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## 2009 Maryland School Assessment

- Assesses reading and mathematics
- Administered in Grades 3-8
- 364,119 students
- Students receive a score of Basic, Proficient or Advanced
- Fulfills No Child Left Behind requirements, used to determine school Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- 100\% of students must score proficient by 2014


## Third-Grade Cohorts

Reading
\% Proficient + Advanced


Math
\% Proficient + Advanced


## Early Leaming Foundations for Suc cess

| Third Grade MSA Results (proficient or better) | 2003 | 2009 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | $58.1 \%$ | $84.9 \%$ |
| Mathematics | $65.1 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ |
| Readiness Programs |  |  |
| Pre-kindergarten for 4-year olds from <br> "economically disadvantaged backgrounds" | Limited | Yes |
| Kindergarten | Half-day | Full-day |
| All Early Learning Programs coordinated by <br> MSDE | No | Yes |
| Prepared to Enter First Grade Ready to Learn <br> (Maryland Model for School Readiness) | $52 \%$ |  |
| ready | 73\% <br> ready |  |

## Early Leaming Impact on Third Grade Results

| Third Grade MSA Results (proficient or better) | 2003 | 2009 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | $58.1 \%$ | $84.9 \%$ |
| Mathematics | $65.1 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ |

Did these third graders enter first grade ready to learn?

| Kindergarten Year | 1999-00 | 2005-06 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Maryland Model for School Readiness <br> (MMSR) Assessment | Test not <br> available | Students <br> tested |
| MMSR Fully Ready Composite Score | NA | $60 \%$ <br> ready |

## State Curic ulum Assures Continuity

## Statewide K-12 Curic ulum Standards

| Third Grade MSA Results (proficient or better) | 2003 | 2009 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | $58.1 \%$ | $84.9 \%$ |
| Mathematics | $65.1 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ |

## Cumulative Impact of State Curriculum on

Teaching and Learning

| Grades students experiencing instructional <br> continuity with State Curriculum | $\mathbf{3}$ | K-3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Teachers Experienced with State Curriculum | 1 year | 7 years |

## Bridge to Excellence (BIE)

| Third Grade MSA Results (proficient or better) | 2003 | 2009 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | $58.1 \%$ | $84.9 \%$ |
| Mathematics | $65.1 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ |

Cumulative Impact of Bridge to Excellence on Teaching and Learning

State Education Aid
\$ 2.5 bil. \$4.5 bil.
Local School System Master Plans
1 year 7 years

## Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

|  | 2003 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | 58.1\% | 84.9\% |
| Mathematics | 65.1\% | 84.3\% |
|  | 2004 | 2009 |
| Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) |  |  |
| All Classes | 66.9\% | 88.5\% |
| Elementary - High Poverty Schools | 46.6\% | 79\% |
| Nationally Board Certified Teachers | 158 | 302 |

## Eementary Gains:

## Continued progress 2008-2009

## Elementary Reading

- Gains at Grades 3 \& 5,
- 1.9 point decrease in Grade 4
- All subgroups show gains.


## Elementary Math

- Gains at all three grade levels (Gr. 3, 4, \& 5)
- All subgroups show gains.


## Eementary Gains

## Reading and Math

Reading 2003-2009


1
25-point gain since 2003

Math 2003-2009


25-point gain since 2003

## Middle School Progress

## 2008 to 2009

## Middle School Reading

- Gains at all three grade levels (Gr. 6, 7, \& 8) - All subgroups show gains.

Middle School Math

- Gains at all grade levels (Gr. 6, 7, \& 8)
- All subgroups show gains.


## Middle School

## Gains continue to close Reading-Math gap

Reading 2003-2009


介
22-point gain since 2003

Math 2003-2009


32-point gain since 2003

## 2009 MSA

## Senvices groups making greatest gains

- All subgroups made progress.
- Continue to close achievement gaps
- Most pronounced in early grades
- Most significant gains
- Elementary ELL and FARMs group
- Early learning has lasting effects.
- It is harder to erase early deficits in later years.


