MSDE Updates to the AIB

December 15, 2022

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Mohammed Choudhury

PRESENTATION OUTLINE

- 1. College and Career Readiness Exploratory and Long-Term Studies
- 2. Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty
- 3. Workgroup on English Learners in Public Schools

College and Career Readiness Exploratory and Long-Term Studies Updates



- 1. Background Context and Blueprint Requirements
- 2. Exploratory Study
- 3. National Research and Maryland Context
- 4. Long-Term Study

Background Context and Blueprint Requirements

The Blueprint for Maryland's Future directs MSDE to utilize rigorous research studies to set the College and Career Readiness standard for students.



Blueprint for Maryland's Future: Requirements

• The Blueprint calls for a clear definition of a college and career readiness standard and a system of assessments that ensure students are reaching their goals and receiving the support needed. The MSDE is commissioning two separate research studies to define and verify the CCR standard.

Exploratory Study

 MSDE has partnered with the Maryland Assessment Research Center (MARC) at the University of Maryland to complete a short-term quantitative study to explore the relationship between high school state and national standardized tests, and other potential predictors of success measured in high school (such as course grades), and success in postsecondary coursework and/or workforce outcomes.

Long-Term Study

 MSDE will be awarding a contract to a research organization to perform a deep content analysis to determine the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in the first year at a community college or 4-year college or university in Maryland. Maryland schools should strive to prepare its students not just to be "ready," but to be equipped to thrive in any postsecondary or career environment.



Current CCR Interim Standard

The Blueprint sets a new **College and Career Readiness standard** that allows graduates to succeed in entry-level credit-bearing college courses. The goal is for all students to meet the standard by the end of their 10th grade year.

Current Blueprint Interim Standard Effective Now

A student meets the CCR Standard if they meet or exceed the standards in both English and Math:

AND

English

English 10

- Score 3 or 4 on Fall or Spring MCAP
- Score 4 or 5 on the PARCC
- Score 2 or 3 on early Fall MCAP

Math

Algebra I, Algebra II, or Geometry

- Score 3 or 4 on Fall or Spring MCAP
- Score 4 or 5 on the PARCC
- Score 2 or 3 on early Fall MCAP

Or a score of 520 on the Math SAT



CCR Standards: Statutory Context

- Before the State Board can set an updated long-term CCR Standard, the research study must first be completed.
 - While the Long-Term study is being conducted, the interim CCR standard is used for funding calculations.
 - The current agreements between LEAs and community colleges may still be used for community college course placement during this period.
- After the Long-Term research study is complete, the State Board adopts a CCR standard that "enables the student to be successful in entry level credit bearing courses or postsecondary education training at a State community college."
 - <u>At that point</u>, "Each community college and other open-enrollment public institution of higher education shall accept for enrollment in credit-bearing courses any individual who has achieved college and career readiness according to the standard adopted by the State Board."

MD Code, Education, §<u>15-126;</u> §<u>7-205.1</u>

- 1. Background Context and Blueprint Requirements
- 2. Exploratory Study
- 3. National Research and Maryland Context
- 4. Long-Term Study

Updates on the short-term quantitative study exploring the relationship between high school and postsecondary measures.

Guiding Questions

- 1. How should academic measures **be operationalized to increase strength of prediction?**
- 2. Which assessments or other high school measures are the best predictors of actual success in postsecondary coursework?
- 3. What **performance level on assessments or other high school measures** are the best predictors of actual success in postsecondary coursework?
- 4. How do results from the exploratory study **align with the interim CCR standard** set by the Blueprint?
- 5. Do any measures have a **disproportionate impact on a group of students?**
- 6. How does **the use of multiple measures** predict success in postsecondary coursework?

Measures of College and Career Readiness

The exploratory study examined the relationship between high school measures and success in postsecondary coursework.

High School Measures

- Grade point average (GPA)*

 Cumulative at the end of 10th, 11th, and 12th grades
- College entrance exams
 - Composite and subject scores
 - o ACT, SAT
- State standardized tests
 - o ELA 10, Algebra I

Postsecondary Success Metrics

- First year college GPA, based on the first 30 credits earned, on a scale from 0 to 4, weighted by course credits
- Postsecondary success, defined as a first-year college GPA of 3.0 or above

* GPA of ELA, math, and science courses, weighted by course credits earned.

FOULTY AND EXCELLENCE

Study Population

The exploratory study examined students who exited Maryland public schools in 2017-2019 and earned 30 credits in a Maryland public college/university.



EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Study Sample: Student Characteristics

On average, **college enrollees are more likely** than high school exiters **to be Asian or white**, and **less likely to be English learners, Students with Disabilities, or students eligible for free meals.**

	All High School Exiters, 2017-2019	Two-Year College Students	Four-Year College Students
Number of Students	214,251	12,899	42,441
Male	51.4%	44.5%↓	43.3%↓
White	39.0%	48.3% ↑	44.6% ↑
Asian	6.2%	9.1% ↑	14.2% ↑
Black/African-American	34.3%	21.0%↓	28.1%↓
Hispanic/Latino	16.1%	16.8% ↑	8.6%↓
FARMs	33.4%	27.0%↓	19.0%↓
English learners	6.2%	1.8%↓	0.4%↓
Students with Disabilities	9.7%	5.6%↓	1.7%↓

↑ Up arrow indicates the percentage is higher than all high school exiters.

↓ Down arrow indicates the **percentage is lower** than all high school exiters.

FARMs are students eligible for free and reduced priced meals.

Overview of Study Results

- High school GPA and the state ELA assessment are the strongest predictors of first-year college GPA.
 - For two-year college students, **high school GPA** and the **state standardized test in ELA** are **stronger** predictors of firstyear college GPA than either college entrance exams or the Algebra I state standardized test.
 - For four-year college students, **high school GPA**, the **state standardized test in ELA**, and **college entrance exams** are **similarly strong predictors** of first-year college GPA.
- High school GPA is slightly more precise in predicting first-year college GPA.
 - High school GPA more accurately predicted postsecondary success than state tests or college entrance exams.
- Student group impacts
 - Black and Hispanic students and students eligible for free and reduced-priced meals (FARMS) are less likely to meet the cut score on all high school measures.
 - Black students and students eligible for FARMS are more likely to meet the high school measure threshold through GPA or state standardized tests than through college entrance exams.
- Multiple measures would increase the number of students identified as CCR.
 - Allowing for an option to meet a CCR standard through either GPA or through assessments increases the number of students meeting the standard while the average first-year college GPA for those students still exceeds the "postsecondary success" definition of 3.0.

How Should Measures Be Operationalized?

- Measures that include multiple years and subjects are stronger predictors.
- The composite scores of college entrance exams are better predictors of first-year college GPA than their component scores (e.g., Math, Reading).
- Aggregated high school GPA* is a better predictor of first-year college GPA than subject-specific high school GPA (e.g., Math, Science).
- **High school GPA at higher grade levels** are **better predictors** of first-year college GPA than high school GPA at lower grade levels (e.g., cumulative grade 12 GPA is a better predictor than cumulative grade 10 GPA).

Exploratory Study

^{*} Aggregated GPA includes ELA, math, and science course grades.

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Which High School Measures Are The <u>Strongest</u> Predictors of Postsecondary Success?

- For two-year college students, high school GPA* and the state standardized test in ELA are stronger predictors of firstyear college GPA** than either college entrance exams or the state standardized test in Algebra I.
- For four-year college students, high school GPA, the state standardized test in ELA, and college entrance exams are similarly strong predictors of first-year college GPA.

Measure Type	High School Measure	Two-Year Colleges	Four-Year Colleges
	HS GPA (Grade 10)	0.32	0.40
GPA	HS GPA (Grade 11)	0.34	0.42
	HS GPA (Grade 12)	0.36	0.44
ege ance am	ACT	0.25	0.43
Coll Entr Ex:	SAT	0.27	0.43
ate dard st	ELA 10	0.32	0.42
Sti Stan	Algebra I [†]	0.20	0.37

Correlations Between High School Measures and First-Year College GPA

Correlations measure the strength of the relationship between two measures and range between -1 and +1 with a higher absolute value indicating a stronger relationship.

* GPA of ELA, math and science courses, weighted by course credits earned. ** College GPA is based on the first 30 credits earned.

† Algebra I is typically taken 1-3 years earlier than the other test measures.

EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE



Of the students that **met the high school threshold through their GPA**, a **larger percentage** of students **had a first-year college GPA (FYGPA) above 3.0** than students who met the high school threshold through any other measure.

	Two-year College		Four-year College		
High School Measure	High School Measure Threshold Score	Percent Earned FYGPA above 3.0***	High School Measure Threshold Score	Percent Earned FYGPA above 3.0***	
Grade 10 GPA	2.68	66%	2.81	78%	
Grade 11 GPA	2.69	66%	2.81	78%	
Grade 12 GPA	2.74	68%	2.83	80%	
SAT	1010	61%	1070	75%	
ACT	19	59%	21	76%	
ELA 10 ⁺	756	63%	757	76%	
Algebra I ⁺	745	59%	751	74%	

* GPA of ELA, math and science courses, weighted by course credits earned. ** College GPA is based on the first 30 credits earned.

*** Of students who met or exceeded the high school measure score. † The interim state CCR standard score is 750.

EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Do Any Measures Have a Disproportionate Impact On Student Groups For <u>Students at Two-Year Colleges</u>?

- Black and Hispanic students are less likely than Asian and White students to meet the cut score and students eligible for free and reduced-price meals (FARMs) are less likely to meet the cut score on all high school measures examined.
- White students are more likely to meet the high school measure threshold through the college entrance exams or state standardized tests than through GPA.
- Students eligible for FARMs are more likely to meet the high school measure threshold through GPA than the college entrance exams or state standardized tests. GPA is the only CCR measure that allows for similar percentages of students to meet the threshold, regardless of FARMs eligibility status.

