



DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF POLICY ANALYSIS
MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Warren G. Deschenaux
Executive Director

July 21, 2017

The Honorable Thomas V. Mike Miller, Jr., Co-chair
The Honorable Michael E. Busch, Co-chair
Members of the Legislative Policy Committee

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On June 30, 2017, the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) submitted a draft of the [consolidated State plan](#) (plan) to the Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) for review and comment pursuant to [Chapter 630 of 2014](#). Every state that receives specified federal elementary and secondary education funding, notably Title I funds to serve economically disadvantaged students, is required to submit a plan to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Chapter 630 requires MSDE to provide LPC at least 30 days to review and comment on the plan before submitting it to USDE. MSDE must submit the State's plan to USDE by September 18, 2017. Comments from LPC and other stakeholders must be received by MSDE by August 10, 2017. The State Board of Education (State board) will vote on the plan prior to submission to USDE on September 18.

The Department of Legislative Services (DLS) has reviewed the plan and has identified five issues that LPC may wish to provide comment to MSDE on: (1) lack of specificity in some elements of the plan; (2) identification of schools in need of comprehensive (CSI) and targeted support and improvement (TSI); (3) distribution of funds for CSI and TSI; (4) requiring specific interventions; and (5) lack of methodology for comparing schools with similar demographic characteristics. DLS has also identified two other topics of note: (1) requiring schools with less than 95% participation on assessments to be TSI schools; and (2) compliance with the requirement that "access to or credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum" be an academic indicator. An overview of ESSA and Chapter 29 of 2017 (Protect Our Schools Act of 2017) is provided below, followed by an analysis of whether Maryland's plan complies with federal and State law.

Every Student Succeeds Act

In 2015, President Barack Obama signed [ESSA](#), the most recent reauthorization of ESEA, which provides federal funds for elementary and secondary education. Under the previous

authorization of ESEA, known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), each state educational agency (SEA) was required to hold schools accountable based solely on results of statewide assessments and one other academic indicator. ESSA significantly modified the requirements for differentiating among schools and the basis on which schools must be identified for further comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

Under ESSA, each SEA is required to have an accountability system that is based on the following five indicators: (1) proficiency on assessments, which may include growth in proficiency in high school; (2) growth in proficiency in grades below high school or another academic indicator; (3) high school graduation rates; (4) progress of English language learners toward proficiency; and (5) a nonacademic indicator, which is known as an indicator of school quality or student success. In Maryland, MSDE is the SEA.

After MSDE submits Maryland's plan to USDE, the plan (along with the plans submitted by other states at that time) must undergo a peer review process that meets certain requirements. Once peer review is completed, each SEA will receive peer review notes that will constitute the official record regarding how SEA's plan addresses federal statutory requirements. The peer review notes will serve as recommendations to the U.S. Secretary of Education to determine whether additional information is needed from SEA before the Secretary approves the plan. Unless the Secretary determines that the plan fails to meet the requirements for a consolidated State plan as detailed in ESSA, the Secretary must approve the plan no later than 120 days after its submission, which will be January 16, 2018. If the Secretary determines that the State's plan fails to meet the requirements, USDE must offer the State an opportunity to revise and resubmit its plan.

Protect Our Schools Act of 2017

During the 2017 legislative session, the General Assembly overrode the Governor's veto of House Bill 978 ([Chapter 29](#)), and the Protect Our Schools Act of 2017 became law. Chapter 29 requires the State's educational accountability program to include at least three school quality indicators that measure the comparative opportunities provided to students or the level of student success in public schools. One of the school quality indicators must be school climate surveys. The school quality indicators used may not be based on student testing. Of the academic indicators established by the State board, one must be access to or credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum that is indicative of on-track progress at key transition points within elementary and secondary education.

Chapter 29 requires the State board to establish a composite score that includes both academic and school quality indicators that provide for meaningful differentiation of schools. The composite score must (1) incorporate a methodology that compares schools that share similar demographic characteristics, including the proportion of economically disadvantaged students; (2) be reported in a manner that states for each score the individual indicator score that is used to calculate the composite score for each school; (3) be calculated numerically in a percentile form;

and (4) may not be reported using a letter grade model. The combined total of the academic indicators may not exceed 65% of the composite score. No academic or school quality indicator may be weighted as less than 10% of the total amount of the composite score. Subject to these restrictions, the final weights of the academic and school quality indicators must be determined by the State board with stakeholder input.

