

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Maryland



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services (DEI/SES) has the responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to have a comprehensive system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the IDEA, State laws, and applicable federal and State regulations. The mission of the DEI/SES is to provide leadership, support, and accountability for results to twenty-four (24) Local School Systems (LSSs), twenty-four (24) Local Infants and Toddlers Programs (LITPs), Public Agencies (PAs), and stakeholders through the provision of a seamless, comprehensive system of coordinated services to infants, toddlers, young children, and youth with disabilities, birth through age 21, and their families.

The Division is organized by five branches:

- Policy and Accountability
- Performance Support and Technical Assistance (TA)
- Family Support and Dispute Resolution
- Interagency Collaboration
- Resource Management and Monitoring.

The Division matrix organizational design integrates knowledge to improve compliance and results and ensures consistent communication within the DEI/SES, throughout the Department, and with external stakeholders and partners.

Through the implementation of cross matrix leadership, the DEI/SES is committed to the following essential principles to improve results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with developmental delays and disabilities and their families:

- Transparency: Maintaining an open door to stakeholders and regularly communicating through formal and informal outreach
- Stakeholder Engagement: Engaging our stakeholders in timely and meaningful consultation on priority topics, including policies that affect children with disabilities
- Effectiveness: Serving stakeholders in a timely and effective manner and ensure the availability of the best "real-time" data for decision-making and dissemination of evidence-based models throughout the State
- Alignment: Arranging our priorities to be synchronous with those of MSDE and federal requirements while also including the concerns of our LSSs, PAs, and advocates
- Accountability: Striving to improve compliance and performance results for all local school systems and public agencies. The DEI/SES has developed a tiered system of general supervision and performance support to identify systems and agencies in need of differentiated support and TA (Differentiated Framework)

The Differentiated Framework includes tiers of general supervision and engagement to improve birth – 21 special education/early intervention results. Essential components of Maryland's comprehensive system of general supervision include (see General Supervision section for detailed information):

- Effective policies and procedures
- State Performance Plan (SPP) goals and targets
- Accountability to Improve Performance (AIP)
- Fiscal management
- Dispute resolution
- Targeted TA and support

The DEI/SES has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for performance support and TA to provide a tiered system of monitoring and supports to address the needs of each LSS. The Differentiated Framework illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for students with disabilities. The Division is committed to maintaining compliance and providing supports to improve the quality of special education services. An LSS/PA is assigned to a tier based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The corresponding support an LSS receives is differentiated based on that agency's assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of the LSS/PAs' needs.

The Differentiated Framework involves directing the DEI/SES' attention to LSS/PAs in need of more comprehensive engagement, TA, and support in order to enable those programs to meet indicator targets, improve results, narrow the achievement gap, correct identified noncompliance, and maintain compliance.

A majority of the LSS/PAs are currently in the Universal Tier of General Supervision. This Tier represents LSS/PAs that have met identified performance and compliance criteria, resulting in a determination status of "Meets Requirements" or is in the first year of "Needs Assistance." In the Universal Tier of Engagement, the focus is on professional development/learning and follow-up coaching and support to address statewide needs based on overall State trend data (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to early intervention/special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide TA include State and regional professional development, online tools, resources through Maryland Learning Links, and Technical Assistance Bulletins (TABs). Comprehensive monitoring for the "Universal" tier occurs once every four years.

An LSS/PA receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for two consecutive years or one year of "Needs Intervention" is assigned to the Targeted Tier of General Supervision. An LSS/PA in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for identified noncompliance, or noncompliance may not be sustained despite correction within the required one-year period. The corresponding Targeted Tier of Engagement focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, and TA) to address the needs of the LSS/PA on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LSS/PA from needing substantial support. The LSS/PA leadership is required to engage with the DEI/SES to review State and local data and information in order to implement an IP that is approved by the DEI/SES to build capacity to

effectively address the identified needs. LSS/PAs in the Targeted Tier receive comprehensive monitoring every other year.

An LSS/PA receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for three consecutive years, "Needs Intervention" for two consecutive years, or "Needs Substantial Intervention" for one year is assigned to the Focused Tier of General Supervision.

At this level, the goal of the Focused Tier of Engagement is to direct substantial support to address the continuous lack of improvement of the LSS/PA through significant systems change. A multi-faceted State and local leadership team meets regularly to develop and implement an action plan designed to effect systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. The State Superintendent and the DEI/SES Assistant State Superintendent work closely with the local School Superintendent to develop a cross-departmental, cross-divisional State and local implementation team. The MSDE provides increased oversight activities to assess progress and may direct federal funds, impose special conditions, and/or require regular submission of data. Comprehensive monitoring for LSS/PAs in the Focused Tier occurs annually.