Percent of Two-Year College Students that Met High School Measure Scores by Student Group



17 | Maryland State Department of Education

FOULTY AND EXCELLENCE

Do Any Measures Have a Disproportionate Impact On Student Groups For <u>Students at Four-Year Colleges</u>?

- Black and Hispanic students are less likely than Asian and White students to meet the cut score and students eligible for free and reduced-price meals are less likely to meet the cut score on all high school measures examined.
- White students are more likely to meet the high school measure threshold through the college entrance exams or state standardized tests than through GPA.
- Black students and students eligible for free and reduced-price more likely to meet the high school measure threshold through GPA or state standardized tests than through college entrance exams.

100% 100% 85%87% 84%83% 78%^{81%} 82% 72%73%7%75%78% 81%779 71%^{73%}68%69%67%^{69%}70% 80% 80% Percent of Students Percent of Students 50%62%61%62%61%62%60% 56%57%55%54% 60% 60% 49% 50% 48% 49% 44%42% 38%36% 40% 40% 20% 20% 0% 0% Non-FARMs **FARMs** Asian Black Hispanic White SAT (1070) ACT (21) Grade 10 GPA (2.81) Grade 11 GPA (2.80) ACT (21) Grade 10 GPA (2.81) Grade 11 GPA (2.80) SAT (1070) Grade 12 GPA (2.83) PARCC ELA 10 (757) PARCC ALG I (751) Grade 12 GPA (2.83) PARCC ELA 10 (757) PARCC ALG I (751)

Percent of Four-Year College Students that Met High School Measure Scores by Student Group



How Do The Results Align With The Blueprint's Interim CCR <u>Math</u> Standard?

- To meet the Blueprint Interim CCR Standard, students need to earn a score of 750 each on the ELA and Math assessments.
- <u>Two-year colleges:</u> The Exploratory Study found that a score of 745 on the PARCC Algebra I maps to a 3.0 GPA in the first-year of college.
 - This means that for 2-year college students, the interim standard slightly under identifies CCR students in Algebra I.
 - In 2019, 3,619 students, or 3.6% of test takers, scored between 745 and 749 on the Algebra I test.
- <u>Four-year colleges:</u> The Exploratory Study found that a score of 751 on the PARCC Algebra I maps to a 3.0 GPA in the first-year of college.
 - For 4-year college students, the interim standard in Algebra I is closely aligned with postsecondary success.
 - In 2019, 869 students, or 0.9% of test takers, scored
 750 on the Algebra I test.

PARCC Algebra I Scores Mapped to a First-Year College GPA of 3.0





How Do The Results Align With The Blueprint's Interim CCR <u>ELA</u> Standard?

- To meet the Blueprint Interim CCR Standard, students need to earn a score of 750 each on the ELA and Math assessments.
- <u>Two-year colleges:</u> The Exploratory Study found that a score of 756 on the PARCC ELA 10 maps to a 3.0 GPA in the first-year of college.
 - This means that for 2-year college students, the interim standard is slightly lower than the score that maps to a 3.0 GPA in the first-year.
 - In 2019, 3,111 students, or 3.5% of test takers, scored between 751 and 756 on the ELA 10 test.
- <u>Four-year colleges:</u> The Exploratory Study found that a **score of 757 on the PARCC ELA 10 maps to a 3.0 GPA** in the first-year of college.
 - For 4-year college students, the **interim standard is slightly lower than the score that maps to a 3.0 GPA** in the first-year.
 - In 2019, 4,140 students, or 4.6% of test takers, scored between 751 and 757 on the ELA 10 test.

PARCC Scores Mapped to a First-Year College GPA of 3.0



How Well Does The Interim CCR Standard Predict Postsecondary Success?

Students who met the **interim CCR standard on both assessments** were about twice as likely to have first-year GPAs at or above 3.0 than those who did not meet either standard.

Met interim standard in:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
ELA 10 and Algebra I	3,986	3.15	62%
Only Algebra I	1,331	2.87	42%
Only ELA 10	2,966	3.04	54%
Neither ELA 10 nor Algebra I	3,604	2.76	33%

Two-Year Colleges

Four-Year Colleges

Met interim standard in:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
ELA 10 and Algebra I	22,029	3.36	78%
Only Algebra I	6,462	3.10	60%
Only ELA 10	4,306	3.03	54%
Neither ELA 10 nor Algebra I	6,220	2.80	36%

FYGPA is first-year college GPA. Analyses use 750 as the ELA 10 and Algebra I standard.

How Well Does GPA Predict Postsecondary Success?

Students who **met the study's high school GPA threshold** were nearly twice as likely to earn a first-year college GPA of 3.0 or greater.

Two-Year Colleges

	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
Met HS GPA threshold of 2.74	5,620	3.21	66%
Did not meet HS GPA threshold of 2.74	6,265	2.76	34%

Four-Year Colleges

	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
Met HS GPA threshold of 2.83	25,259	3.38	79%
Did not meet HS GPA threshold of 2.83	13,157	2.86	40%

FYGPA is first-year college GPA. Analyses use 2.83/2.74 as the Grade 12 GPA standard for four- and two-year colleges, respectively.

How Does The Interim CCR Standard Compare To a GPA Threshold?

For both two- and four-year college students, a high school **GPA threshold is as strong or a slightly stronger predictor** of postsecondary success than the interim, test-based CCR standard. More students met the GPA threshold than met the test-based CCR standard.

Met interim standard or high school measure in:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
ELA 10 and Algebra I	3,986	3.15	62%
GPA	5,620	3.21	66%

Two-Year Colleges

Four-Year Colleges

Met interim standard or high school measure in:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
ELA 10 and Algebra I	22,029	3.36	78%
GPA	25,259	3.38	79%

How Are Multiple CCR Measures Related To Postsecondary Success?

Allowing for an option to meet a CCR standard through either GPA or through assessments increases the number of students meeting the standard while the average first-year college GPA for those students still exceeds the "postsecondary success" definition of 3.0.

Two-Year Colleges

Met High School Measure In:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
GPA <u>and</u> ELA 10 <u>and</u> Algebra I	2,440	3.34	75%
ELA 10 <u>and</u> Algebra I	3,986	3.15	62%
GPA	5,620	3.21	66%
GPA <u>or</u> (ELA 10 <u>and</u> Algebra I)	7,164	3.14	61%

Four-Year Colleges

Met High School Measure In:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent at or above 3.0 FYGPA
GPA and ELA 10 and Algebra I	17,590	3.46	84%
ELA 10 <u>and</u> Algebra I	22,029	3.36	78%
GPA	25,259	3.38	79%
GPA <u>or</u> (ELA 10 <u>and</u> Algebra I)	29,697	3.23	75%

FYGPA is first-year college GPA. Analyses use 750 as the ELA 10 and Algebra I standard and 2.83/2.74 as the Grade 12 GPA standard for four- and two-year colleges, respectively.



National Research: **Types of Multiple Measures Placement Systems**

- Multiple measure placement systems have **options** for how to operationalize the decision process.
- A **Decision Rule** system uses a series of checks against thresholds.
- A **Decision Band** system will evaluate the next check only **if within a set range**. Scores below this band are not eligible for the other measures.
- Another option is to use a more complex statistical algorithm that weighs all measures at once and calculates the probability of success.

Cullinan, D. (2018). Toward Better College Course Placement: A Guide to Launching a Multiple Measures Assessment System. MDRC. <u>https://www.mdrc.org/publication/toward-better-college-course-placement</u>



band

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

CCR Course Placement with Multiple Measures: Students at <u>2-Year Colleges</u>



26 | Maryland State Department of Education

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

CCR Course Placement with Multiple Measures: Students at <u>4-Year Colleges</u>





How Are Multiple CCR Measures Related To Postsecondary Success?

Two-Year Colleges

Four-Year Colleges

Met standard in:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent above 3.0 FYGPA	Met standard in:	Number of Students	Average FYGPA	Percent above 3.0 FYGPA
ELA 10, Algebra I and GPA	2,442	3.34	75%	ELA 10, Algebra I and GPA	17,590	3.46	84%
Only ELA 10 and Algebra I	1,544	2.86	41%	Only ELA 10 and Algebra I	4,438	3.00	52%
Only ELA 10 and GPA	1,524	3.21	68%	Only ELA 10 and GPA	3,507	3.26	73%
Only Algebra I and GPA	559	3.08	58%	Only Algebra I and GPA	2,269	3.23	70%
Only Algebra I	772	2.71	31%	Only Algebra I	2,037	2.81	37%
Only ELA 10	1,442	2.85	40%	Only ELA 10	2,955	2.90	43%
Only GPA	1,097	2.99	49%	Only GPA	1,893	3.04	56%
None	2,537	2.67	26%	None	4,327	2.70	28%

FYGPA is first-year college GPA. Analyses use 750 as the ELA 10 and Algebra I standard and 2.83/2.74 as the Grade 12 GPA standard for four- and two-year colleges, respectively.

- 1. Background Context and Blueprint Requirements
- 2. Exploratory Study
- 3. National Research and Maryland Context
- 4. Long-Term Study

National Research and Maryland Context

Identifying best practices around the country and across Maryland.



National Research: Using Multiple Measures For Course Placement

- The Blueprint seeks to ensure that all students can demonstrate their readiness for College and Career. The interim measure within The Blueprint only allows for a student to demonstrate their readiness through standardized assessments.
- Traditional methods for course placement may be poor predictors of student success.
- Studies have found that alternative measures particularly high school GPA— offer substantially better predictions of which students will succeed in college-level courses.
 - High school GPA captures both academic strengths and relevant nonacademic characteristics like motivation.
- To yield even higher predictive power, HS GPA can be combined with other measures, including: state graduation tests, SAT or ACT scores, writing assessments, high school transcript information, years since high school graduation, and/or noncognitive assessments.
 - This **Multiple Measures Placement** approach is now in use at more than half of community colleges nationwide (including in Maryland).