CSI and TSI plans must be implemented in compliance with existing collective bargaining agreements between the local boards of education and the exclusive bargaining representative. For each public school identified by MSDE for CSI, the local board of education must develop and implement a plan to improve student outcomes at the school. The plan must be developed in consultation with specified individuals and stakeholders, and the school, local board, and MSDE must approve and annually review the plan. For each public school identified by MSDE for TSI, the school must develop and implement a plan to improve student outcomes at the school. A TSI plan must meet the same specified requirements as those for CSI plans. The local board of education must monitor and annually review the TSI plan.

After a two-year period from the date of a plan's implementation, if a local board of education determines that student outcomes have not improved at a public school, the local board must consult with the school to develop additional strategies and interventions including funding, community support, and grants provided in the Public School Opportunities Enhancement Program. After a three-year period, if MSDE determines that student outcomes have not improved at a public school and intervention is necessary, MSDE must collaborate with the local board of education in determining the appropriate intervention strategy, subject to existing collective bargaining agreements. An intervention strategy may not include (1) creating a State-run school district; (2) creating a local school system in addition to the existing 24 school systems; (3) converting or creating a new public school without local board approval; (4) issuing scholarships to public school students to attend nonpublic schools through direct vouchers, tax credit programs, or education savings accounts; and (5) contracting with a for-profit company. A decision of MSDE regarding an intervention strategy is final.

Maryland's Draft Consolidated State Plan and Compliance with Federal and State Law

In general, the accountability system will operate as follows: a five-star rating system for schools will be based on the academic and school quality indicators that comprise the composite score. The plan complies with the following requirements of Chapter 29: (1) the combined total of the academic indicators does not exceed 65% of the composite score; (2) the accountability system includes at least three school quality indicators; and (3) each academic indicator and each school quality indicator is weighted at least 10% of the composite score.

In compliance with the requirements of ESSA, Maryland's plan includes provisions relating to: (1) education of migratory children; (2) prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk; (3) supporting effective instruction;

(4) English language acquisition and language enhancement; (5) student support and academic enrichment grants; (6) 21st Century Community Learning Centers; (7) rural and low-income school program; and (8) education for homeless children and youth program under the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

Academic and School Quality Indicators

As shown in **Appendices 1 and 2**, the academic indicators comprise 65% of the composite score. The academic achievement indicator comprises 20% of the composite score for elementary, middle, and high schools. Across all schools, the English language proficiency indicator will be 10% of the composite score. The “other academic” indicator for elementary and middle schools is comprised of two measures: academic growth (25%) and credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (10%). High schools have two indicators: graduation rates (15%) and “readiness for postsecondary success.” Readiness for postsecondary success is comprised of “on-track in 9th grade” (10%) and credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum (10%).

For elementary, middle, and high schools, school quality indicators comprise 35% of the composite score. They are chronic absenteeism (15%), school climate (10%), and opportunities/access to a well-rounded curriculum (10%).

Statewide Percentile Ranking

As described above, some indicators are comprised of multiple measures and some measures are comprised of multiple components. Each component will be assigned points using one of two methods: the percentage method or the cut-score method. These methods are described in more detail below. A school’s performance on each indicator will then be combined on a 100 point scale to calculate that school’s composite score.

Using each school’s composite score, a statewide percentile ranking will be calculated. The percentile will then be converted into the five-star rating system. Then, using the equity gap “rules,” which have not yet been developed by MSDE, the equity gap will be factored into a school’s final five-star rating. In addition, up to five stars will be awarded for each indicator at each school.