## Eementary Reading: Summary of

 Achievement Gap Reductions| Group | Gap <br> Reduction | 2009 Percent <br> Proficient |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| FARMs | 19.5 | 78.5 |
| Special Ed | 16.1 | 69.5 |
| ELL | 27.5 | 72.1 |
| African <br> American | 17.5 | 79.6 |
| Hispanic | 18.7 | 81.3 |

## Middle Math: Summary of

## Achievement Gap Reduction

| Group | Gap <br> Reduction | 2009 Percent <br> Proficient |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| FARMs | 6.9 | 53.9 |
| Special Ed | +0.8 | 38.6 |
| ELL | +6.4 | 45.4 |
| African <br> American | 6.9 | 54.5 |
| Hispanic | 5.5 | 62.3 |

## Eementary Reading

## Closing achievement gaps for all races



## Elementary Math

## Closing achievement gaps for all races



## African American Students

## 7 in 10 profic ient in Eementary Math



## The Achievement Gap: Ell, Elementary Reading



## The Achievement Gap: FARMS, Eementary Math



## The Achievement Gap: Special Education, Middle School Reading
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## What is "AYP"

- Adequate Yearly Progress - sufficient progress toward the goal of $100 \%$ proficient by 2014.
- Determination of school success based on No Child Left Behind
- Uses MSA results and attendance data
- Schools must meet a yearly target (AMO)
- Must meet target for each of 8 subgroups


## Sample AYP Chart

Results by:

## , STATEE D COUNTY

) Schoor AYP: Adequate Yeariy Progress

|  | County | Middle (ID: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | > AYP | $\rangle$ Assessments $>$ De |  | ographics |
| 2009 AYP: <br> - Show Trends | Not Met <br> All indicators | t be "Met" to m ing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ce AYP. For } \\ & \text { Mat } \end{aligned}$ | ils, click on the matics | nks below. |
|  | -Percent Proficient Met | -Participation Rate <br> Met | -Percent Proficient Met | -Participation Rate Met | *Attendance <br> Met |
| All Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native | na | na | na | na |  |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | Met | Met | Met | Met |  |
| African American | Met | Met | Met | Met |  |
| White (not of Hispanic origin) | Met | Met | Met | Met |  |
| Hispanic | Met | Met | Met | Met |  |
| Free/Reduced Meals | Met | Met | Not Met | Met |  |
| Special Education | Met | Met | Not Met | Met |  |
| Limited English Proficient | Met | na | Met | na |  |

## Challenges to Achieving AYP

- Target rises each year
- All subgroups must achieve targets
- Subgroups with 5 students or more counted
- Confidence interval shrinks each year
- Students receiving special services
- Challenged to achieve targets


## School Improvement Categories

| STAGES | PATHWAYS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Comprehensive <br> Needs <br> Pathway | Focused <br> Needs <br> Pathway |
| Developing <br> Stage | Failing: <br> -All students or | Failing: <br> -1 to 2 subgroups |
| Priority Stage | -3+ subgroups | - |

## School Improvement Categories

| STAGES | PATHWAYS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Comprehensive <br> Needs <br> Pathway | Focused <br> Needs <br> Pathway |
| Developing <br> Stage | Schools enter after <br> not achieving AYP <br> two times | Schools enter after <br> not achieving AYP <br> two times |
| Priority | Schools enter when <br> AYP failed fifth time | Schools enter when <br> AYP failed fifth time |

## Schools in Improvement

| STAGES | PATHWAYS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Comprehensive <br> Needs <br> Pathway | Focused <br> Needs <br> Pathway |
| Developing <br> Stage | 40 schools | 37 schools |
| Priority |  |  |
| Stage | 72 schools | 9 schools |

## AYP Results

- 19 schools Exit
- 158 schools currently in Sch. Improvement - 12 fewer than 2008
- 134 schools missing AYP first time - "Not Met" - 134 schools - 2/3 of these schools missed 1 to 2 cells
- Special Education subgroup most missed


## Summary

- Student performance continues to improve
- Achievement gaps closing
- Lasting early learning benefits
- State Curriculum improving teaching
- Students needing services have challenges
- Fewer schools in School Improvement
- Maryland well positioned for the Common Core of State Standards


## Vision for the Future:

## Common Core Standards

- Md. has signed on to the move toward national standards
- Allow valid comparison among states
- Ensure students are college or work ready
- Md. is an American Diploma Project state with aligned standards
- MSA test results show MD teachers and students are ready to raise the bar
- More Highly Qualified Teachers in high poverty schools.


## State Board of Education

## Questions and Discussion