Ganga, Elizabeth, & Amy Mazzariello. (2019 April). Modernizing College Course Placement by Using Multiple Measures. ECS: Education Commission of the States and CAPR: Center for the Analysis of Postsecondary Readiness. Available at https://postsecondaryreadiness.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Modernizing_College_Course_Placement_by_Using_Multiple_Measures_Final.pdf



ACT Scores by Race/Ethnicity and Family Income



5		
4		
3		
2		
1		
0		
9		
8		
7		
6		
5		
4		
3		
2		
1		
0		
9		
в		
7		
6		
5		
4		
3		
2		
1		
0		
9		
В		
7		
6		

Family Income

- About \$0 to \$24,000
 About \$24,000 to \$36,000
 About \$36,000 to \$50,000
 About \$50,000 to \$60,000
- About \$60,000 to \$80,000 About \$80,000 to \$100,000 About \$100,000 to \$120,000 About \$120,000 to \$150,000 More than \$150,000

31 | Maryland State Department of Education

American Indian/Alaskan

Hispanic

White/Caucasian

Asian American

References:

1.

Boeckenstedt, Jon. "Some Final Thoughts on the SAT and ACT." https://jonboeckenstedt.net/2020/01/10/some-final-thoughts-on-the-sat-and-act/ (Accessed October 12, 2021)



National Research and Maryland Context

National Research: **Types of Multiple Measures Placement Systems**

- Multiple measure placement systems have **options** for how to operationalize the decision process.
- A **Decision Rule** system uses a series of checks against thresholds.
- A **Decision Band** system will evaluate the next check only **if within a set range**. Scores below this band are not eligible for the other measures.
- Another option is to use a more complex statistical algorithm that weighs all measures at once and calculates the probability of success.

Cullinan, D. (2018). Toward Better College Course Placement: A Guide to Launching a Multiple Measures Assessment System. MDRC. <u>https://www.mdrc.org/publication/toward-better-college-course-placement</u>





National Research and Maryland Context

National Research:

Validity and Accuracy of Course Placement

- Randomized Controlled Trials were conducted in 3 states.
 - Students were randomly assigned to either be placed using multiple measures, or by using traditional standardized assessments.
 - The multiple measure systems **used allowed more students to be "bumped up" into qualifying for credit-bearing courses**, but would not disqualify any students who met the traditional standard.
- Students bumped up by MMA are more likely to complete collegelevel courses, compared to the status quo.
- All subgroups defined by race/ethnicity, gender, and Pell status were more likely to enroll in these courses.
- The SUNY study found **significant positive effects on college-level English course completion among men and students of color.**
- The Minnesota and Wisconsin study found **significant positive effects in both subjects among all demographic subgroups.**

College-Level Course Completion Rates Among Students in the Bump-Up Zone



NOTE: SUNY rates include the completion of any college-level course in math or English; MN/WI rates include the completion of only introductory courses in these subjects. ***p < .01

Lessons From Two Experimental Studies of Multiple Measures Assessment. Dan Cullinan. January 2022. Center for the Analysis of Postsecondary Readiness. <u>https://postsecondaryreadiness.org/lessons-learned-multiple-measures-assessment/</u>



National Research: Corequisite Remediation

- Developmental students enroll simultaneously in college-level courses and developmental courses that provide concurrent support.
 - The idea is to **provide students with the extra support** they might need from the developmental curriculum **without delaying** their entry into college-credit-bearing courses.
- A large study of English corequisite remediation in five Texas community colleges found large effects on students' likelihood of passing college-level English, including consistently positive effects for students of all races.
 - Another study at CUNY assessed mathematics corequisite remediation within differentiated math pathways. This study found large, positive effects on students' likelihood of completing their full math sequence, and even found positive effects on persistence and graduation rates.

The Latest on Developmental Education Research What States and Colleges Need to Know. Alyssa Ratledge. October 2020. MDRC. <u>https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/Ideas_Evidence-Dev_Ed_Research_0.pdf</u>



National Research and Maryland Context

Maryland Context: Using Multiple Measures For Course Placement

- All of Maryland's community colleges have adopted multiple measures for course placement through the MOU.
- Students with qualifying scores or who have a cumulative high school (unweighted) GPA of 3.0 or higher are considered college and career ready.
- The 16 community colleges review an **average of 6.9 assessments each**.

Some institutions use as many as nine assessment methods.



Figure 1: Counts of Assessment Tools used by Maryland's Colleges and Universities

Note: Institutions could select all that apply.

Some majors in the Math or Science fields may require higher scores.

Report On Assessment Tools. Maryland Higher Education Commission. December 2021. https://mhec.maryland.gov/publications/Documents/Research/PolicyReports/2021AssessmentToolsReport.pdf



National Research and Maryland Context

Maryland Context:

Validity and Accuracy of Course Placement

- Some students who fail to complete necessary remediation are able to complete the associated credit-bearing courses.
 - The green bar shows the portion of students who are identified as needing remedial coursework, do not complete the remediation, but are still able to complete credit-bearing coursework.
- These results mean that current placement methods may need to be studied and modified to more accurately identify the students who need remediation.
 - All community colleges reported performing studies testing their multiple measures placement outcomes, which helped set the standards in the MOU.



RNN: Remediation Not Needed. CRC: Completed Remedial Course. RRNC: Remediation Required – Not Completed


National Research and Maryland Context

Maryland Case Study: Control C

- Cecil College's analysis of the use of MOU criteria has shown that students who were placed in college-level math or English courses through their verified cumulative high school grade point average were at least slightly more likely to earn an A, B, or C in the college-level course than students placed through another measure.
- The College also recently **developed their own placement tool for English courses**, which has students write an essay, **faculty review the essay**, **and faculty consult** with professors of the relevant courses to **discuss the student's fit in that course**.
 - 83% of students placed into college-level English using this method passed the course.

	Placement Type	Number earning an A, B, or C	Number placed in college-level course	% who earned an A, B, or C
College-level Math	GPA	146	240	61%
College-level Math	Other	113	198	57%
College-level English	GPA	240	343	70%
College-level English	Other	230	410	56%

	Placement Type	% who passed
Integrated Reading and Writing Level II (Developmental)	Essay	64%
	All	62%
College Composition	Essay	83%
(College-level)	All	64%

Report On Assessment Tools. Maryland Higher Education Commission. December 2021. https://mhec.maryland.gov/publications/Documents/Research/PolicyReports/2021AssessmentToolsReport.pdf



Power of GPA Case Study: Chicago

- Research from Chicago Public Schools found that students' high school grade point averages are five times stronger than their ACT scores at predicting college graduation.
- "GPAs measure a very wide variety of skills and behaviors that are needed for success in college, where students will encounter widely varying content and expectations." - Elaine Allensworth, Director of the UChicago Consortium

References:

1. High School GPAs and ACT Scores as Predictors of College Completion: Examining Assumptions About Consistency Across High Schools," Allensworth and Clark, Educational Researcher, Jan. 27, 2020.



Power of GPA Case Studies: Community Colleges

Montgomery College, Maryland

- Montgomery College offers 8 options for placement into credit bearing classes, as part of their Multiple Placement Options
- Graduates from Maryland high schools may take credit bearing courses based on an unweighted, cumulative high school GPA of 2.75 or higher

Everett Community College, Washington

- Students who graduated from a Washington state high school with a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or higher can receive placement into English 101.
- Students who completed a math class at a Washington state high school and earned a C+ or better in both semesters may enroll in a credit bearing Math course

References:

- 1. Montgomery College. Assessment and Testing Centers. <u>https://www.montgomerycollege.edu/admissions-registration/assessments.html</u>
- 2. Everett Community College. Alternative Placement Options. <u>https://www.everettcc.edu/enrollment/placement/alternative-placement-options</u>



Power of GPA Case Study: California

- In 2017, California overhauled community college placement and remediation in English and math.¹
 - Colleges are now required to rely on students' high school grades for placement and restricted from requiring students to enroll in remedial courses.
- As of 2021, The University of California will not take SAT and ACT scores into account in admissions or scholarship decisions²
 - Admission instead requires a GPA of 3.0 in 15 core "A-G" high school courses* 3
- Research in California has also found that high school GPA is consistently the strongest predictor of four-year college outcomes and that as an admissions criterion, high school GPA has less adverse impact than standardized tests on disadvantaged and underrepresented minority students.
 - High school GPA as a predictor of college success results in a much higher representation of low income and underrepresented minority students in the top of the UC applicant pool⁵

References:

- 1. Hern, K., Snell, M., and Henson, L. (2020). Still Getting There: How California's AB 705 Is (and Is Not) Transforming Remediation and What Needs to Come Next. Sacramento, CA: Public Advocates.
- 2. University of California Will No Longer Consider SAT and ACT Scores. Giulia McDonnell Nieto del Rio. New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/15/us/SAT-scores-uc-university-of-california.html
- 3. University of California. Freshman Requirements https://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/admission-requirements/freshman-requirements/ * GPA of 3.4 required for nonresidents of California
- 4. Geiser, Saul & Maria Veronica Santelices, 2007. "Validity Of High-School Grades In Predicting Student Success Beyond The Freshman Year: High-School Record vs. Standardized Tests as Indicators of Four-Year College Outcomes," University of California at Berkeley, Center for Studies in Higher Education, UC Berkeley.
- 5. Kurlaender, M., & Cohen, K. (2019, March). Predicting college success: How do different high school assessments measure up? [Report]. Policy Analysis for California Education. <u>https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/predicting-college-success-how-do-different-high-school-assessments-measure-2019</u>

- 1. Background Context and Blueprint Requirements
- 2. Exploratory Study
- 3. National Research and Maryland Context
- 4. Long-Term Study

Updates on the contract award to a research organization to perform a deep content analysis and quantitative relationship analysis.

