment 10 (Title III, Part A), local school systems may reference with page numbers, or copy and paste as appropriate.

Limited English Proficient Students

No Child Left Behind requires that corrective actions are taken in local school systems that failed to make progress on the AMAOs:

- *For any fiscal year.* The school system must separately inform a parent or the parents of a child identified for participation in or participating in a language instruction educational program of the system's failure to show progress. The law stipulates that this notification is to take place not later than 30 days after such failure occurs. The law further requires that the information be provided in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parent can understand.
- *For two or three consecutive years.* The school system must develop an improvement plan that will ensure that the system meets such objectives. The plan shall specifically address the factors that prevented the system from achieving the objectives.
- *For four consecutive years.* The state shall require the local system to modify the curriculum program and method of instruction or determine whether or not the local school system shall continue to receive funds related to the system's failure to meet the objectives, and require the local system to replace educational personnel relevant to the system's failure to meet the objectives.

A. Based on the Examination of AMAO I, AMAO II, and AMAO III Data (Tables 4.1- 4.3):

Table 4.1 System AMAO I, 2008-2009			
	N	Number Who Met Target	% (% = Number Who Met Target)
Total	307	281	91.53%

Table 4.2 System AMAO II, 2008-2009*			
	N	Number Who Met Target	%
Total	421	78	16.08%

NOTE: In order for a local school system to meet the System AMAO I, 2008-2009, **at least 56%** of students must make a 15 scale score point increase on the 2009 LAS administration as compared to last year's administration.

* Note (Table 4.2): In order for a local school system to meet the System AMAO II, 2008-2009, at least 15% of students must meet grade-specific targets for English Language Proficiency.

Limited English Proficient Students

Table 4.3: System AMAO III						
AYP Status for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students*						
	Reading			Math		
	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High
2007	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
2008	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
2009	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

1. Describe where progress is evident.

HCPS Response:

The LEP subgroup aggregate for HCPS made AYP again in 2009 in both reading and mathematics. Based on AMAO 1 results for English Language Learners, 91.5% are progressing satisfactorily in Harford County Public Schools.

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies to which you attribute the progress of Limited English Proficient students towards attaining English proficiency.

HCPS Response:

The elementary and secondary schools continue to take increasing ownership of English Language Learners. The Office of World Languages uses Title III funding to provide either during the day or beyond the school day intervention tutors for ELLs, as well as providing outreach to the parents of these children. Additionally, the Office of World Languages offers 4 professional development modules for schools to take advantage. (2.1b.8; 2.1b.9; PI-7; PI-14)

3. Describe where challenges are evident in the progress of Limited English Proficient students towards attaining English proficiency by each domain in Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing.

HCPS Response:

The ESOL staffing/ELL student ratio in Harford County Public Schools is quite high, i.e., ranging from 40-45 students per teacher and the 8 of the 10 staff members are itinerant with each having a case load of 3 – 7 schools. This ratio impacts the amount of time during which push-in/pull-out ESOL instructional services can be accommodated. The resultant impact is demonstrated through individual ELL's language acquisition abilities in the domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made to ensure sufficient progress of Limited English Proficient students towards attaining English proficiency. Include a discussion of corresponding resource allocations, and incorporate timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

The Office of World Languages will continue to promote the addition of during/beyond the

Limited English Proficient Students

school day intervention tutors for the benefit of providing ELLs additional content area support/encouragement/instruction. In one school community where AYP attainment continues to pose a hurdle, once a week ELL parental education is being offered in conjunction with twice a week beyond the school day tutorials being provided for the ELLs. (2.1b.9)

B. Describe the corrective action plan specifying action to be taken for not meeting AMAO I:

Local school systems not making AMAO I must provide an update on how the school system has revised the applicable components of the Master Plan to ensure progress of English Language Learners towards English proficiency. In the report, school systems should describe what challenges are evident and what changes or adjustments will be made so that the school system will meet AMAO I.

HCPS Response:

Harford County Public Schools achieved AMAO 1.

C. Describe the corrective action plan specifying action to be taken for not meeting AMAO II:

Local school systems not making AMAO II must provide an update on how the school system has revised the applicable components of the Master Plan to ensure progress of English Language Learners towards English attainment. In the report, school systems should describe what challenges are evident and what changes or adjustments will be made so that the school system will meet AMAO II.

HCPS Response:

Harford County Public Schools achieved AMAO II. However, the calculated percentage for AMAO II for this school system is significantly lower this year than before. The reason for this year's AMAO II percentage of 16.08% is a result of a change from a "4 or 5" overall student proficiency of all the subgroup LAS Links tested areas to a "4 or 5" in ALL of the assessed subgroups of the LAS Links assessment.

D. Describe the corrective action plan specifying action to be taken for not meeting AMAO III:

Local school systems not making AMAO III must provide an update on how the school system has revised the applicable components of the Master Plan to ensure progress of Limited English Proficient students toward attaining reading and math proficiency. In the report, school systems should describe what challenges are evident and what changes or adjustments will be made so that the school system will make Adequate Yearly Progress. You may refer to other sections of this update as appropriate.

HCPS Response:

Harford County Public Schools has initiated a deliberate outreach educational program to ELL students in the two school communities whose schools did not reach AYP due to ELLs. In conjunction with this outreach, a parental outreach component will be offered as well, in order to further impact positively the cognitive learning concepts which are being instructionally delivered in the classrooms. (2.1b.9)

I.D.iii

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

School System Improvement

This section must be completed **ONLY** by local school systems in improvement or corrective action.¹

Instructions:

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

HCPS Response:

HCPS is not a school system in improvement or corrective action.

School Improvement

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

Under No Child Left Behind, local school systems must review the progress of Title I schools primarily to determine (1) if each school has made adequate yearly progress toward meeting State standards by 2013-2014, and (2) if schools have narrowed the achievement gap. In conjunction with the local school system, the State must review the effectiveness of each school's actions and activities that are supported by Title I, Part A funds², including parental involvement and professional development.

¹ Section 13A.01.04.08 of the Code of Maryland Regulations.

² This information is included in Attachment 7 of Part II.