At the highest tier, the Intensive Tier of General Supervision, an LSS/PA fails to progress and correct previously identified noncompliance despite receiving TA and support. The failure to comply has affected core requirements, such as the delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight. The LSS/PA enters into a formal agreement with the MSDE to guide improvement and may have additional sanctions. The MSDE may direct, recover or withhold State or federal funds. Comprehensive monitoring occurs twice annually for LSS/PAs in the intensive tier.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Data Collection

The first step is the collection and review of quantitative and qualitative data used for making data-informed decisions about program management and improvement. Data are derived from a variety of sources and the data collection process is continuous. First, the MSDE Data System incorporates information from a variety of other MSDE offices. The DEI/SES collaborates with staff members from the Division of Assessment, Accountability, and Information Technology and the Division of Student Support, Academic Enrichment & Educational Policy to collect, disaggregate, analyze, report, and/or develop new data collections, as determined appropriate, to ensure data on students with disabilities required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the IDEA are accurate, valid, and reliable. Data on students with disabilities are located in different data collection sets. The access to newly collected disaggregate data on students with disabilities has allowed for the cross-referencing of data reports between different data sets. Relational links using the Unique Student ID numbers allow cross-referencing between all data sets.

Special Services Information System (SSIS) 618 Data Collection

The Special Services Information System (SSIS) functions as a centralized data submission system for the IDEA Part B Section 618 data. Personnel data are collected annually in Excel spreadsheets. Section 618 data are submitted via a secure server file transfer of data from LSSs and PAs, who are to monitor and verify their data collection systems at the local level. Most PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students.

The following processes and procedures are in place to ensure the reliability of the data system:

- The SSIS secure server is available twenty-four (24) hours a day for file submissions. The secure server is backed up nightly and replicated off-site. Files posted are reviewed and edited daily
- Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using the Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk
- Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed

The SSIS Manual provides detailed information for LSSs/PAs to build mechanisms within their systems for data accuracy. The DEI/SES runs edit reports of the files for the LSSs and PAs to correct and resubmit their files to the DEI/SES. To ensure validity, the DEI/SES SSIS Manual provides data standardization for definitions and provides system edits similar to those suggested systems edits provided by the IDEA Data Center (IDC). Validity of the data and consistency with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data instructions is ensured throughout the data collection process by a number of practices and safeguards including edits built into the data collection system, such as data definition edits (what values are put in what fields), out-of-range edits, cross-field or relationship edits, and checks to ensure that all LSSs and PAs submit data.

The DEI/SES regularly revises the SSIS Manual according to State and/or federal regulations. The Manual is distributed at Data Manager Meetings, placed on the DEI/SES website, and is also sent to each LSS/PA electronically. The DEI/SES produces the Census Publication and Related Tables from the data system which contains multiple tables and is posted on the MSDE website. An additional internal report produced is the 5% Analysis Report which highlights any LSS/PA with 5% or more population increases or decreases. The MSDE uses the EMAPS reports to flag large changes in the data. Data are disaggregated to determine which LSS/PA is involved. When disaggregated data are suspect, the DEI/SES contacts the local director of special education. Directors of special education and the DEI/SES staff work together to validate the data. The LSSs/PAs provide the DEI/SES the reasons for large changes in data and that information is analyzed at the MSDE and provided to EMAPS.

The LSSs/PAs using the Maryland Statewide Online IEP system transmit data nightly to the SSIS. Three LSSs use vendor-supported IEP systems to aggregate data for electronic file transfers quarterly to an MSDE secure server for web-based data submission of the annual child count, census data, and exit data. Personnel data continue to be collected annually in Excel spreadsheets. Quarterly, the DEI/SES collects child count, exit count, and Indicators 11, 12, and 13 data from LSS/PAs.

The accuracy of the data is dependent upon the accuracy of the submitted school-level data. Questions and discrepancies in the data are verified by the DEI/SES staff with the respective LSS/PA. The LSS/PA SSIS Data Manager corrects errors and resubmits the entire data file to DEI/SES to ensure that corrections are made in both the database and the error file. The mdssis.org system allows two methods of data submission:

- Data submitted as one large file and then corrected and resubmitted; or
- Data submitted as a large file and error records are held in a suspense file until the LSS/PA corrects the errors online.

Once corrected records are accepted, the LSS/PA can extract the corrected file and repopulate the LSS/PA system with the corrected records.

Data collection or reporting issues related to the COVID-19 Pandemic will be discussed within individual indicators, if applicable.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

25

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

IDEA Requirements

The DEI/SES conducts a comprehensive student file review to ensure LSSs/PAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR). The LSSs/PAs are selected for review on a cyclical basis using a representative sample based on student enrollment that includes large, medium, and small districts. Every Maryland LSS/PA will be reviewed at least once during the four-year cycle. Please see the information above about monitoring schedules based upon the Differentiated Framework.

Effective Policies, Procedures, and Practices

Maryland has policies and procedures aligned with IDEA. State law and COMAR support State implementation of the IDEA. Each LSS/PA is responsible

for developing policies, procedures and practices for effective implementation in accordance with federal and State requirements. The DEI/SES has embedded the review of LSS/PA policies, procedures, and practices within existing components of general supervision.