Blueprint Requirements and Scope of Research Study

- Fulfilling Blueprint requirements, MSDE contracted with an **external research organization** to conduct an **empirical study of the skills, knowledge, and abilities needed to succeed in the first year** of Maryland community college coursework.
- The research will be comprised of **two different parts: a quantitative study and a content and standards alignment study.**
- To confirm and expand on the results of the Exploratory Study, the **quantitative component** of the Long-Term Study will:
 - Measure the **relationship between the interim CCR standard and student readiness to succeed** in entry-level creditbearing coursework or postsecondary education training.
 - Explore additional possible measures of student readiness beyond the standard the interim CCR standard. Based on previous research, possible measures could include GPA, course credit attainment, career and technical education (CTE) course credit attainment, or a combination of these with assessment scores, attendance, or other behavioral metrics.
- The second research component, the **content and standards alignment study will**:
 - Complete a deep content analysis to determine the levels and types of literacy in reading, writing, and mathematics that are needed to succeed in entry-level courses and postsecondary training offered at colleges in the state.
 - Explore the alignment of Maryland College and Career Ready Standards to the content of entry-level credit-bearing postsecondary courses and postsecondary training and to the content of remedial postsecondary courses.
 - Examine top-performing educational systems throughout the world and consider potential sources of bias in assessments used to determine college and career readiness.

Source: Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article $\$ 7–205.1

Long-Term Study

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE



- To complete the critical research that will inform the adoption of the CCR standard, MSDE sought out the most qualified researchers in the industry, through a Competitive Sealed Proposals process.
- MSDE released a Request for Proposals (RFP) on May 16, 2022.
 - Copies of the solicitation notice were sent directly to 43 prospective vendors including six Maryland firms.
- Firms had until July 14, 2022 to submit their proposals.
 - \circ 5 proposals were received from researchers across the country.
- An evaluation committee of MSDE and LEA staff members evaluated each proposal on its technical merits. The committee met with each offeror to discuss their proposal.
 - The **technical evaluations were then combined** with the evaluation of the financial offers.
- On November 16, 2022, the Board of Public Works approved the recommended contract.



- The American Institutes for Research (AIR) has been selected and approved to conduct the Long-Term CCR Standard study.
 - The proposal submitted by AIR was determined to be the most advantageous for the State. The evaluation committee determined AIR demonstrated a superior understanding of the work required and provided specific details as to how they would satisfy the State's requirements. AIR's proposal provided a strong background and related experience, having completed projects for the United States Department of Education, MSDE, and Anne Arundel County Public Schools. AIR defined a concise project timeline and plan for meeting the expected deliverables.
- MSDE facilitated the official study kickoff meeting on December 1 and will serve as a partner during the research study.
 - MSDE will share the summary of the results from the Exploratory Study and coordinate between AIR and the Maryland Longitudinal Data System Center for data transfers. MSDE will also ensure all requirements of the study are completed, including focus groups with community colleges.
 - As specified in the Blueprint, **AIR will submit their final research report** to the Governor, the Maryland General Assembly, the AIB, and MSDE **on or before September 1, 2023.**

Working Timeline

The timeline will include multiple and frequent opportunities for postsecondary entities to provide feedback, including focus groups, webinars, surveys, and in-person meetings.

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

	2022	2023								
Activity Description	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.
Assess Data, Link Data, and Create Single Analytic Data File	•									
Complete Literature Review	•									
Inventory College Course Requirements	•			-						
Conduct Focus Groups	•					· — · · →				
Analysis of Top-Performing School Systems										
Conduct Assessment Review										
Conduct Quantitative Analysis		-						•		
Interim Report: Quantitative Study										
Interim Report: Content and Standards Alignment Study (Qualitative Analysis)										
Final Report and Presentation to Stakeholders										

EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE



The implementation of the Maryland College and Career Readiness Standards included a full transition that took **five years from standards adoption to full implementation** with the associated assessments.



*States are required to submit assessments for a federally required peer review when there has been a major change in the assessment system. The peer review includes demonstration of the completion of an achievement standard setting process after the first operational administration of the assessment.

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Previous MD Standards and Assessment Transitions: Science

The implementation of the Next Generation Science Standards included a full transition that took over **five years from standards adoption to full implementation** with the associated assessments.



*States are required to submit assessments for a federally required peer review when there has been a major change in the assessment system. The peer review includes demonstration of the completion of an achievement standard setting process after the first operational administration of the assessment.

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Potential Impact for Standards and Assessment Transitions

A change in the Maryland CCR content standards and a change in assessment measures will have an impact on the timeline for the determination of CCR status of students.



A new or changed CCR assessment without revision to CCR standards will require development, field testing and standard setting. (2024, 2025, 2026)

*States are required to submit assessments for a federally required peer review when there has been a major change in the assessment system. The peer review includes demonstration of the completion of an achievement standard setting process after the first operational administration of the assessment.

Final Report Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty



Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty

- **1.** Background and Requirements
- 2. Developing Socioeconomic Blocks and Tiers
- 3. Proposed Calculation Methods
- 4. Recommended Methodology
- 5. Next Steps

Background and Requirements

Reviewing the directives and vision of the Blueprint for Maryland's Future and other legislation.



Legislative Requirements

- Under the Blueprint for Maryland's Future, the Maryland State Department of Education is tasked to complete a study on incorporating neighborhood indicators of poverty to determine a school's eligibility for the Concentration of Poverty grant and the Compensatory Education program and submit a report on the results.
- Additionally, as part of the provisions related to analyzing neighborhood indicators of poverty, the Blueprint for Maryland's Future directs MSDE to work to incorporate Medicaid data into the direct certification of students eligible for the free or reduced-price meals program.
 - Traditionally, direct certification identifies families that participate in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Foster Care, or status as a student experiencing homelessness.
 - Incorporating Medicaid into the list of programs will increase the number of students that can be directly identified as eligible.



Progress Towards Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty

	July 2019 HB 1206 (2019) Census Tracts and Blocks legislation enacted		Septemb Pilot student geolocation provided by MSDE	ember 2021 Udent ation data ed by LSSs to the December August 20 MSDE studie analyzes and neighborhoc indicators of		er 2021- 2022 ies, d evaluates od of poverty	October 2022 Final Report due to the AIB
_		MLDS Cente MSDE Conve Workgroup	er and ene	Interim Repo the MD Gen Assembly an	ort due to eral d the AIB	MSDE begin data collectio student geol information	s standard on of ocation
		August 2	020	Novembe	er 2021	Septemb	er 2022
	Phase	I: Data and Sys	stems	Phase 2: E	Study, Analyz valuate	e, Phase	e 3: Implement and Impact

Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty

- 1. Background and Requirements
- 2. Developing Socioeconomic Blocks and Tiers
- 3. Proposed Calculation Methods
- 4. Recommended Methodology
- 5. Next Steps

Developing Socioeconomic Blocks and Tiers

Incorporating neighborhood measures to calculate and identify socioeconomic status.



How is Poverty Measured in Education?

The count of students eligible for a free or reduced price meal under USDA's **National School Lunch Program** (NSLP) is the most commonly used measure of poverty in education.

Pros	Cons
(Core Conditions Met)	(Limitations and Data Quality Issues)
 Universal participation and criteria Regularly updated Stable infrastructure with long history and well funded Accessible and widely available 	 Binary measure capturing little variation in household income (Domina et al., 2018) Measure is of an individual at a point-in-time and not a neighborhood measure. Participation rates are not constant across grades (Harwell & LeBeau, 2010) Systemic differences in participation Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) limits availability of student level data Eligibility of students relies on household forms and/or direct certification



National Exploration of a Neighborhood Poverty Indicator

New Mexico

- New Mexico's Family Income Index Act signed into law April 2021
- Census data is used to identify household income of every NM public school student.
- Each school's Family Income Index is calculated through the percentage of students in families with the lowest incomes.
- Allocated \$15 million to 108 schools, with awards ranging from \$20,000 to \$434,174, to fight concentrated poverty in schools.

Texas

- Texas's HB 3 in 2019 established the statewide Socioeconomic Tier Model for Texas School-Age Residents.
- Census block groups are **tiered by income and household characteristics** using ACS data.
- Increased compensatory education funding for students in lower socioeconomic tiers.
- Created the Teacher Incentive Allotment, a statewide career ladder initiative to recruit, retain, and reward highly impactful teachers to teach in rural and high needs schools, allotting \$3,000 to \$32,000 per designated teacher.



The Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)

- The Community Eligibility Provision (CEP), enacted as part of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, is a recent addition to the federal National School Lunch Program (NSLP). It allows schools and districts serving low-income populations to provide free meals for all students, regardless of students' individual circumstances.
- The CEP expands meal access to students while **reducing the paperwork burden from families**.
 - Families at CEP schools do not submit an annual income eligibility form.
- To be eligible for participation in CEP, a school or district needs to have at least 40% of its students eligible for free meals, using the direct certification process.
- In the 2021-2022 school year, there were **four local education agencies** (Baltimore City and Dorchester, Somerset, and Wicomico counties) in Maryland that **implemented CEP in all schools** in the district, and an additional **ten counties that implement CEP in some of their schools**. A total of **354 schools** in 2021-2022 had implemented CEP.



Multiple Factors Impact Poverty

Poverty is "the extent to which an individual does without resources."

(Payne, R. K. (2005). A framework for understanding poverty. Aha! Process.)