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

Table 5.1 Number and Percentage of All Schools Making Adequate Yearly Progress												
	Elementary			Middle			High*			Special Placement		
	Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP		Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP		Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP		Total # of Schools	Schools Making AYP	
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
2003	32	28	87.5	8	4	50	10	8	80	1	1	100
2004	32	32	100	8	7	87.5	10	9	90	1	1	100
2005	32	31	96.9	8	7	87.5	10	9	90	1	1	100
2006	32	30	93.8	8	7	87.5	10	9	90	1	1	100
2007	32	30	93.8	8	5	62.5	11	7	63.6	1	1	100
2008	32	29	90.6	9	3	33.3	11	10	90.9	1	1	100
2009	32	28	87.5	9	6	66.7						

Table 5.2 Number and Percentage of Title I Schools Making Adequate Yearly Progress												
	Elementary			Middle			High			Special Placement		
	Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP		Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP		Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP		Total # of Title I Schools	Title I Schools Making AYP	
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
2003	6	3	50	0			0			0		
2004	6	6	100	0			0			0		
2005	6	5	83.3	0			0			0		
2006	6	6	100	0			0			0		
2007	6	4	66.7	0			0			0		
2008	6	6	100	0			0			0		
2009	6	3	50	0			0			0		

• High School AYP data unavailable at the time of this report

1. Identify the challenges, including those specific to Title I schools, in ensuring that schools make Adequate Yearly Progress. Describe the changes or adjustments, and the corresponding resource allocations, which will be made to ensure sufficient progress. Include timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

Three HCPS middle schools – Fallston Middle, North Harford Middle, and Havre de Grace Middle – did not make AYP in 2009 (Table 5.1). Of these three schools, Fallston Middle is designated in the Local Attention stage of the School Improvement process. However, North Harford and Havre de Grace middle schools are now designated as Year I schools in the School Improvement process due to two consecutive years not making AYP. Another middle school, Aberdeen Middle, did achieve Safe Harbor/AYP status in 2009 but remains in Year I for another year. Additionally, Edgewood Middle, having made AYP in 2009, remains in the Restructuring Implementation priority status of School Improvement.

Adequate Yearly Progress

1. HCPS Response continued:

Four HCPS elementary schools did not make AYP in 2009 (Table 5.1) and are therefore designated in need of Local Attention, although not in School Improvement. These schools are Deerfield, Edgewood, Magnolia, and William Paca elementary schools. Of these four schools, the latter three are Title I schools. None of HCPS elementary schools are in school improvement. None of the Title I schools are in school improvement.

The following schools have been identified as School Improvement schools for the 2009-2010 school year:

Elementary Schools:

- No HCPS elementary school is currently in school improvement
- No Title I school is currently in school improvement

Middle Schools:

- Edgewood Middle School (EMS) – Restructuring Implementation
- Aberdeen Middle School (AMS) – Year 1 (Safe Harbor)
- North Harford Middle School (NHMS) – Year 1
- Havre de Grace Middle School (HDMS) – Year 1

High Schools:

- 2009 AYP data for high schools was not available at the time of this report.
- The Alternative Education Program (AEP) will continue as a priority needs school in 2009-2010. The Alternative Education Program serves students in grades 6-12.

The following table (Table I.Diii-A) outlines the measures in place at the identified School Improvement schools for school year 2009-2010 in efforts to ensure sufficient progress in order to make AYP and exit the school improvement process.

Adequate Yearly Progress

HCPS School Improvement Measures 2009-2010

Table I.Diii-A

Priority Needs Schools	Timeline	Challenges	Resource Allocation	School Improvement Changes and Adjustments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EMS - AEP 	<p>July 2009 – June 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued financial support of Alternative Governance Plan during tight fiscal times • Continued growth for all subgroups while ensuring a focus on those subgroups not making AYP • Ensuring that school is fully staffed with highly qualified teachers (as noted in AGP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMS – Math Coach to support interventions SY 2009-2010 • EMS – Continuation of 4th Assistant Principal, full time Instructional Facilitator and 2nd Mentor Teacher • AEP – transportation funds to support full day school on 5th day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with all schools on setting sub-group targets that speak to meeting the AMO and not just AYP. This also includes reaching or exceeding the HCPS Target for sub-groups currently meeting the AMO • Conduct weekly ILT meetings to analyze student achievement data, identify students and staff needs, and plan professional development activities • Conduct monthly SIT meetings to monitor the development and implementation of the school’s SIP to ensure that it reflects the previous and current data and analysis • Train entire school staff to effectively implement the Classroom Focused Improvement Process (CFIP) in order to effectively monitor the achievement of all students and adjust instruction accordingly • Conduct ILT and Executive Director of Secondary Education meetings to monitor and support school improvement activities • Review and analyze student data Instructional Data Management System (INFORM) in efforts to make decisions about appropriate intervention programs and instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners • Develop and implement an interventions plan targeting any student not performing at the proficient level with specific emphasis on individual student monitoring • Implement the MSDE approved Alternative Governance Plan • Conduct quarterly meetings with the Alternative Governance Board and the HCPS Board of Education in order to share updates on ABP progress • Submit progress results to MSDE on a TBD basis • Work with all schools on setting sub-group targets that speak to meeting the AMO and not just AYP. This also includes reaching or exceeding the HCPS Target for sub-groups currently meeting the AMO

Adequate Yearly Progress

HCPS School Improvement Measures 2009-2010				
Table I.D.iii-A continued				
Developing Needs Schools	Timeline	Challenges	Resource Allocation	School Improvement Changes and Adjustments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AMS - NHMS - HDMS 	July 2009 – June 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued growth for all subgroups while ensuring a focus on those subgroups not making AYP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMS & HDMS - Math Coach to support interventions SY 2009-2010 • AMS, NHMS & HDMS - Boundless Learning professional development model to support co-teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct weekly ILT meetings to analyze student achievement data, identify students and staff needs, and plan professional development activities • Conduct monthly SIT meetings to monitor the development and implementation of the school's SIP to ensure that it reflects the previous and current data and analysis • Train entire school staff to effectively implement the Classroom Focused Improvement Process (CFIP) in order to effectively monitor the achievement of all students and adjust instruction accordingly • Conduct ILT and Executive Director of Secondary Education meetings to monitor and support school improvement activities • Review and analyze student data Instructional Data Management System (INFORM) in efforts to make decisions about appropriate intervention programs and instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners • Develop and implement an interventions plan targeting any student not performing at the proficient level with specific emphasis on individual student monitoring

1. HCPS Response continued:

The following tables outline the measures in place at the HCPS Title I schools that did not make AYP in 2009 in efforts to ensure sufficient progress.