Issues for Consideration by LPC

Lack of Specificity in the Plan

One issue with the plan is the lack of detail regarding certain provisions and methodologies that affect the key mechanics of the accountability system. Many parts of the plan describe the methodology as “currently under study,” and thus, **DLS is unable to conduct a full analysis of the accountability system. Furthermore, the lack of specificity may be cited during the peer review process as an issue for the U.S. Secretary of Education, which may require MSDE to make changes to the plan.**

Five-star Rating System

The plan indicates that based on the composite score, also known as the system of meaningful differentiation, Maryland will use a five-star rating system for accountability. In addition to classifying schools into one of the five levels of stars based on a composite score, each individual indicator will also be classified using a five-star system.

Chapter 29 prohibits the composite score from being “reported using a letter grade model.” There were concerns that poor performing schools would be negatively labeled as an “F” school if MSDE chose to use an A-F grading scale. The five-star system is not “a letter grade model” and thus complies with Chapter 29. However, DLS notes that the use of a five-star scale is similar to the five letter grades of A-F (since E is not typically used) and may raise similar labeling concerns.

The plan states that the methodology for categorizing schools based on the five-star rating system is “currently under study.” Without specific details on what methods MSDE will use to categorize schools into one of five star levels, a full analysis of the accountability system is not possible. For example, each star category could include 20% of schools. Alternatively, 5% of schools could be in the five- and one-star levels and 30% of the schools could be in each of the middle three star levels.

Percentile Form

As required by Chapter 29, the plan calculates the composite score in percentile form; however, it is unclear if the percentile calculations will be reported on the school’s dashboards or report cards. As required by ESSA, the dashboards must include information on the accountability system and report each school’s performance on the indicators and ranking. This is how the public, including parents, will be able to view the accountability system. It is unclear from the plan whether the percentile scores will be published on the dashboards, or whether that information will be collapsed into the five-star rating system. It is also unclear, in general, what information will be reported to parents. At its July 18, 2017 meeting, the State board indicated an intent to further explore and examine possible methods to present data and design the dashboards prior to the submission of the plan to USDE.

Equity Gap

The equity gap is a measurement of the performance of subgroups of students compared to all students, and is a measure of how well the needs of all subgroups of students are being met. According to the plan, MSDE is currently studying the appropriate “rules” to ensure that a school with significant equity gaps will be reclassified into a lower star level. Therefore, it is not possible to provide a full analysis of how the equity gap will be accounted for under the accountability system. However, MSDE has indicated that the equity gap will be factored into the accountability system after schools have been categorized into one of the five star levels.

Cut Score Distribution for Certain Measures

MSDE proposes to use the cut-score method for the three school quality indicators and the “academic growth” component for elementary and middle schools. For this method, “cut scores” for each number of points must be assigned. MSDE has not yet determined the ranges for the cut scores; thus, DLS cannot provide a full analysis of the method.

For the percentile method, the number of points assigned to a particular component is determined by the percent of students satisfying the requirements of a component. This is based on fundamental mathematical calculations and does not require MSDE to set a scale or distribution of scores. For example, if 60% of students are proficient on an assessment and the component is worth 10 points, then the school would receive 6 points for that component.

For the cut-score method, MSDE must set ranges of cut scores for each component. This method provides for greater “meaningful differentiation” for measures where the percentages are skewed toward one end of a scale. For example, for chronic absenteeism, where most schools have persistent attendance rates above 90%, MSDE proposes assigning different amounts of points based on percentages of students chronically absent. If a school has 0% to 2% chronic absenteeism, then the school would receive the full 15 points for this component. If a school has 2% to 4% chronic absenteeism, the school would receive 12 points for this component. As shown by this example, the cut scores for a particular component can affect the impact of that component on the overall calculation of the composite score.

The plan explains how points “might” be assigned using cut scores, but MSDE does not define any of the actual scales or rules for distribution of points that will be used. It only states that MSDE is “currently studying this system to ensure that it is clear, meaningful, and provides differentiation among schools.”

School Quality Indicator: School Climate Survey

Chapter 29 requires that one of the school quality indicators in the accountability system must be school climate surveys. The school climate surveys must include at least one question to educators regarding the receipt of critical instructional feedback.