Development Of Census Block Groups Into Socioeconomic Tiers



Maryland has 4,079 Census block groups



Using the ACS measures, each Census block group was given a socioeconomic score and ranked lowest to highest



Census block groups were assigned into one of five tiers based on the socioeconomic score, with a similar number of school-age residents in each Tier.



Tier Methodology

- Using data from the American Community Survey, a composite index of four neighborhood indicators of poverty was constructed for 4,035 Census block groups* in Maryland based on:
 - Median household income
 - \circ Adult education level
 - \circ Home ownership
 - \circ Household composition
- Each block group was then ranked from highest to lowest poverty and placed into one of five tiers so that each tier consists of about 1/5 of school-age residents.

* Maryland has 4,079 Census block groups but 44 block groups were missing all four measures and were not assigned a score or tier.



Distribution Of Tiers By Household Characteristics

Each tier contains a similar number of school-age residents (approximately 195,000).

Tier	Median household income	Home ownership (%)	Single Parent Households (%)	Educational Level 0.0 = No education 1.00 = Advanced degree	Block Groups (N)	Block Groups (%)
Tier 5	\$48,048	34.9%	70.7%	0.50	899	22.3%
Tier 4	\$70,339	60.9%	38.9%	0.58	884	21.9%
Tier 3	\$90,277	76.1%	24.3%	0.62	828	20.5%
Tier 2	\$115,395	85.2%	15.1%	0.68	771	19.1%
Tier 1	\$173,503	92.8%	8.3%	0.78	653	16.2%

Tier 5 represents households with high poverty/low socioeconomic score. Tier 1 represents households with low poverty/high socioeconomic score.

Source: MSDE, Office of Policy Analysis and Fiscal Compliance

Socioeconomic Block Group Tiers in Maryland



EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE



Socioeconomic Tiers By Local Education Agency



62 | Maryland State Department of Education



Distribution of Tiers In Selected Counties

Howard County

Baltimore City





Distribution Of Tiers In Selected Counties

Queen Anne's County

Caroline County







Students Within Each SES Tier

- The percentage of students in each tier varies greatly across LEAs.
- Less than 20% of students in Calvert, Carroll, and Howard Counties reside in the two highest poverty tiers (Tiers 4 and 5).
- More than half of students in 15 LEAs reside in neighborhoods with similar levels of poverty.



Percent of Students within each Tier, by LEA



Preliminary Data Analysis

- Combining student level and neighborhood level indicators of poverty shows the extent that individual poverty is related to neighborhood poverty.
 - Few to no economically disadvantaged students live in the lowest poverty neighborhoods and few non-economically disadvantaged students live in the highest poverty neighborhoods.
 - Not all non-economically disadvantaged students live in low poverty neighborhoods.
 - Not all economically disadvantaged students live in high poverty neighborhoods.
- Instead of solely relying on a measure of whether students are economically disadvantaged or not, the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood can provide additional differentiation between levels of poverty.



Note: Economically disadvantaged is defined as any student identified as directly certified. Direct certification allows local education agencies to certify students as eligible for free meal benefits using participant data from other means-tested programs.

Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty

- 1. Background and Requirements
- 2. Developing Socioeconomic Blocks and Tiers
- 3. Proposed Calculation Methods
- 4. Recommended Methodology
- 5. Next Steps

Proposed Calculation Methods

Potential approaches to calculate compensatory education funding for schools using socioeconomic neighborhood tiers.



Overview of Proposed Methodologies

- Calculation Method One: The first method assigns all students to their Maryland Neighborhood Tier (Tier 1 to Tier 5). Economically-disadvantaged status is not considered.
- Calculation Method Two: The second method assigns only economicallydisadvantaged students (those identified through direct certification) to their Maryland Neighborhood Tier (Tier 1 to Tier 5). Non-economicallydisadvantaged students are not included in the calculation.
- Calculation Method Three: The third method assigns all students to their Maryland Neighborhood Tier (Tier 1 to Tier 5) and further subcategorizes students based on whether or not those students are economically-disadvantaged.

Current Compensatory Education Formula

- The Compensatory Education portion of the Blueprint formula includes the statutorily calculated **allocation of compensatory education funds** to local education agencies based on certain measures of student poverty that are defined in §5-222 of the Education Article.
- Eligibility for Compensatory Education State aid in current law is based on:
 - The number of students eligible for free- or reduced-price meals for the prior fiscal year;
 - o The number of students eligible for and included in USDA CEP counts; or
 - The number of students directly certified and who are enrolled in the prior fiscal year
- The exact per-pupil amount each year is determined by the statutory Compensatory Education funding weight multiplied by the target per-pupil foundation amount.
- The statutory amount of the **weight overall decreases over time** in FY 23 the weight is 89%; In FY 33 and beyond, the weight is 71%.
 - The FY 23 per-pupil amount is \$7,396 (\$8,310 * 89%); the FY 33 per-pupil amount is \$8,780 (\$12,365 * 71%).

Case Studies

- To illustrate the **impact of neighborhood indicators** for determining compensatory education funding, a **series of case studies** is presented, one for each calculation methodology.
- Each "case study" highlights two schools with similar grade levels and similar current percentages of economically disadvantaged students. However, these schools are located in different geographic areas and have students living in census blocks assigned different socioeconomic tiers.
 - While the example schools have **similar rates of economically disadvantaged students**, they have **different levels of socioeconomic need**, as defined by the socioeconomic tiers.
- Each case study should show whether or not, and how much, the calculation methodology allocates additional funding to the school with the higher need.
 - The school with a higher percentage of students living in Tier 4 and Tier 5 neighborhoods should have a greater difference in compensatory education funding, when compared to the school with more students living in Tier 1 and Tier 2.

Note: school-level dollar amounts reflected in this analysis are hypothetical based on enrollment and do not reflect actual district spending.



Case Study: School Profiles





44% of Lakeland Elementary/Middle students are economically disadvantaged.

94% of students live in Tier 5 neighborhoods.

40% of Francis Scott Key Elementary/Middle students are **economically disadvantaged.**

Students live in neighborhoods in each of the 5 Tiers.



Calculation Method One

- Calculation Method One is the **simplest of the three methods**.
- The inputs for this method are the student's enrollment status at the school and the Maryland Neighborhood Tier (MNT) of the student's residence.
- Based on the location of each student's residence, they are assigned to the Maryland Neighborhood Tier (MNT) of that Census block group.



 Students living in Tiers 4 or 5 live in lower SES neighborhoods than students living in Tiers 1 or 2.

MNT	1	2	3	4	5
Relative Weight and Dollar Amount	0% \$0	0% \$0	100% \$7,396	110% \$8,136	120% \$8,875


Case Study: Calculation Method One

Lakeland has more students living in high poverty neighborhoods, so it should a larger increase than Francis Scott Key.

Lakeland, under method one, receives an increase of \$2.3 million, compared to Francis Scott Key's \$900,000 increase.

The difference in funding between the two schools grows from a difference of \$2.2 million to a difference of \$2.6 million. Current (FY 23) Formula Compensatory Education by School, and Potential Compensatory Education Revenue Using Method One

Schools		Current	Method One Weighted	
Francis Scott Key Elementary/Middle		\$ 2,536,828	\$3,179,540	
Lakeland Ele	mentary/Middle	\$ 4,718,648	\$5,810,297	
\$7,000,000 \$6,000,000 \$5,000,000 \$4,000,000 \$3,000,000 \$2,000,000 \$1,000,000	\$4,718,648 \$2,536,828 \$2,181,820	\$5, \$3, \$2,0	810,297 179,540 530,757	
\$0 Francis S	Current Scott Key Elementary/Middle	Method (e —— Lakeland Elementa	Dne Weighted ry/Middle	



- Calculation Method Two builds on the Compensatory Education funding model implemented by the state of Texas after the passage of Texas' HB3 in 2019.
- Only students who are identified as economically disadvantaged through direct certification or a Free and Reduced-Price Meal application form generate funding.
 - Non-economically-disadvantaged students do not generate any funding.
- Based on the location of each student's residence, they are assigned to the Maryland Neighborhood Tier (MNT) of that Census block group.
 - Students living in **Tiers 4 or 5 live in lower SES neighborhoods** than students living in Tiers 1 or 2.

MNT	Relative Weight and Dollar Amount
Non – Economically disadvantaged	0% \$0
1	100% \$7,396
2	110% \$8,136
3	120% \$8,875
4	130% \$9,615
5	140% \$10,354



Case Study: Calculation Method Two

Lakeland has more students living in high poverty neighborhoods, so it should a larger increase than Francis Scott Key.

Under method two, Lakeland receives an increase of \$2.4 million compared to Francis Scott Key's \$800,000 increase.

The difference in funding between the two schools grows from a difference of \$2.2 million to a difference of \$3.3 million.

Methods one and two move the schools in the expected direction, with **method two a slightly better fit than method one** (both increasing in resources, with Lakeland increasing more).

Current (FY 23) Formula Compensatory Education by School, and Potential Compensatory Education Revenue Using Method Two





- Calculation Method Three provides the most nuanced approach of the three methods by creating ten different categories that students can be assigned to, with each category able to generate a unique level of funding.
- To assign a student to a category, students are first determined whether they are identified as economically disadvantaged, as measured by direct certification.
 - Then, the **student's MNT is identified.**
 - Finally, the combination of where the student's Tier and economically disadvantaged status meet in the chart below determines to which category the student will be assigned.

	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5
Not economically	0%	0%	60%	70%	80%
disadvantaged	\$0	\$0	\$4,437	\$5,177	\$5,916
Economically disadvantaged	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%
	\$6,656	\$7,396	\$8,135	\$8,875	\$9,615



Case Study: Calculation Method Three

Lakeland has more students living in high poverty neighborhoods, so it should a larger increase than Francis Scott Key.