Adequate Yearly Progress

TITLE I Schools				
Challenges Facing Schools Not Making AYP In 2009			Changes and Adjustments to Ensure Sufficient Progress	
<p><u>William Paca/Old Post Road Elementary School</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall size of school (avg. 1,000 students) • Two building campus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary building - open space ○ Intermediate building - lack of air conditioning ○ Massive master scheduling tasks ○ 50 classroom teachers ○ Five first year teachers ○ Two second year teachers ○ Four out of six special educators are non-tenured • Fluctuating student enrollment • Increase in average class size at grade 2 and 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Additional grade 2 and grade 4 teacher ○ 9 second grade classrooms ○ 7 fourth grade classrooms • 9 sections of Kindergarten went into 8 sections of 1st grade • 8 sections of 3rd grade went into 7 sections of 4th grade • Increase in number of students with special needs • A number of students continue to be chronic attendance concerns • Increase in behavior referrals • No active PTA • Poor parental involvement • FaRMS and SE subgroups did not make AYP in reading and mathematics in 2009 			<p><u>William Paca/Old Post Road Elementary School</u></p> <p>Additional Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Math Specialist (Title I funded) • Two additional para-educators (Title I funded) • Behavior Specialist (grant funded) • Additional Family Liaison (Title I funded) • Parent Resource Room <p>Common Planning/Co-teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-taught classrooms with special educators • Common Planning for special educators and classroom teachers <p>Additional Grade level Data Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade levels will meet three times per month to intentionally analyze student data <p>Technology in classrooms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School is equipped with interactive white boards, Activ-votes, interactive slates, docu-cams, digital cameras, 15 laptop carts (Title I funded) <p>Additional Interventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success Maker (Title I funded) <p>Additional Behavior Intervention Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lunchroom incentives • "Student Of The Week" • Classroom competitions • School bus behavior incentives <p>Intentional Staff Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on Reading and Math • See chart below 	
William Paca/Old Post Road Elementary School Staff Development 2009-2010				
Date	Time Frame	Grade	Professional Development Topic	Funding Source
9/10/09	2 Hour rotations	K, 1 and 2	Behavior Management and Team Building	Title I Staff Development
9/24/09	2 hour rotations	3, 4, and 5	Incorporating CARS into Reading Instruction	Title I Staff Development
9/25/09	Early Dismissal	1 and 3	Building Number Sense	N/A
10/15/09	Early Dismissal	2 and 5	Building Number Sense	N/A
11/4/09	Early Dismissal	K and 5	Building Number Sense	N/A
11/11/09	2 Hour rotations	K, 1 and 2	Differentiating Reading Instruction and Working with Words	Title I Staff Development
11/12/09	2 hour rotations	3, 4, and 5	Differentiating Reading Instruction and Working with Words	Title I Staff Development
1/6/10	2 hour rotations	3, 4, and 5	Reading Strategies based on current assessment data	Title I Staff Development
1/7/10	2 Hour rotations	K, 1 and 2	Reading Strategies based on current assessment data	Title I Staff Development
1/15/10	Early Dismissal	1 and 5	Differentiating Mathematics Instruction	N/A
2/12/10	Early Dismissal	2 and 3	Differentiating Mathematics Instruction	N/A
3/19/10	Early Dismissal	K and 4	Using Mathematics data to drive instruction	N/A
4/16/10	Early Dismissal	3 and 5	Using Mathematics data to drive instruction	N/A
5/14/10	Early Dismissal	1 and 4	Using Mathematics data to drive instruction	N/A
May TBD	2 hour rotations	3, 4, and 5	Grouping Students for 10-11 school year	Title I Staff Development
May TBD	2 Hour rotations	K, 1 and 2	Grouping Students for 10-11 school year	Title I Staff Development

Adequate Yearly Progress

TITLE I Schools	
Challenges Facing Schools Not Making AYP In 2009	Changes and Adjustments to Ensure Sufficient Progress
<p><u>Edgewood Elementary School</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase of students in poverty • High transient population • Increase of average class size in all grades (K-5) • Difficulty and Complexity of scheduling Interventions during the school day <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduction of three Para-educators who supported in-school Interventions • Increase in number of students with special needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A change in the Pre-Kindergarten Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two additional special education programs ▪ Reconfiguration of general ed. Pre-K to Co-Taught Pre-K ▪ Addition of an Early Learning Program (Specialized Early Intervention Program) • Limited experience of critical support staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Title I Teacher Specialist-2nd year in position ○ Gifted/Talented Teacher-1st year in position ○ Reading Specialist-2nd year in position ○ Instructional Facilitator-1st year in position • Mentor-split between two schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At Edgewood Elementary-.5 • Instructional Facilitator-split between Edgewood and William Paca/Old Post Road Elementary Schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At Edgewood Elementary-.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Due to 1st year in assignment, the Instructional Facilitator is required to attend mentor meetings as well as New Administrator meetings and New Instructional Facilitator meetings. In September 2009, she will be in her buildings only 66% of her duty days (this is split between 3 buildings) ▪ Limited time scheduled for Edgewood Elementary School (only 5 days in all of September 2009) • A number of students have chronic attendance concerns • Increase in office behavior referrals and suspensions • A constantly changing PTA Board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Average PTA Board Term-1 year • Limited Parent Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Language and Communication Barriers 	<p><u>Edgewood Elementary School</u></p> <p>Additional Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase of Title I Teacher Specialist Time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From 2.5 days to 4 days a week <p>Common Planning/Co-Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-Taught Classrooms with Special Educators • Co-Taught Classrooms with Math and Reading Specialists • Common planning time for classroom teachers, special educators, and Math/Reading Specialists <p>Grade Level Data Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade Levels will meet twice a month with an intentional focus on Reading and math which will align with weekly Faculty Meetings and PLC work. <p>Technology in Classrooms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edgewood is equipped with Interactive whiteboards, Activ-votes, docu-cams, digital cameras and a 16 laptop computer cart(Title I Funded) <p>Additional Interventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success Maker(Title I Funded) • Before and After School Programs(HCPS and Title I Funded) • ELL After School Sessions for Parents and Students(Title 4 Funded) <p>Additional Behavior Intervention Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-Wide behavior Plan(PBIS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eagle Dollars and Feather Store • Lunchroom Incentives • Classroom Incentives • School Bus Behavior Incentives • Small group pull-out with Guidance Counselor for targeted students • Community Mentoring and Church Involvement • Behavior Intervention Manual purchased for all grade levels <p>Intentional Staff Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A focus for 2009-2010 staff development is reading and math. This year, we have been intentional in planning one Faculty Meeting a month to focus on reading strategies. A data meeting, that same month, will focus on reading strategies application, which will allow us to see the direct correlation between staff development content and student performance in reading through analyzing a variety of data sources.

Adequate Yearly Progress

TITLE I Schools	
Challenges Facing Schools Not Making AYP In 2009	Changes and Adjustments to Ensure Sufficient Progress
<p><u>Edgewood Elementary School continued.....</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following subgroups did not make AYP in 2009: Reading – Hispanic; FaRMS; SE: LEP Mathematics – FaRMS; SE 	<p><u>Edgewood Elementary School continued.....</u></p> <p>Intentional Staff Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our PLC topic for this school year is <i>Communicating Mathematically</i>. The staff, Kindergarten through 5th grade, will participate in a yearlong book study. This year, we have been intentional in planning one PLC Meeting a month to focus on a discussion about a chapter read in <u>Introduction to Communication</u> by Susan O’Connell. A data meeting, that same month, will focus on what was learned and implemented from the chapter which will allow us to see the direct correlation between staff development content and student performance in math through analyzing a variety of data sources.

The following chart outlines the Intentional Staff Development activities to be held at Edgewood Elementary School during 2009-2010.