Maryland's plan includes school climate as one of the school quality indicators for elementary, middle, and high schools. However, the metric for this measurement and the appropriate survey instrument have not yet been identified. Until MSDE develops the survey instrument, DLS cannot provide a full analysis of whether the plan complies with this provision of State law.

Frequency of Monitoring Intervention and Support Plans

Chapter 29 requires that for schools identified by MSDE for CSI, the local board must develop and implement a CSI plan to improve student outcomes at the school. The school, local board, and MSDE must approve the plan, and MSDE must monitor and *annually* review the plan.

For schools identified by MSDE for TSI, the school must develop and implement a TSI plan to improve student outcomes at the school. The plan must meet the same criteria as the CSI plans. Instead of MSDE, the local board must monitor and *annually* review the plan.

Maryland's plan is silent on how often MSDE or the local board will monitor and review both the CSI and TSI plans.

Identification of CSI and TSI Schools

Section 1111(c)(4)(D) of ESSA requires states to establish a methodology to identify CSI schools that includes: (1) the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools; (2) public high schools with graduation rates below 67%; and (3) schools with one or more student subgroups performing below the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools and failing to improve after three years. In addition, School Improvement IV Grant schools will be included until the grant ends in 2020-2021. ESSA also permits a state to establish additional statewide categories of schools; MSDE has chosen to include the lowest performing 5% of *all* schools for CSI in the plan.

Schools identified for TSI will include (1) schools with one or more student subgroups performing the same or worse than the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools; (2) schools with one or more student subgroups consistently underperforming by not meeting their targets for two consecutive years; and (3) schools that fail to meet the federal 95% participation requirement on assessments.

MSDE indicates in the plan that only academic achievement and academic progress indicators will be used to identify CSI and TSI schools. However, when asked by DLS, MSDE was unable to clarify whether one or both of the components that make up the academic progress indicator will be used. To identify CSI schools, MSDE will use these two indicators to rank Title I schools and, separately, to rank *all* schools (including Title I and non-Title I schools). Any non-Title I school that falls into the lowest performing 5% of all schools will also be identified as a CSI school.

To identify TSI schools, MSDE will use these two indicators to rank each student subgroup. Schools where one or more student group is performing worse than the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools will be identified as a TSI school. The CSI and TSI identification rankings will be conducted independently of the ranking for the five-star system.

While this separate ranking process for identifying CSI and TSI schools may be permissible under ESSA, this provision in the plan may not be consistent with the legislative intent of Chapter 29. In Chapter 29, § 7-203(c) of the Education Article addresses the calculation of the composite score and requires that it include at least three school quality indicators. Section 7-203.4 of the Education Article, as amended by Chapter 29, requires that CSI and TSI plans “include the school quality indicators described under § 7-203(c).” Therefore, because improvement plans must include school quality indicators, the legislature may have intended for the composite score, which includes all the academic and school quality indicators selected for the accountability system, to be used to identify CSI and TSI schools. **Identifying CSI and TSI schools using only academic achievement and academic progress may be not be consistent with the legislative intent of Chapter 29. Further advice on this issue is forthcoming from the Office of the Attorney General.**

Distribution of Funds for CSI and TSI Schools

Chapter 29 requires MSDE to distribute federal funds for the implementation of CSI and TSI plans based on a formula and driven by the identified needs of each school identified by MSDE. The plan provides that “distribution of funds will be connected to meeting established benchmarks and accountability measures.” **Distributing funds in this manner is not based on a formula or driven by the school’s needs; thus, DLS believes that this provision in the plan does not comply with Chapter 29.**

Requiring Specific Interventions

Chapter 29 includes provisions that affect the implementation of CSI and TSI plans and the specific strategies MSDE may use to intervene at a CSI or TSI school.

Chapter 29 requires that for both types of plans, after a two-year period from the date of a plan’s implementation, if a local board determines that student outcomes have not improved at a public school, the local board must consult with the school to develop additional strategies and interventions. However, this may not be construed to authorize MSDE to require a local board to implement a specific intervention strategy, until three years after the date of the plan’s implementation.

Under Chapter 29, after a three-year period, if MSDE determines that intervention in a CSI or TSI school is necessary, MSDE must collaborate with the local board in determining the appropriate intervention strategy, subject to existing collective bargaining agreements.