Under method three, Lakeland receives an increase of \$2.5 million compared to Francis Scott Key's \$222,000 increase.

The difference in funding between the two schools grows from a difference of \$2.2 million to a difference of \$4.4 million.

Method three has the largest difference in funding change between the two sites, with both sites moving in the expected direction. **Method three yields an increase in funding for both schools with more precision and is the best fit of the three methods** as resources should predominantly increase for Lakeland, given the difference in enrollment by neighborhood tiers. Current (FY 23) Formula Compensatory Education by School, and Potential Compensatory Education Revenue Using Method Three

Current	Weighted		
\$ 2,536,828	\$ 2,758,708		
dle \$4,718,648	\$ 7,202,224		
\$	7,202,224 4,443,516 2,758,708		
\$0 Current Method Three Weighted Francis Scott Key Elementary/Middle — Lakeland Elementary/Middle			
d	Current \$ 2,536,828 ddle \$ 4,718,648		

Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty

- 1. Background and Requirements
- 2. Developing Socioeconomic Blocks and Tiers
- 3. Proposed Calculation Methods
- 4. Recommended Methodology
- 5. Next Steps

Initial Recommended Methodology

MSDE's recommendation for implementing neighborhood indicators of poverty.

Comparison of Calculation Methods

Calculation Method 3 is the only method that meets all four criteria and has the greatest differentiation between student socioeconomic status.

	Method 1 MNTs Only	Method 2 MNTs for Economically- disadvantaged students	Method 3 MNTs and Economically disadvantaged Status
Calculation includes neighborhood indicator of poverty (MNT)?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Calculation includes an individual/family indicator of poverty (Economically disadvantaged status)?	No	Yes	Yes
Differentiates between Economically-disadvantaged students?	No	Yes	Yes
Attempts to account for missed Economically- disadvantaged students?	Yes	No	Yes
Number of levels of student socioeconomic status?	5	6	10

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE



Initial Recommended Methodology

- MSDE Recommends adopting Calculation Method Three
- The ten possible categories that students can be assigned to provide the greatest amount of variation in the amount of funding a student can generate. This allows for the funding to be allocated more precisely and accurately. The students and schools that need the most funding will be capable of receiving it.
- Allocating greater amounts of funding for students living in low SES neighborhoods recognizes the impact that concentrated poverty has on families and students.
- Enabling students to generate funding for living in low SES neighborhoods, even without completing a meal benefit application or opting-in to a public assistance program reduces burden on families and schools while also identifying additional students that have been missed in historical methods.



•

Impact of Implementing the Initial Recommended Methodology

- Data available to identify low-income families will be more accurate.
 - Current methods use proxy measurements that are indirect and incomplete.
- Expansion of free meals through the Community Eligibility Provision
 - Schools currently can be hesitant to adopt CEP due to lagging data.
 - Utilizing neighborhood indicators could reduce LEA reservations to participating in CEP, which offers free meals for all students.
- Increase of community schools
 - Identifying more students using Neighborhood Indicators increases the number of schools above the threshold to qualify for concentration of poverty funding.
- More adequate funding allocation
 - By directing the resources to the students and schools that need them the most, student outcomes will improve and become more equitable across the state.

	Compensatory Education Funding			
Pilot Program LEAs	Current Formula	Calculation Method 3	Change from Current	Percent Change from Current
Anne Arundel	\$227,863,364	\$276,169,598	\$48,306,234	21%
Caroline	\$22,313,732	\$35,542,218	\$13,228,486	59%
Frederick	\$92,886,364	\$125,570,767	\$32,684,403	35%
Baltimore City	\$503,098,108	\$555,295,378	\$52,197,270	10%
Total	\$846,161,568	\$992,577,961	\$146,416,393	17%

Neighborhood Indicators of Poverty

- 1. Background and Requirements
- 2. Developing Socioeconomic Blocks and Tiers
- 3. Proposed Calculation Methods
- 4. Recommended Methodology
- 5. Next Steps

Next Steps

Continuing the process to implement the recommended methodology to support students, teachers, schools, and districts.

Further Policy Considerations

- Equity and access: The identification of MNTs may be used to develop policies that support disadvantaged students related to access and enrollment in schools and programs. A student's MNT could be used for eligibility or priority for lottery or other high-demand school and program placement.
- Teacher incentives and placement: School-level scores based on the enrollment of students in various MNTs could be leveraged to recruit, retain, and reward highly impactful teachers to teach in high needs schools.
- Title I: As school systems across the country continue to identify new and alternative methods to identify a student's socioeconomic status, the use of the MNT methodology may provide an option for better calculating Title I eligible student counts for each school and for LEAs and to subsequently allocate funding through ESEA Title I.

Next Steps



Next Steps

- Now that the first full statewide data collection of student level Census block and tract information for enrolled students is completed, MSDE will continue its analysis process and will submit recommendations for the remaining missing elements of the funding formulas.
 - MSDE will also engage with representatives of the LEAs to ensure that the new methodology aligns with the needs and priorities of those who will be entrusted with supporting students using these funds.
- MSDE's **final recommendations** for incorporating neighborhood indicators of poverty to determine a school's eligibility for the Compensatory Education program and the Concentration of Poverty grant, utilizing the complete set of data, will include:
 - The methodology for calculating Maryland Neighborhood Tiers
 - $\,\circ\,$ The process for completing the recommended Calculation Method
 - The Funding Formula dollar amounts and relative funding weights that will generate funding
 - o Cost estimates for each school, each local education agency, and Maryland as a whole
 - Funding comparisons of the new methodology compared to current formulas



Timeline

Date	Task
November 15, 2022	LEAs submit complete data of student enrollment and student Census Block
	and Tract locations to MSDE
November 15 - November 22, 2022	Data validation and error checks. Descriptive statistics and exploratory data
	analysis completed.
November 23 – November 30, 2022	Preparation of report on the data necessary to implement the neighborhood
	poverty indicators methodology, as required by §5-223.
December 1, 2022	Submission of report on data necessary to implement the neighborhood
	poverty indicators methodology, as required by §5-223.
December 1 – December 16, 2022	Possible methodologies and formulas described above are applied to full
	data set. Cost estimates are determined. Impact analysis at the school level is
	completed. Validation and error checks completed.
December 19, 2022 – January 7, 2023	Engagement with representatives from LEAs on new methodology and its
	implications.
January 10, 2023	MSDE completes final recommendations for incorporating neighborhood
	indicators of poverty to determine a school's eligibility for the Compensatory
	Education program and the Concentration of Poverty grant, utilizing a
	complete set of data.

Final Report Workgroup on English Learners in Public Schools



Workgroup on English Learners in Public Schools

- 1. Overview of Workgroup
- 2. Recommendations

Overview of Workgroup

Reviewing the requirements, members, activities, and overall recommendations of the Workgroup on English Learners in Public Schools .

Blueprint Requirements

- The Blueprint directs the Workgroup on English Learners to :
 - o Collect data on English learners and the services available to them.
 - Review methods of teaching and providing other services to English learners in Maryland and elsewhere.
 - Make recommendations on improving the education of English learners, including whether additional funding should be provided.
 - \odot Submit reports on the research and recommendations of the Workgroup.



Workgroup Members and Meetings

- The Workgroup was composed of **legislators**, **educators**, **stakeholders**, **advocates**, **university professors**, **and experts** from within Maryland and across the country.
- The EL Workgroup held a series of 16 meetings from August 2021 to October 2022.
- Each meeting focused on a guiding question and included a spotlight on national best practices and research on the topic.
- National experts and researchers presented and answered questions from Workgroup members.
- MSDE staff provided an overview of Maryland's existing policy and practices as well as an examination of pertinent data.
- Each meeting included an opportunity for **community partners** and Workgroup members to **provide input and discuss the topic**.



- 1. Support and Sustain Multilingualism by Promoting an Asset-Based Approach
- 2. Equitable Engagement and Communication With Multilingual Families
- 3. Implementation of Instructional Programs To Support ELs
 - a. Scale **Two-Way Immersion** Programs

Overview of Workgroup

Not included in AIB Comprehensive Plan

- b. Literacy Instruction Aligned to the Science of Reading That Meets the Needs of ELs
- c. Effective English Language Development (ELD) Programs
- 4. Assessment and Accountability Systems to Support ELs
 - a. Equitable and Valid Assessments For English Learners
 - **b.** Transparent and Equitable Accountability And Reporting For ELs At All Stages of English Language Development
 - c. New and Expanded Ways to Reclassify ELs

Not included in AIB Comprehensive Plan

Overview of Recommendations (2 of 2)

- 5. Teacher Preparation Policies to Support ELs
 - a. All Teachers Prepared to Serve English Learners
 - b. Maryland Bilingual Teacher Certification
 - c. Teacher Pipeline
- 6. Identification and Support for Young English Learners
- 7. Support For Students With Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE)
- 8. Equitable Access to College and Career Readiness (CCR) Curriculum and Pathways
- 9. Funding Allocations And Spending Decisions That Support Success For ELs

Not included in AIB Comprehensive Plan

Workgroup on English Learners in Public Schools

1. Overview of Workgroup

2. Recommendations

Recommendations

The Workgroup's recommendations for supporting English learners in schools across Maryland.

Recommendation 1

Support and Sustain Multilingualism by Promoting an Asset-Based Approach

- Maryland should develop and implement a statewide strategy to promote and formally reinforce asset-based perspectives regarding ELs at every level from the Maryland State Department of Education to individual educators and staff.
 - MSDE should develop strategies to confront the English learner deficit mindset in the State.
 - MSDE should formally shift from the English learner label to additive terminology such as multilingual or emerging bilingual, focusing on students' strengths and affirming their home languages.
 - MSDE should practice and promote an asset-based perspective in the State regarding English learners in its forthcoming Strategic Plan; workstreams related to the Blueprint for Maryland's Future; through flagship programs, initiatives, and strategies; and publications and messaging.
 - MSDE should establish a culture that celebrates and formally reinforces the assets of multilingual learners and provide formal training opportunities for local education agency staff and state educational leaders.