Edgewood Elementary School Staff Development 2009-2010				
Date	Time Frame	Grade Levels Participating	Professional Development Topic	Funding Source
September 10, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Reading Focus (45 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Reading Professional Development application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development
September 14, 2009	Faculty Meeting-Reading Focus (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development (Eagle U)	N/A
September 23, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development
October 5, 2009	Faculty Meeting Math PLCs (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development- PLC Book Study (<i>Communicating Mathematically</i>)	Title I Professional Development
October 7, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development
October 19, 2009	Faculty Meeting-Reading Focus (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development (Eagle U)	N/A
October 22, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Reading Focus (45 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Reading Professional Development application based on analysis of student data	N/A
November 2, 2009	Faculty Meeting Math PLCs (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development- PLC Book Study (<i>Communicating Mathematically</i>)	Title I Professional Development
November 12, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development

Adequate Yearly Progress

Edgewood Elementary School Staff Development 2009-2010				
Date	Time Frame	Grade Levels Participating	Professional Development Topic	Funding Source
November 16, 2009	Faculty Meeting-Reading Focus (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development (Eagle U)	Title I Professional Development
November 30, 2009	Faculty Meeting Math PLCs (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development- PLC Book Study (<i>Communicating Mathematically</i>)	Title I Professional Development
December 7, 2009	Faculty Meeting-Reading Focus (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development (Eagle U)	Title I Professional Development
December 10, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Reading Focus (45 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Reading Professional Development application based on analysis of student data	N/A
December 17, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development
January 7, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development
January 11, 2009	Faculty Meeting Math PLCs (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development- PLC Book Study (<i>Communicating Mathematically</i>)	Title I Professional Development
January 21, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Reading Focus (45 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development (Eagle U)	N/A
February 8, 2009	Faculty Meeting-Reading Focus (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development- PLC Book Study (<i>Communicating Mathematically</i>)	Title I Professional Development
February 11, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development
February 25, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Reading Focus (45 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Reading Professional Development application based on analysis of student data	N/A
March 4, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Reading Focus (45 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Reading Professional Development application based on analysis of student data	N/A
March 8, 2009	Faculty Meeting-Reading Focus (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development (Eagle U)	Title I Professional Development
March 22, 2009	Faculty Meeting Math PLCs (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development- PLC Book Study (<i>Communicating Mathematically</i>)	Title I Professional Development
March 25, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development
April 8, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Reading Focus (45 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Reading Professional Development application based on analysis of student data	N/A
April 12, 2009	Faculty Meeting-Reading Focus (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development (Eagle U)	Title I Professional Development
April 19, 2009	Faculty Meeting Math PLCs (50 minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Professional Development- PLC Book Study (<i>Communicating Mathematically</i>)	Title I Professional Development
May 13, 2009	Grade Level Data Meetings-Math Focus (45 Minutes)	K-5 Teacher Specialists Special Educators	Math PLC application based on analysis of student data	Title I Professional Development

Adequate Yearly Progress

TITLE I Schools	
Challenges Facing Schools Not Making AYP In 2009	Changes and Adjustments to Ensure Sufficient Progress
<p><u>Magnolia Elementary School</u> Magnolia Elementary School has identified the following three challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific to Title 1 Schools: 84.6% of our students receive free or reduced meals; High rate of mobility- 33% of our students changed from the beginning to the end of the 2008-2009 school year; Historically, there has been a high rate of teacher turnover; 50% of our Special Education staff has changed from the 2008-2009 to the 2009-2010 school year. • Decreasing the number of Students scoring at the basic proficiency level as measured on MSA: Percentage of students scoring basic on the 2009 MSA – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3rd = 25.6% Math; 30.7% Reading 4th = 19.7% Math; 25% Reading 5th = 31% Math; 26.9% Reading • Narrowing the Achievement Gap: All of the sub groups that achieved AYP did so by falling within the confidence intervals or by using safe harbor. 	<p><u>Magnolia Elementary School</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased technology resources: Interactive White Boards, additional computer lab, ActivSlates, Flip Cameras – Increased student engagement and attention (Title I ARRA funds: \$136,000) • Extended School Day for Identified Targeted Students- Utilize approved interventions as well as provide assistance with homework (County School Funds: \$16,000/Title I ARRA Funds: \$163,296) • Facilitate Grade Level Planning for reading instruction; Additional afterschool, paid opportunities for staff development in the teaching of reading (County School Funds: \$5,200; Title I 2010 Budget: \$34,650; Title I Carryover Budget: \$26,000; Paraeducator support) • Weekly Grade Level Data Meetings: Teachers will collect and analyze formative assessment data in the area of reading comprehension and determine next steps as it relates to student needs (Paraeducator Support) • Monthly Professional Development sessions both during the school day and afterschool focused on differentiation of instruction. (County School Funds: \$5,200; Title I 2010 Budget: \$34,650; Title I Carryover Budget: \$26,000) • Monthly Grade Level Data Meetings: Teachers will meet with the Title 1 teacher specialist to analyze student reading data, monitor students in our Quartiles, and plan appropriate instruction. • Professional Development of County Initiative Classroom Focused Instructional Process (CFIP) • Increased Communication with Parents: Our Community Collaboration Team, Instructional Strategy Team, Curriculum Alignment Team is following through with suggestions from our Family Involvement Team to increase the information available on our website and increase the number of Family Nights that provide ways to work with students for parents (Title I 2010 Budget: Family Involvement \$16,996) • Family Involvement Nights: • Reading, Math, Assessment, Technology (Title I 2010 Budget: Family Involvement \$16,996)

Adequate Yearly Progress

B. Based on the Examination of Schools in Improvement Data (Tables 5.3 and 5.4):

Table 5.3: Number of All Schools in Improvement														
	2005-2006 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2005	2006-2007 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2006
	(based on 2005 AYP)							(based on 2006 AYP)						
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		
Elementary Schools			1						1					
Middle Schools	2	1							1				2	
High Schools	2							1	1					
Special Placement Schools														
Total	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	
	2007-2008 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2007	2008-2009 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2008
	(based on 2007 AYP)							(based on 2008 AYP)						
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs				Developing Needs			Priority Needs			
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation			Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		
Elementary Schools						1								
Middle Schools				1			1				1			
High Schools	1	1	1				1	1		1				
Special Placement Schools														
Total	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	
	2009-2010 Level of Improvement						Exiting in 2009							
	(based on 2009 AYP)													
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs										
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation									
Elementary Schools														
Middle Schools	3					1								
High Schools														
Special Placement Schools														
Total	3	0	0	0	1	0								

Adequate Yearly Progress

Table 5.4: Number of Title I Schools in Improvement												
	2005-2006 Level of Improvement					Exiting in 2005	2006-2007 Level of Improvement					Exiting in 2006
	(based on 2005 AYP)						(based on 2006 AYP)					
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation	
Elementary Schools	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Middle Schools												
High Schools												
Special Placement Schools												
Total	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
	2007-2008 Level of Improvement					Exiting in 2007	2008-2009 Level of Improvement					Exiting in 2008
	(based on 2007 AYP)						(based on 2008 AYP)					
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs			Developing Needs			Priority Needs		
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation		Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation	
Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Middle Schools												
High Schools												
Special Placement Schools												
Total	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
	2009-2010 Level of Improvement					Exiting in 2009						
	(based on 2009 AYP)											
	Developing Needs			Priority Needs								
	Year 1	Year 2	CA	Restructuring Planning	Restructuring Implementation							
Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Middle Schools												
High Schools												
Special Placement Schools												
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0						

1. Describe the actions that the school system is taking to ensure that the No Child Left Behind and Title I requirements for schools identified for Developing Needs (Improvement-Year 1; Improvement-Year 2; and Corrective Action) and Priority Needs (Restructuring-Planning and Restructuring-Implementation) are being addressed.
 - Describe actions that the school system took during the 2008-2009 school year.
 - Describe the actions that the school system will take once school improvement status is determined for the 2009-2010 school year.