Under the plan, all schools identified for CSI will be required to complete a needs assessment developed by MSDE and have a root cause analysis conducted by a third party. Each CSI school will be required to use an English language arts and math curriculum vetted by MSDE. CSI principals and teacher leaders will be required to participate in leadership training programs. TSI and CSI schools will be required to establish a network of partners and community resources based on the needs assessment of each school, including providing academic, health, and social service supports.

Although Chapter 29 identifies strategies and interventions that must be implemented after a two-year period by a local board of education, Chapter 29 also provides that these strategies and interventions may not be construed to authorize the State board to implement a specific intervention strategy until after a three-year period from the plan's implementation. DLS believes that the plan may not comply with this provision in State law.

Lack of Methodology for Comparing Demographic Characteristics

Chapter 29 requires the State board, in establishing a composite score that provides for meaningful differentiation of schools under the accountability system, to incorporate a methodology that compares schools that share similar demographic characteristics, including the proportion of economically disadvantaged students.

Maryland's plan does not include a method for exclusively comparing schools with similar demographic proportions. The plan only compares each student subgroup against the same student subgroup in the State, and provides a percentile ranking of how that subgroup performed on each indicator. **This method does not result in a comparison of schools with similar demographic proportions, and thus, DLS believes that it does not comply with State law.**

At the State board's July 18, 2017 meeting, MSDE advised that they are currently developing a new online report card system that will allow for comparison of schools with similar demographic characteristics. However, this system will not satisfy the requirements of Chapter 29 because it will not be part of the composite score calculation process.

Other Topics of Note

Requiring Schools with Less Than 95% Participation on Assessments to be TSI Schools

Section 1111(c)(4)I(iii) of ESSA requires states to provide a clear and understandable explanation of how the state will factor the requirement to annually measure the achievement of not less than 95% of all students and not less than 95% of all students in each student subgroup, into the statewide accountability system. MSDE has chosen to fulfill this requirement by designating a school that does not meet the 95% assessment participation requirement for all

students or for any one of the required student subgroups, averaged over a three-year period, as a TSI school. MSDE indicates in the plan that a school designated as a TSI school due to this requirement will not be eligible for TSI funding.

The participation rate for required assessments of all students and all required subgroups of students will be measured annually and included on the State report card. ESSA permits states to identify additional schools for TSI. Although it is not explicitly stated, it is assumed that these schools will be subject to the same improvement interventions as other TSI schools and that if these schools do not improve in two years, they will be subject to more rigorous interventions by the local board. Maryland law does not address assessment participation rate.

Under NCLB, a state was subject to federal sanctions if its testing participation rate was below 95%. Under ESSA, a state may choose how to factor the 95% participation requirement into the school accountability system, and as stated earlier, MSDE has chosen to satisfy this requirement by designating such schools as TSI schools. According to 2016 data, half of local school systems in the State had at least one school with a participation rate of less than 95% for all students.

Given the recent interest shown by the General Assembly regarding limiting testing and participation in assessments, this provision of the plan may be of interest.

Credit for Completion of a Well-rounded Curriculum

Chapter 29 requires that access to *or* credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum that is indicative of on-track progress at key transition points within elementary and secondary education be included as one of the academic indicators in the State's accountability program. MSDE's plan complies with this requirement. While *access* to a well-rounded curriculum is one of the school quality indicators, *credit for completion* of a well-rounded curriculum is an academic indicator. For elementary schools, this indicator is measured by both the percent of students scoring proficient on the Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (MISA) (which will be included in the accountability system beginning in 2018-2019) and the percent of 5th grade students passing each core course in social studies, fine arts, physical education, and health.

For middle schools, this indicator is measured by the percent of students scoring proficient on MISA, percent of students scoring proficient on the Middle School Social Studies Assessment (MSSA) (which will be included in the accountability system beginning in 2020-2021), and the percent of 8th grade students passing each core course in math, English language arts, social studies, and science. Until MISA and MSSA scores are available, these components will not be included in the accountability system.