Recommendations can be implemented through:

Policy and Protocols of MSDE, LEAs, and Schools

RYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF DUCATION Recommendations

Recommendation 1 Support and Sustain Multilingualism by Promoting an Asset-Based Approach

- California: The CA Education for a Global Economy Initiative aims to ensure that all children in California public schools receive the highest quality education, master the English language, and access high-quality, innovative, and research-based language programs to prepare them to fully participate in a global economy. The CA Ed.G.E. Initiative authorizes school districts and county offices of education to establish language acquisition programs for both native and non-native English speakers and requires school districts and county offices of education to solicit parent and community input in developing language acquisition programs.
- New York: The State Department's Blueprint for English Language Learner (ELL)/Multilingual Learner (MLL) Success has assetbased language embedded throughout the document. Principle Number 4 specifically calls out the asset of bilingualism and biliteracy by stating, "Districts and schools recognize that bilingualism and biliteracy are assets and provide opportunities for all students to earn a Seal of Biliteracy upon obtaining a high school diploma."
- Texas: Demonstrating the long history of bilingual education in Texas, the 1973 Bilingual Education and Training Act requires that if a school district has 20 students in the district with the same first language, the local school district board must establish a bilingual education program. In 2021, SB 2066 eliminates references to the term, "Limited English Proficient" in favor of the term, "Emergent Bilingual." Also in 2021, SB 560 requires the TEA to develop a strategic plan for Emergent Bilinguals (EBs) in coordination with Texas' Higher Education and Workforce Commissions to increase the number of bilingual certified teachers and increase the effective implementation of dual language one-way and two-way programs.

Recommendation 2

Equitable Engagement and Communication with Multilingual Families

- Maryland should explore legislation and/or regulations to establish a mandated comprehensive language access policy for MSDE and public schools.
 - MSDE should use national exemplars and models to outline a Maryland State policy and/or regulation for language access at MSDE and in public schools.
 - MSDE should explore regional language access resource centers to support and build capacity for all local education agencies.
 - MSDE should provide asset-based training for Department and LEA staff that will emphasize the rights of multilingual stakeholders, especially parents/guardians.

Recommendations can be implemented through:

Legislation and/or COMAR Regulations

Recommendation 2 Equitable Engagement and Communication with Multilingual Families

- New York: The New York State Education Department created the Blueprint for English Language Learners' Success. As a result of the Blueprint included a Parents' Bill of Rights, New York has expanded their parent and family communications by requiring all districts ensure that parents/guardians of ELs have equitable access to information; provide communications in parents'/guardians' preferred language and mode of communication; and provide interpretation and translation of critical communications through a qualified interpreter or translator.
- Washington: State law in Washington requires school districts to provide vital communications in a language that a parent or guardian can understand. The Language Access Workgroup advises the State on specific strategies meant to improve meaningful, equitable access for public school students and their family members who have language access barriers.
- Prince George's County Public Schools: PGCPS established the Office of Interpreting and Translation in 1993. To meet the
 needs of multilingual families, the office offers many language access resources, including pre-arranged meetings and events
 with in-person and virtual remote interpreters, on-the-spot telephonic interpreting, on-demand translation, and a document
 translation library.
 - PGCPS also established a Professional Language Access Community that developed a framework which guides hiring and assessment practices, builds context for language access, builds investment in language access, and nurtures growth in knowledge about language equity.



Recommendation 3: Implementation of Instructional Programs to Support ELs

Recommendation 3a Scale Two-Way Immersion Programs

- Maryland should develop, fund, and implement a statewide approach to expansion of two-way immersion programs.
- MSDE should develop a phased plan for expanding best-in-class two-way immersion programs across the State, including an assessment of available funding sources, research-based program requirements, a community engagement plan, training, and technical assistance.
- Maryland should amend or supplement existing statutory funding formulas to include mandates that would provide the funding necessary to expand and implement two-way immersion programs. MSDE should advocate that formula amendments provide:
 - The EL state aid formula weight to LEAs in cases where students participate in a two-way immersion program, regardless of EL status.
 - A dedicated startup fund to cover initial immersion program startup costs.
- MSDE should **engage stakeholders** in regions across Maryland where the student demographics support the launch of two-way dual language immersion programs.

Not included in AIB Comprehensive Plan

Recommendations can be implemented through:

Policy and Protocols of MSDE, LEAs, and Schools

Amending the EL Funding Formula and/or Additional Appropriation



Recommendation 3: Implementation of Instructional Programs to Support ELs

Recommendation 3a Scale Two-Way Immersion Programs

- Texas: In 2019, Texas passed House Bill 3, resulting in changes to the weighted funding formula used to calculate bilingual education allotment. Schools receive additional funds for students participating in a dual language immersion program (one-way or two-way). The State has allocated an additional weight of 0.05 (for a total 0.15 weight) to the basic allotment for EL/Limited English Proficient students participating in a DLI program.
- Washington: In Washington, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has included universal access to dual language learning, inclusivity, and cultural responsiveness as predominant themes throughout their goals. The OSPI vision of dual language education as an equity strategy is that "all students will have access to dual language education and the opportunity to become proficient in two or more languages by 2030." To support the vision, Washington provides state grants and funding, awards Tribal, Heritage, and Dual Language grants, developed a Dual Language Steering Committee and Bilingual Education Advisory Committee, and created a bilingual teaching fellows program.
- Utah: Utah established Dual Language Immersion in 2008 with its passage of Senate Bill 41, which **provided funding for public schools to open or expand DLI programs across the state**. In 2019-20, approximately 224 public schools in Utah (23%) had a DLI program, serving about 58,000 students in 1-way and 2-way programs.
- Prince George's County Public Schools: PGCPS offers two-way immersion programs where English speakers and native Spanish speakers are
 integrated for content and literacy instruction in both languages. The program started with kindergarten students in 2015 and has added a grade
 level each year since. In the school year 2021-2022, students in the immersion program are in grades K-7 with a transition at grade 6 to a centralized
 middle school immersion program. PGCPS reports that students in the program score higher on local literacy assessments than their peers, English
 learners exit ELD programs in faster rates, and students meet language proficiency requirements for the Maryland Seal of Biliteracy as early as
 middle school.

Recommendation 4: Assessment and Accountability Systems to Support ELs

Recommendation 4b Transparent and Equitable Accountability and Reporting for ELs at All Stages of English Language Development

- Maryland should hold MSDE, local education agencies, and schools accountable for EL achievement at all stages of English language development by enhancing the reporting of data on English learners.
 - MSDE should expand public reporting to include progress and performance of ELs and reclassified ELs (RELs) and comparisons to non-English learners.
 - MSDE should provide transparent and robust reporting on Long-term English learners (LTELs).
 - MSDE should ensure that the Maryland accountability system provides transparent and comprehensive data on EL achievement at all stages of English development compared to their peers.

Recommendations can be implemented through:

Legislation and/or COMAR Regulations

Additional Appropriation

ID EXCELLENCE

Recommendation 4: Assessment and Accountability Systems to Support ELs

Recommendation 4b Transparent and Equitable Accountability and Reporting for ELs at All Stages of English Language Development

- Oregon: Researchers have proposed the expansion of reporting and accountability for English learners, reporting the following language classifications: Current ELs, Former ELs, Ever ELs (Current ELs + Former ELs), and Never ELs. Oregon has begun reporting outcomes for all four categories; however, altering accountability to include these categories would require a reauthorization of ESSA. Oregon's partial implementation of this expanded reporting increases understanding of how outcomes change across grade levels, of system performance, of where intervention is needed, and of reasons for patterns that emerge.
- California: English learners are among thirteen student groups whose performance is measured on all state indicator. Numerous data reports are publicly available, such as enrollment by EL status, At Risk for being Long-Term English learners and Long-Term English learners by grade, ever-ELs by years as EL and reclassified status and grade, ELs by language and grade, and annual reclassification counts and rates.
- Maryland Local Education Agencies Spotlight: Long-term English learners (LTELs) are English learners who have been enrolled in a U.S. school for more than six years and have not been reclassified as English proficient. As part of the Workgroup's meeting on accountability, local EL coordinators were invited to share about how their LEAs track and use data on LTELs.
 - Anne Arundel County Public Schools: In AACPS, once LTEL data are collected, it is shared with teachers, principals, and other leaders to provide a more comprehensive picture of the school's population. Sharing this data at the school level elevates the importance of tailoring instruction and professional development to meet the needs of LTELs. By examining this data at the county level, AACPS realized a need for a different approach for this population. The ELD office partnered with the AVID office to implement the AVID Excel program.

Recommendation 4: Assessment and Accountability Systems to Support ELs

Recommendation 4c New and Expanded Ways to Reclassify ELs

- Currently, Maryland's English language proficiency (ELP) assessment is the only criterion used to determine reclassification of ELs as English proficient, a high-stakes decision, which limits access to other coursework for ELs.
- Maryland should revise its policy to provide multiple measures to reclassify ELs.