Adequate Yearly Progress

HCPS Response:

The following schools were identified as School Improvement schools for the 2008-09 SY:

Elementary Schools:

- No HCPS elementary school
- No HCPS Title I school

Middle Schools:

- Edgewood Middle School (EDMS) – Restructuring Implementation
- Aberdeen Middle School (ABMS) – Year 1

High Schools:

- Aberdeen High School (ABHS) – Year 2 (Safe Harbor)
- Edgewood High School (EDHS) – Year 1 (Safe Harbor)
- Alternative Education Program (AEP) – Restructuring Planning

The following table (Table I.Diii-B) displays the 2008-2009 actions for HCPS schools in improvement.

HCPS School Improvement Measures 2008-2009		
School(s)	Timeline	School Improvement Measure
- EDMS - AEP - ABHS - EDHS - ABMS	July 2008 – June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notify parents that the school has been identified for improvement including an explanation of what the identification means, the reason the school was identified, and explanation of what the school is doing to address the problem of low achievement, and an explanation of how they can become involved in addressing the academic issues that led to the identification • Use MSA data and other measures of school performance to develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP) • Provide parents and school staff the opportunity to participate in the development of the SIP • Submit SIP to the Executive Director of Secondary Education Coordinator of School Improvement • Conduct weekly ILT meetings to analyze student achievement data, identify students and staff needs, and plan professional development activities • Conduct monthly SIT meetings to monitor the development and implementation of the school’s SIP to ensure that it reflects the previous and current data and analysis • Conduct ILT and Executive Director of Secondary Education meetings to monitor and support school improvement activities • Participate in discussions to review and investigate middle school reform concepts/models

Adequate Yearly Progress

HCPS School Improvement Measures 2008-2009

Table I.Diii-B continued

School(s)	Timeline	School Improvement Measure
- EDMS - AEP - ABHS - EDHS - ABMS	July 2008 – June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review and analyze student data Instructional Data Management System (INFORM) in efforts to make decisions about appropriate intervention programs and instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners ● Develop and implement an interventions plan targeting any student not performing at the proficient level with specific emphasis on individual student monitoring
- EDMS - ABHS - EDHS	July 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implement 4 week after school and extended year programs focused on the areas of reading and mathematics to support low performing students
- EDMS	August 2008 – June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implement the MSDE approved Alternative Governance Plan ● Conduct quarterly meetings with the Alternative Governance Board and the HCPS Board of Education in order to share updates on ABP progress ● Submit progress results to MSDE on a TBD basis
- AEP	August 2008 – June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conduct Teacher Capacity Needs Assessment ● Establish Alternative Governance Board (AGB) to develop MSDE Alternative Governance Plan (ABP) ● Conduct ABG meeting in order to identify Alternative Governance Model and develop ABP ● Submit AGP to HCPS BOE and MSDE SBOE
- ABHS	August 2008 – June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conduct Teacher Capacity Needs Assessment ● Identify and document which of the following Corrective Action/s were implemented during the 2008-2009 school year. ● Corrective Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide for all relevant staff, appropriate, scientifically research-based professional development, aligned with the Maryland Teacher Professional Development Standards, that is likely to improve the academic achievement of low-performing students; ▪ Institute a new curriculum grounded in scientifically based research, and provide appropriate professional development to support its implementation; ▪ Extend the length of the school year or school day; ▪ Replace school staff who are deemed relevant to the school not making adequate progress; ▪ Significantly decrease management authority at the school; ▪ Restructure the internal organization of the school; or ▪ Appoint one or more outside experts to advise the school on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ how to revise and strengthen the improvement plan it created while in school improvement status; and ○ how to address the specific issues underlying the school’s continued inability to make AYP
- EDHS	August 2008 – June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conduct Teacher Capacity Needs Assessment

Adequate Yearly Progress

HCPS Response:

The following table (Table I.Diii-C) displays the 2008-2009 actions for HCPS schools in improvement.

HCPS School Improvement Measures 2009-2010		
Table I.Diii.C		
Schools	Timeline	School Improvement Measure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EDMS - AEP - ABMS - NHMS - HDMS 	<p>July 2009 – June 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notify parents that the school has been identified for improvement including an explanation of what the identification means, the reason the school was identified, and explanation of what the school is doing to address the problem of low achievement, and an explanation of how they can become involved in addressing the academic issues that led to the identification • Use MSA data and other measures of school performance to develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP) • Work with all schools on setting sub-group targets that speak to meeting the AMO and not just AYP. This also includes reaching or exceeding the HCPS Target for sub-groups currently meeting the AMO • Design the SIP to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scientifically based research strategies that will bring all students to proficiency in reading and mathematics ○ Professional development that meets the MD Teacher professional Development standards ○ Technical assistance ○ Parent involvement ○ Measurable annual objectives for progress by each subgroup of students ○ Activities that extend beyond the school day/year ○ Incorporation of a teacher mentoring program ○ Implementation responsibilities • Provide parents and school staff the opportunity to participate in the development of the SIP • Submit SIP to the Executive Director of Elementary or Secondary Education and the Coordinator of School Improvement • Conduct weekly ILT meetings to analyze student achievement data, identify students and staff needs, and plan professional development activities • Conduct monthly SIT meetings to monitor the development and implementation of the school’s SIP to ensure that it reflects the previous and current data and analysis • Train entire school staff to effectively implement the Classroom Focused Improvement Process (CFIP) in order to effectively monitor the achievement of all students and adjust instruction accordingly • Conduct ILT and Executive Director of Secondary Education meetings to monitor and support school improvement activities • Review and analyze student data Instructional Data Management System (INFORM and SCANTRON Achievement Series) in efforts to make decisions about appropriate intervention programs and instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners • Develop and implement an interventions plan targeting any student not performing at the proficient level with specific emphasis on individual student monitoring.

Adequate Yearly Progress

HCPS School Improvement Measures 2009-2010		
Table I.Diii.C continued		
School	Timeline	School Improvement Measure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EDMS - ABMS 	July 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement 4 week after school and extended year programs focused on the areas of reading and mathematics to support low performing students with additional special educator support • Provide an extended learning opportunity through a field trip linked to the state curriculum
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EDMS - AEP 	August 2009 – June 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the MSDE approved Alternative Governance Plan • Conduct quarterly meetings with the Alternative Governance Board and the HCPS Board of Education in order to share updates on ABP progress • Submit progress results to MSDE on a TBD basis • Complete MSDE Staffing report

I.D.iv Attendance Rates

Attendance rates are an additional measure used in Maryland's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculations.