For high schools, this indicator is split into two: (1) on-track in 9th grade; and (2) credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum. On-track in 9th grade is measured by the percent of 9th grade students earning at least four credits in English language arts, math, science,

social studies, or world language. Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum is measured by the percent of 12th grade students graduating or exiting with a certificate of program completion and achieving at least one of the following:

- score of 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement examination or score of 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate Program examination;
- meet a standard set by the College Board on the SAT;
- meet a standard set by ACT on the ACT;
- earn credit for dual enrollment;
- meet the University *System* of Maryland entry requirements (although the plan identifies “University of Maryland,” based on public meetings, the intent is to use the University System of Maryland entry requirements);
- complete an industry certification from a Career and Technology Education (CTE) program;
- complete an apprenticeship from a CTE program;
- complete a MSDE-approved CTE program;
- met a standard on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery examination; or
- for students obtaining a Maryland high school certificate of program completion; entering the world of work through gainful employment; postsecondary education and training; supported employment; or other services that are integrated in the community.

Conclusion

DLS has reviewed the plan thoroughly and notes several issues about which members of LPC may wish to comment. I trust this information has been helpful. If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Kelsey-Anne Fung or Caroline L. B. Boice, who wrote this analysis, or Sara C. Fidler or Rachel H. Hise, who reviewed this analysis, in the Office of Policy Analysis.

July 21, 2017
Page 12

If the committee wishes to provide comments to MSDE regarding the plan, please advise J. Ryan Bishop or Carol L. Swan, staff to LPC.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "W. G. Deschenaux", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Warren G. Deschenaux
Executive Director

WGD/KAF:CLB/kjl

Enclosures (2)

cc: Ms. Victoria L. Gruber
Ms. Alexandra Hughes
Mr. J. Ryan Bishop
Mr. Andy Smarick
Dr. Karen B. Salmon

Appendix 1 – Composite Score for Elementary and Middle Schools

Overall Distribution	Indicator	Measure	Components	
			Elementary Schools	Middle Schools
65%	Academic Achievement	Achievement composite: 20%	Math proficiency and performance: 10 points ELA proficiency and performance: 10 points	
	Other Academic (also called Academic Progress)	Academic growth: 25%	Math growth: 12.5 points ELA growth: 12.5 points	
		Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum: 10%	Science achievement: 5 points	Science achievement: 3.5 points
			Percent of 5 th grade students passing “core” coursework: 5 points	Social studies achievement: 3.5 points Percent of 8 th grade students passing “core” coursework: 3 points
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	Percent of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency: 10 points		
35%	School Quality/ Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15%	Percent of students chronically absent: 15 points	
		School climate: 10%	Survey with at least one question to educators: 10 points	
		Access to a well-rounded curriculum: 10%	Percent of 5 th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points	Percent of 8 th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points

Source: Maryland State Department of Education, Maryland Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan, June 27, 2017 (DRAFT TWO), Department of Legislative Services

Appendix 2 – Composite Score for High Schools

Overall Distribution	Indicator	Measure	Components	
			Elementary Schools	Middle Schools
65%	Academic Achievement	Achievement composite: 20%	Math proficiency and performance: 10 points ELA proficiency and performance: 10 points	
	Other Academic (also called Academic Progress)	Academic growth: 25%	Math growth: 12.5 points ELA growth: 12.5 points	
		Credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum: 10%	Science achievement: 5 points	Science achievement: 3.5 points
			Percent of 5 th grade students passing “core” coursework: 5 points	Social studies achievement: 3.5 points Percent of 8 th grade students passing “core” coursework: 3 points
	Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	Progress toward English language proficiency: 10%	Percent of students making progress towards attaining English language proficiency: 10 points	
35%	School Quality/ Student Success	Chronic absenteeism: 15%	Percent of students chronically absent: 15 points	
		School climate: 10%	Survey with at least one question to educators: 10 points	
		Access to a well-rounded curriculum: 10%	Percent of 5 th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points	Percent of 8 th grade students enrolled in a well-rounded curriculum: 10 points

Source: Maryland State Department of Education, Maryland Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan, June 27, 2017 (DRAFT TWO), Department of Legislative Services