 MSDE should design and implement multiple pathways for EL reclassification based on stakeholder engagement with practitioners from Maryland LEAs. Recommendations can be implemented through:

Legislation and/or COMAR Regulations

Not included in AIB Comprehensive Plan



Recommendation 4: Assessment and Accountability Systems to Support ELs

Recommendation 4c New and Expanded Ways to Reclassify ELs

- California: California has four criteria that LEAs must use in establishing their reclassification process: Assessment of English language proficiency; teacher evaluations; parent consultation; and basic skills performance relative to English proficient students.
 - California provides broad guidance; however, LEAs can individualize according to the needs of their community. To date, the state has standardized the overall score on the English Language Proficiency Assessment to be considered for reclassification.
- Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania established uniform procedures for reclassifying ELs as former ELs when they attain proficiency, using the overall composite ACCESS for ELLs score. Teachers are trained to complete the state's standardized language use inventories for each eligible student prior to the release of ACCESS for ELLs scores. When the reclassification score is equal to or greater than 10.5, the state's threshold for reclassification, an EL is reclassified as a former EL. The academic progress of former ELs is also actively monitored by district personnel for a period of two years after reclassification.

Recommendation 5: Teacher Preparation Policies to Support ELs

Recommendation 5b Maryland Bilingual Teacher Certification

- Maryland should: Adopt a bilingual certification; and Ensure that unnecessary barriers do not limit multilingual candidates from becoming certified teachers in Maryland.
 - MSDE should promulgate regulations for bilingual certification to be presented to the State Board of Education and PSTEB.
 - MSDE should promote the expansion of approved dual certification programs (ESOL plus another certification area) in Maryland's colleges and universities.
 - MSDE should eliminate barriers for multilingual teacher candidates in all content areas and identify alternatives that can be implemented while still maintaining rigorous requirements.

Recommendations can be implemented through:

COMAR Regulations

Additional Appropriation

Recommendation 5: Teacher Preparation Policies to Support ELs

Recommendation 5b Maryland Bilingual Teacher Certification

- **California:** Assembly Bill 1871, enacted in 2008, provides for the **issuance of bilingual authorizations** rather than certificates and expands the options available to meet the requirements for the Bilingual Authorization.
- New York: New York offers a Bilingual Education Extension to a base certificate authorizing the holder to teach bilingual education. The educator must previously hold the appropriate base certificate. Candidates may obtain an initial bilingual extension through either a state-approved teacher preparation program or the individual evaluation pathway.
- Texas: Texas offers both initial Bilingual certification and English as a Second Language (ESL) certification. To obtain bilingual education certification, educators must already hold a Texas teaching certificate and could then enroll in an alternative certification program. The LEA may also provide temporary certification through an Emergency Permit, which is non-renewable and valid for one year. All teachers in a Bilingual Education Program (one-way and two-way) must be certified in bilingual education.

Recommendation 6 Identification and Support for Young English Learners

- Maryland should adopt: A standardized, comprehensive method for identifying, collecting and sharing information about young English learners that is required across all LEAs and child care providers; and A statewide plan for supporting young English learners in PreK and early childhood settings that provides guidance, service models, and strategies for meeting their instructional needs and family engagement.
 - MSDE should **develop and implement regulatory pathways for identification** of young English learners.
 - MSDE should identify and use developmental screening (conducted in the child's home language) to get a baseline of young English learners' cognitive development, social and emotional skills, and language development.
 - MSDE should ensure that the KRA and Early Learning Assessment (ELA) are administered in Spanish. MSDE should also explore whether Maryland EXCELS rubrics, support, and EXCELS rating systems can offered in Spanish.
 - MSDE should amend statute to enable English learner students, students experiencing homelessness, and students with disabilities to count towards PreK Tier 1 Funding.

Recommendations can be implemented through:

Legislation and/or COMAR Regulations

Additional Appropriation

Recommendation 6 Identification and Support for Young ELs

- California: The California Department of Education (CDE)'s P-3 alignment effort is designed to bring together stakeholders across systems to identify, develop and implement policy and practice solutions focused on ensuring developmentally informed, rigorous, and joyful learning experiences are available to all children across the preschool and early years.
- Illinois: Illinois is unique in requiring all school districts to identify DLLs ages 3 to 5 by their first day attending a preschool program. In programs that serve at least 20 DLLs who speak the same home language, districts are required to provide programming that supports English language development.
- New Jersey: In New Jersey, if the home language survey indicates the student's primary language is other than English, it should be followed up with an individual conversation between the teacher and the primary caregivers to understand the child's home language environment and to help families understand the school district's linguistic, social-emotional, and academic goals for the children.
- Baltimore City Public Schools: City Schools has an established practice to provide English language development (ELD) services to PreK English learners. After being identified through their home language survey, PreK English learners are screened using the standardized assessment tool to determine their English proficiency level. ELD services, such as coteaching and specialized instruction during content instruction, are customized according to student proficiency levels and school instructional programming.

Recommendation 8

Equitable Access to College and Career Readiness Curriculum and Pathways

- Maryland should implement specialized programs and customized supports for ELs that ensure that ELs are accurately identified for gifted and talented services, have access to advanced coursework, and have equal access and opportunity to achieve success in a Post-CCR Pathway.
 - MSDE should develop a **toolkit for LEAs to implement specialized programs** and support for ELs.
 - Maryland should formally adopt multiple measures to be used to demonstrate College and Career Readiness.
 - Maryland should explore whether COMAR regulations should be amended to codify practices to accurately identify ELs as gifted and talented and to codify English learner students' opportunities to access advanced coursework.
 - Maryland should explore the creation of an Early College High School
 Designation process as well as the creation of a funding source to facilitate the launch of new Early College High Schools that intentionally serve historically underserved students, including ELs.

Recommendations can be implemented through:

Legislation and/or COMAR Regulations

> Budget Adjustments

EDUCATION EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Recommendation 8 Equitable Access to College and Career Readiness Curriculum and Pathways

- Massachusetts: The Massachusetts Early College Initiative, which creates and maintains partnerships connecting the state's districts and high schools with the state's colleges to give thousands of Massachusetts students, especially first-generation college-goers, access to college completion and career success. The Equitable Access guiding principle encourages designated programs to "prioritize students underrepresented in higher education enrollment and completion. To facilitate this, programs should be structured to eliminate barriers to student participation."
- Texas: Texas Education Agency developed the Early College High School (ECHS) Blueprint, which provides foundational principles and standards for innovative partnerships with colleges and universities. All ECHSs must implement and meet the requirements: "The ECHS recruitment and enrollment processes shall identify, recruit, and enroll the subpopulations of at-risk students ... including, but not limited to, ... students who are of limited English proficiency... Enrollment decisions shall not be based on state assessment scores, discipline history, teacher recommendations, parent or student essays, minimum grade point average (GPA), or other criteria that create barriers for student enrollment. The ECHS shall identify, recruit, and enroll subpopulations ... that are historically underrepresented in college courses."
- Los Angeles Unified School District: LA Unified provides a district initiative focused exclusively on supporting and identifying "Diverse Gifted Learners," "L.A. Unified strives to identify all gifted and talented students, including our culturally and linguistically diverse ELs and SELs. A significant number of Gifted/Talented Programs policies, procedures and programs are intentionally designed to promote the identification and participation of gifted/talented ELs and SELs. To address the underrepresentation of ELs and SELs and ensure their equitable referral and identification, L.A. Unified has clearly established policies and procedures that address all aspects of Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)"
- Anne Arundel County: Anne Arundel Community College and Anne Arundel County Public Schools designed a summer bridge program for rising high school seniors designated as English learners (ELs). Rising EL seniors would complete the "English for Academic Purposes-Capstone Grammar and Editing" course as well as the "Student Success Seminar" at the college to build up their English proficiency so that they would be more likely to test out of EL designation before graduating high school.
Recommendations

Recommendation 9 Funding Allocations and Spending Decisions that Support Success for ELs

Not included in AIB Comprehensive Plan

- Maryland should amend the funding formula to provide additional funding weights.
 - Maryland should establish a method to support LEAs that serve small EL populations.
 - MSDE should identify specific **uses of state EL funding for LEAs and schools**.
 - MSDE should provide guidance for LEAs and schools on braiding funding.
 - Maryland should adopt "policy level three" to ensure the Blueprint can provide the resources necessary to ensure proper opportunity for all ELs. This would position LEAs to implement the best-in-class instructional opportunities the Blueprint envisions, including:
 - Differentiation of per-pupil formula weight by proficiency level in three tiers.
 - **Diseconomy** of scale per-pupil supplement.
 - Native language prevalence LEA supplement.
 - **SLIFE weight** or SLIFE LEA supplement.

Recommendations can be implemented through:

Legislation and/or COMAR Regulations

Amending the EL portion of the Blueprint funding formula Recommendations

Recommendation 9 Funding Allocations and Spending Decisions that Support Success for ELs

National And Maryland Exemplars

- Michigan: Michigan has increased from \$1.2 million to \$25.2 million from 2017 to 2022. The supplemental funding can be used for direct instruction by ESL or bilingual staff, professional development, computer-assisted instruction, parent engagement, purchase of English language development instructional materials, and transportation to support extended learning and community activities. The legislation requires a fiscal report each year; adequacy of funds will be reviewed every three years.
- California: California's Local Control Funding Formula implements formula weight differentiation with an additional nuance. California (and other states, like Massachusetts) has the same weight for ELs but applies the weight to a base amount associated with a particular grade span. The application of the same weight on differing base amounts results in ELs generating a different amount of revenue based on the grade of the EL. For example, if the weight = 1.0, and there are two base amounts, \$1,000 and \$2,000, the weighted amounts for each would be \$1,000 and \$2,000, respectively.
- Maine: The Maine state aid formula provides a multiplier to English Learner per-pupil funding based upon total local education agency EL enrollment, based on 3 tiers of enrollment. Districts with the fewest ELs receive a larger multiplier than districts with more ELs. This multiplier is designed to ensure that systems with fewer ELs can still generate the revenue necessary to ensure districts can provide adequate education services to meet Maine's Learning Results.



Questions?

111 | Maryland State Department of Education