Based on the Examination of the Attendance Data (Table 5.5):

Table 5.5: Attendance Rates								
Annual Measurable Objective (AMO):		94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	
Subgroups by Level		2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
All Races	Elementary	95.6%	95.5%	95.7%	95.3%	96.2%	96.0%	95.9%
	Middle	94.0%	94.0%	94.5%	94.5%	95.2%	95.2%	95.2%
	High	92.8%	92.5%	92.8%	92.1%	93.2%	92.9%	92.8%
American Indian	Elementary	95.1%	95.2%	95.9%	95.2%	95.6%	95.6%	95.5%
	Middle	93.2%	92.8%	93.5%	93.2%	93.4%	93.6%	92.9%
	High	90.4%	91.4%	92.9%	92.2%	91.3%	91.1%	90.5%
Asian	Elementary	96.4%	96.4%	96.6%	96.4%	97.4%	97.1%	97.2%
	Middle	96.4%	96.2%	96.2%	96.5%	97.2%	97.4%	97.2%
	High	94.5%	94.0%	95.3%	94.6%	95.5%	95.4%	95.2%
African American	Elementary	95.1%	95.1%	95.5%	95.1%	95.9%	95.8%	95.7%
	Middle	93.1%	93.1%	93.5%	93.9%	94.3%	94.5%	95.1%
	High	91.5%	90.8%	91.6%	90.8%	91.4%	91.8%	91.4%
White	Elementary	95.7%	95.6%	95.7%	95.3%	96.3%	96.1%	95.9%
	Middle	94.2%	94.2%	94.7%	94.7%	95.5%	95.3%	95.2%
	High	93.0%	92.9%	93.0%	92.4%	93.6%	93.2%	93.2%
Hispanic	Elementary	95.2%	95.2%	95.3%	95.1%	95.7%	95.5%	95.5%
	Middle	92.4%	93.2%	93.8%	93.5%	94.7%	95.2%	95.2%
	High	90.4%	90.8%	91.0%	90.5%	91.7%	92.2%	91.8%
LEP	Elementary	96.3%	95.4%	96.1%	96.0%	96.5%	96.4%	96.4%
	Middle	94.5%	93.5%	94.3%	95.5%	95.6%	95.2%	95.3%
	High	94.0%	92.8%	93.6%	95.1%	94.4%	94.9%	94.1%
Special Ed	Elementary	94.7%	94.5%	94.8%	94.4%	95.4%	95.2%	95.0%
	Middle	91.7%	91.4%	92.3%	92.6%	93.4%	93.0%	93.9%
	High	90.1%	90.0%	90.2%	89.2%	90.6%	90.4%	90.5%
FARMS	Elementary	93.9%	94.0%	94.3%	93.9%	94.8%	94.6%	94.6%
	Middle	90.1%	90.6%	91.4%	92.0%	92.4%	92.7%	93.2%
	High	88.4%	87.9%	88.8%	87.8%	88.8%	88.9%	88.8%

1. Describe where progress in increasing attendance rates is evident. In your response, identify progress in terms of grade band(s) and subgroups.

HCPS Response:

Attendance rates in 2009 increased slightly at the middle school level for the African American, LEP, SE, and FARMS subgroups. Trends show that there has been a

I.D.iv Attendance Rates

continuing increase over time in attendance at the middle school level for the African American, SE, and FARMS subgroups. At the high school level, attendance rates in 2009 improved slightly for the SE subgroup. At the elementary level, all races and all subgroups continue to exceed the AMO of 94%.

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies and the corresponding resource allocations to which you attribute the progress.

HCPS Response:

One of the objectives of the school improvement planning process for the 2008-2009 school year was to develop and implement strategies to improve student attendance (2.1a.4-2.1a.5). The following questions were to be addressed by each school when analyzing school performance data as a part of this process:

- What trends in performance for all students and for sub-groups do you observe? Consider total score and sub-scores.
- What strategies were implemented to improve performance for all students? What impact did the strategies have?
- What strategies were implemented to improve performance for lower performing students/subgroups? What impact did the strategies have?
- What additional/new strategies could be/will be implemented to improve performance for all students?
- What does the review of the previous year's instructional practices data indicate?
- How were Maryland Professional Development Standards utilized?
- How were the Maryland Technology Standards utilized in the planning and delivery of instruction?
- How did the Instructional Leadership Team and the School Improvement Team plan to align professional development with the instructional practices strategies outlined for addressing student needs?
- Is there an alignment between the work of your PLC's, your professional development, and the strategies outlined in your school improvement plan?
- How will you review, study and update the School Improvement Plan on a quarterly basis?
- What process was used to monitor individual student progress?
- How was the Harford County Public Schools Board of Education Strategic Plan considered?

As a result of this planning process, each school listed those strategies in their school improvement plans geared toward meeting all NCLB/HCPS goals and indicators. In the individual school improvement plans, schools listed various strategies to address improved student attendance. These strategies varied from school to school. Some specific school examples that were implemented are: data monitoring of student attendance by teachers, the School Improvement Team (SIT), and the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT); the implementation of new attendance monitoring procedures; the establishment of an attendance committee; the use of the 'Alert Now' system to monitor attendance; and root cause analysis regarding attendance. This attention to the implementation of strategies and programs geared to improving attendance appears related to the progress.

I.D.iv Attendance Rates

3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, identify challenges in terms of grade band(s) and subgroups.

HCPS Response:

Challenges remain evident at the high school level where the percent of student attendance for 'All Races' is below the standard of 94% set by the state. The subgroups at the high school level that fall below the state standard in attendance are the American Indian/Alaskan Native, African American, White, Hispanic, FARMS, and Special Education subgroups, with a particularly noticeable deficit in the FARMS subgroup where attendance is below 90%.

Although the attendance rate at the middle school level exceeds the state standard for 'All Races', the American Indian/Alaskan Native, FARMS, and Special Education subgroups have attendance rates slightly below the state standard.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made along with the corresponding resource allocations to ensure sufficient progress. Include timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

The Comprehensive Secondary School Reform Plan (CSSRP) contains a number of elements that directly or indirectly affect attendance at the high school level. Elements such as smaller learning communities, freshman academies, and career pathways will support improved attendance.
(PI-12)

As a part of the process of school improvement planning for the 2009-2010 school year, all school improvement planning teams were asked to develop school improvement plans indicating the strategies/actions to address meeting the NCLB requirements, including the established AMO regarding attendance. Schools set targets for attendance for all subgroups that were to meet or exceed the AMO. In addition to the continuation of the practices, programs, and strategies listed in item 2, some of the practices, programs, and strategies that are listed in the 09-10 school improvement action plans from the various schools to address these challenges are as follows:

- Initiating parent contacts to investigate absences
- Utilizing the services of the guidance counselor to provide intervention for identified students
- Providing diverse opportunities for students to be involved in both curricular and extra-curricular activities
- Implementing a mentoring program
- Increasing student participation in additional learning opportunities, such as Advanced Placement courses
- Exploring advocacy strategies for all students
- Use of Alert Now to monitor attendance
- Faculty pre-school meeting to discuss SST procedure

I.D.v Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

NCLB Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

NCLB Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate each year with a regular diploma.

NCLB Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

Graduation rate is an additional measure used in Maryland's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculations.

Based on the Examination of Graduation and Dropout Rate Data (Tables 5.6 and 5.7):

Table 5.6: Percentage of Students Graduating From High School							
Annual Measurable Objective (AMO):	80.99%	80.99%	83.24%	83.24%	83.24%	85.50%	85.50%
Subgroup	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
All students (Counts toward AYP)	85.21	86.71	88.99	87.22	87.18	86.76	86.73
African American	79.05	80.19	82.71	86.21	80.54	82.79	83.53
American Indian/Alaskan Native	76.92	63.64	77.78	91.67	87.50	100	85.00
Asian/Pacific Islander	85.14	93.15	92.31	92.77	89.23	92.42	95.12
Hispanic	86.76	77.97	84.85	84.93	77.33	81.93	81.69
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	86.27	87.94	90.25	87.28	88.75	87.66	87.40
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	62.69	72.22	72.52	72.66	69.57	72.94	71.09
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	42.86		66.67	85.71	100.00	100	
Special Education	74.85	78.86	75.25	75.97	50.00	68.44	65.00
Female	88.48	89.55	92.01	90.27	90.13	91.35	90.61
Male	82.01	83.95	86.18	84.14	84.27	82.27	83.03

Table 5.7: Percentage of Students Dropping Out of School							
State satisfactory standard:	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Subgroup	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
All students	2.84	2.60	3.07	3.23	3.16	2.92	2.32
African American	4.06	3.67	3.69	4.27	4.02	4.52	3.09
American Indian/Alaskan Native	5.77	4.26	0.00	1.49	6.15	1.45	2.78
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.62	1.72	1.78	1.89	1.89	1.57	1.18
Hispanic	4.20	3.35	4.64	3.30	5.48	3.67	2.52
White (Not of Hispanic Origin)	2.59	2.38	2.94	3.02	2.88	2.49	2.13
Free/Reduced Meals (FARMS)	5.87	4.65	5.87	6.02	6.69	3.86	3.22
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	0.00	2.78	2.63	0.00	0.00	0	9.80
Special Education	4.64	3.73	5.79	5.99	7.22	5.17	0.36
Female	2.41	1.93	1.97	2.45	2.35	2.17	1.72
Male	3.25	3.23	4.12	3.99	3.96	3.64	2.91

NOTE: Because the Master Plan Updates are due to the county boards and the Maryland State Department of Education before some or all of the MSA and HSA data analysis are final, the 2008-2009 assessment data contained on these tables 5.6 and 5.7 is preliminary only. It does not reflect the full analysis necessary to ascertain AYP or students' progress toward achieving a diploma. The update will be amended to reflect final assessment data analysis when it is available.

I.D.v Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

1. Describe where progress in moving toward the graduation/dropout target is evident. In your response, identify progress in terms of subgroups.

HCPS Response:

The graduation rate of 86.73% for the aggregate of All Students continues to meet the AMO. The dropout rate for All Students reached its lowest yet with only 2.32% of students having dropped out of school – this rate again meets the standard set by the state of 3.00%. The African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, White, FARMS, Special Education, Female, and Male subgroups achieved their lowest % of students dropping out of school since 2002-2003. The hugely significant improvement for the Special Education subgroup may be an anomaly; however this is a subgroup that has received increased attention in efforts to meet identified learning needs which may be a contributing factor in keeping SE students in school. The Hispanic and male subgroups met the state satisfactory standard for the first time.

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies and the corresponding resource allocations to which you attribute the progress.

HCPS Response:

The following 2008-2009 practices, programs, and strategies appear related to the progress:

- Support the drop-out prevention efforts described in Programs and Initiatives.
- Evaluate the peer mentoring program and refine as indicated.
- Implement the revised credit and course requirements for graduation.
- Utilize the career pathways as a means for managing programs of study for freshmen, sophomores and juniors, and as a means for implementing the delivery of required courses in 2008-2009. Develop the necessary curricular components for implementing the delivery of required courses for Fall 2009.
- Prioritize and implement approved plans for the Secondary School Reform Initiative.
- Refine existing smaller learning communities and the ninth grade transition program.
- Enhance the online course program and increase student participation.
- Review and refine the Alt Ed Program as indicated.
- Identify and implement alternatives to suspensions based on appropriate data.
- Refine senior experiences with application to incoming freshman, sophomores, and juniors.
- Provide professional development as needed regarding *Maryland Career Development Framework, K-12*, career development and activities for students.
- Monitor and report the number of students participating in non- traditional CTE programs.
- Institutionalize the components of the CSSRP that affect juniors and readiness of those components that affect seniors in Fall 2009.

I.D.v Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

- Offer coursework that supports student post-secondary activities.
- Provide annual career counseling and post-secondary educational planning opportunities for students using a 6-year planning tool.
- Utilize assessment data to evaluate programs, monitor student achievement, and provide intervention programs at the school and system level (2.2b.3)
- Implement the following intervention strategies/programs in high schools to address student needs as identified in the HSA-tested subjects: (PI-17)
 - Initiate HSA Online Courses, after-school tutorials, remediation courses, and summer school for those students who do not pass the HSA.
 - Implement *Strategic Reading* at all high schools for Grade 9 at-risk students.
 - Implement the *Corrective Reading* intervention at all high schools for 9th and 10th grade students who are significantly delayed in reading.
 - Implement *Reading and Writing in Your Career* for identified grade 10 students.
 - Continue full implementation of the *Cognitive Tutor Algebra* program for identified students at the high school level.
 - Secure funding, as possible, to employ high school HSA intervention teachers to provide professional development to improve classroom instruction and to coordinate direct student intervention and remediation services.
- Increase student participation in additional learning opportunities, such as Advanced Placement courses, Magnet programs, and cooperative/collaborative classes
- Additional practices, programs, and strategies geared toward ensuring that students have a successful high school experience that will culminate in high school graduation are those listed in individual school improvement plans. Some specific examples include:
 - Providing diverse opportunities for students to be involved in both curricular and extra-curricular activities
 - Implementing a mentoring program for all identified students and subgroups
 - Exploring advocacy strategies for all students
 - Provide a study skills class to afford students a greater opportunity to master reading in a more student-centered environment
 - Provide a.m. homeroom Help Program to provide additional academic support
 - Schedule meetings with school administration and parents/students concerning students who are at-risk for possible non-graduation
 - Develop graduation intervention strategies utilizing advisors, guidance referrals, and administrative counselors.
- Provide a consultant at the middle school level to assist identified schools in addressing the African-American Male achievement gap (PI-6)
- Continue efforts to provide early intervention to address identified needs of at-risk learners and to reduce the number of referrals for special education services. Such efforts include the incorporation of collaborative/cooperative teaching models, best practice instructional strategies, and research-based intervention programs to meet all identified student needs.
- Transitioning services, as mandated by IDEA 2004, have been enhanced to provide interventions to support dropouts and increase the graduation rates in HCPS.
- Implement the comprehensive professional development plan to address the state priorities and master plan goals.

I.D.v Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, identify challenges in terms of subgroups.

HCPS Response:

HCPS continues to work to increase the graduation rates for all subgroups. However the subgroups that did not meet the AMO in 2008-2009 are the African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Hispanic, FARMS, Special Education, and male subgroups. The greatest challenge continues to be to ensure that our FARMS and Special Education subgroups get the assistance that is needed to enable a higher percentage of them to meet graduation requirements.

As far as the dropout rate is concerned, HCPS's greatest challenges are with the African American, FARMS, and LEP subgroups. These subgroups did not meet the state satisfactory standard, although the dropout rate for African American and FARMS is at its lowest ever with the trend showing improvement in 2008-2009 as compared to prior years.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments that will be made along with the corresponding resource allocations to ensure sufficient progress. Include timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

The following 2009-2010 practices, programs, and strategies are in place to address the challenges and promote progress:

- Support the drop-out prevention initiatives as described in the HCPS Programs & Initiatives document. (PI-13)
- Implement during and extended-day learning opportunities for mentoring and youth development programs. (2.1b.24)
- Implement the revised credit and course requirements for graduation. (2.2e.2)
- Utilize the career pathways as a means for managing programs of study for grades 9-12 and as a means for implementing the delivery of required courses in 2009-2010. Develop the necessary curricular components for implementing the delivery of required courses for Fall 2010. (2.2e.3; 2.2f.2)
- Prioritize and implement approved plans for the Secondary School Reform Initiative. (2.2e.4, PI-12)
- Refine existing smaller learning communities and the ninth grade transition program. (2.2e.7)
- Enhance career and technology education programs. (2.2e.9)
- Enhance the online course program and increase student participation. (2.2d.1)
- Review and refine the Alternative Ed Program. (2.2e.11; PI-12)
- Enhance senior year offerings to promote student involvement and success. (2.2f.1)
- Monitor all curriculum for inclusion of the *Maryland Career Development Framework, K-12*. Provide professional development as needed regarding *Maryland Career Development Framework, K-12*, career development and activities for students. (2.2e.12; 2.2f.3)

I.D.v Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

- Monitor and report the number of students participating in non- traditional CTE programs. (2.2f.4)
- Institutionalize the components of the CSSRP that affect juniors and readiness of those components that affect seniors in Fall 2010. (2.2f.5)
- Offer coursework that supports student post-secondary activities. (2.2f.6)
- Provide annual career counseling and post-secondary educational planning opportunities for students, grades 8-12, using a 6-year planning tool. (2.2f.7)
- Provide support (as possible) for schools choosing to implement the Advisory Career Development concept. (2.2f.9)
- Provide a comprehensive, year-round continuum of psychological services that are timely, relevant and outcome-driven. (1.1e.3)
- Provide comprehensive pupil personnel services to intervene and support at-risk students and their families. (1.1e.4)
- Identify and implement alternatives to suspensions based on appropriate data. (For more information on related strategies and programs, see 1.1e.6)
- Review and refine the Alt Ed Program as indicated including the implementation of the AGB recommendations for restructuring planning. (2.2e.11; PI-11; See also HCPS School Improvement tables in section I.D.iii - Adequate Yearly Progress)
- Continue the efforts of the Intervention Committee (2.1b.26; PI-19; Appendix F).
This team began its initial work in schools in 2005-2006 to provide technical support to schools based on identified student needs. In 2009-2010, the Intervention Committee will continue to work with school personnel to coordinate intervention assistance and strategies to meet student needs. As student needs are met, more students are likely to maintain the momentum toward completing graduation requirements.
- Continue to utilize assessment data to evaluate programs, monitor student achievement, and develop intervention programs at the school and system level (2.2a.2; 2.2b.3)
- Implement the following intervention/remediation strategies/programs in middle and high schools to address student needs as identified in the HSA-tested subjects: (2.1a.3; PI-16 – PI-18; Appendix F)
 - Initiate HSA Online Courses, after-school tutorials, remediation courses, and summer school for those students who do not pass the HSA.
 - Continue implementation of *Fast Track*, a reading intervention program for identified students in grades 6-8, at designated schools.
 - Implement the *Strategic Reading* program at all high schools for Grade 9 at-risk students.
 - Continue to implement the *Corrective Reading* intervention program at all high schools for 9th and 10th grade students who are significantly delayed in reading.
 - Implement the *Reading, Writing and Your Career* course at all high schools for grade 10 at-risk students.
 - Continue the *READ 180* program at designated middle schools.
 - Continue full implementation of the *Ramp Up* and *Cognitive Tutor Algebra* programs at all high schools.
 - Expand the implementation of the *Knowing Mathematics* remediation program in middle schools.

I.D.v

Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

- Pilot and/or continue to implement *Do the Math*, *First in Math*, *FASTTMath*, and *Success Maker* remediation programs in middle schools.
- Implement *Navigator* mathematics intervention program in all middle schools.
- Implement *Ramp Up to Algebra* in all high schools.
- Utilize funding to employ middle school mathematics intervention teachers at ABMS, EDMS, HDMS, and MAMS to provide professional development to improve classroom instruction and to coordinate and provide direct student intervention and remediation services.
- Request funding to employ high school HSA intervention teachers to provide professional development to improve classroom instruction and to coordinate direct student intervention and remediation services.
- Implement the *Strategic Intervention Instructional Model* in HSA biology and government co-taught classes at all high schools.
- Provide MSDE's *Bridge Plan* program to identified high school students who meet the criteria for participation
- Implement extended year program for students working on *Bridge Plan*.
- Increase student participation in additional learning opportunities, such as Advanced Placement courses and cooperative/collaborative classes.
- Middle schools have been provided with a resource of consultant/regional expert in the area of African-American Male learning. This consultant will assist schools in the analysis of student achievement data and other data streams to narrow the focus and create a strategic plan for addressing identified teaching and learning needs.
- Additional practices, programs, and strategies geared toward ensuring that students have a successful high school experience that will culminate in high school graduation are those listed in individual school improvement plans.
- Continue efforts to provide early intervention to address identified needs of at-risk learners and to reduce the number of referrals for special education services. Such efforts include the incorporation of collaborative/cooperative teaching models, best practice instructional strategies, and research-based intervention programs to meet all identified student needs.
- Transitioning services, as mandated by IDEA 2004, have been enhanced to provide interventions to support dropouts and increase the graduation rates in HCPS.
- Implement the comprehensive professional development plan to address the state priorities and master plan goals. (4.3c.1)

For additional information about HCPS special education initiatives and the Least Restrictive Environment, see Appendix F.