Significant Disproportionality

States must collect and examine data to determine whether significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is occurring in the State and districts concerning the identification of children as children with disabilities, including specific disability categories; the placement of children in particular educational settings; and the incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary removal. Significant disproportionality is based on an analysis of numerical information. It is defined as a risk ratio (RR) greater than 2.0 and failure to make adequate progress from the previous year's data (.15 for RRs between 2.0 and 4.0 and .50 for RRs = 4.0) for the same race or ethnicity with regard to a disability category, type of disciplinary action, or particular educational setting. An LSS/PA identified as having significant disproportionality must reserve 15% of its IDEA Part B Section 611 and Section 619 passthrough funds to provide Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS); review and, if appropriate, revise district PPPs; and publicly report on the revisions of district policies, procedures, and practices. Additionally, districts identified as having significant disproportionality are restricted from reducing Maintenance of Effort (MOE) by using the 50% reduction rule.

State Performance Plan (SPP)

The SPP is the State's plan to improve results and compliance indicators established by the OSEP and contains a description of the State's efforts to implement the requirements of Part B of the IDEA, including how it will improve performance on indicators. As part of the SPP, each indicator has a target set by the OSEP or the State. All targets set by the State are facilitated through stakeholder engagement.

Accountability to Improve Performance (AIP)

The DEI/SES now places greater emphasis on requirements related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. In addition, the DEI/SES works collaboratively with LSS/PAs to identify root causes and focus on areas in need of improvement. The AIP process verifies data, documents compliance with both IDEA and COMAR regulatory requirements, and provides TA for the timely correction of identified findings of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance concerning the records of individual children with disabilities always result in verification of correction using a two-prong process consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every four years in each LSS/PA to ensure the LSS/PAs are compliant with State and federal regulations, have a system of general supervision in place to monitor child progress and make data-informed decisions, and are focused on improving outcomes for children with developmental delays and disabilities, and their families.

While some monitoring activities are universal for all, other monitoring activities are customized to examine areas of need, such as:

- Indicator data verification
- Other data reviews
- Grant/Fiscal reviews
- Medicaid monitoring
- Family support data
- State complaints
- Advocacy organization concerns

The DEI/SES has developed monitoring activities geared towards these efforts to ensure improved results, including:

- Desk Audits - review of data, IEPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by the DEI/SES at the DEI/SES.
- On-Site Monitoring - review of data, IEPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by DEI/SES staff within the LSS/PAs. On-site monitoring is specifically used to carry out those activities that are not practical to complete through a desk audit by the DEI/SES staff.
- Case Study Reviews - reviews of an individual child's early intervention record to determine whether the child is being provided with appropriate services, which is evidenced by continued growth and progress towards child and family outcomes. Case studies include observations of service delivery and interviews with families and providers.
- Interviews - conducted with administrators, service providers, and parents to measure consistency and understanding of practices across the LSS/PA. DEI/SES staff are able to ascertain the knowledge of local program staff pertaining to the implementation of IEPs, utilization of evidence-based practices, and the responsibilities of staff.
- Directed Onsite Visits - Onsite visits at any time based on data indicating potential concerns or a pattern of concerns over time. These concerns may come from examining data reported to the MSDE as part of the accountability system and other sources of information, such as interactions and conversations with parents, advocates, and/or district personnel. The scope of each directed onsite visit may vary.

Fiscal Management

The primary responsibility of the Resource Management Branch is to ensure effective procurement, use, and oversight of DEI/SES resources. This branch also provides for fiscal subrecipient monitoring of all recipients of the IDEA grant funds throughout Maryland. The branch ensures fiscal accountability in accordance with IDEA and COMAR for federal and State funds administered by the MSDE for the benefit of students with disabilities. The branch assists LSS/PAs, and other subrecipients through the application, reporting, and fiscal management process associated with the grant award.

Dispute Resolution

The IDEA provides safeguards that include formal dispute resolution requirements, such as mediation, formal complaints, resolution sessions, and due process hearings. The Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch collects and analyzes data on an ongoing basis to ensure effective implementation of the dispute resolution system.

Targeted TA and Support

Through the SSIP and data from the examination of the LSS/PA performance, ongoing state activities are used for program improvement and progress measurement. The DEI/SES also aligns improvement activities with existing MSDE initiatives, such as Maryland's Every Student Succeeds Act. TA activities, designed to address the needs of each individual LSS/PA, are based on data that are collected and correction of any noncompliance, consistent with OSEP's 09-02 Memo.

Enforcement

There is a direct relationship between determination status and enforcement. After assigning each LSS/PA a determination status, the DEI/SES applies appropriate enforcement actions. The DEI/SES mandates activities and actions that are designed to ensure that LSS/PAs meet the requirements of IDEA. Each LSS/PA is assigned to one of four tiers of general supervision. This comprehensive information is used to provide differentiated engagement that focuses on building capacity to improve results and direct State resources to those LSS/PAs that are the lowest-performing.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Through the DEI/SES's strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward: Sharpen the Focus for 2020*, the DEI/SES focuses on building the capacity of LITPs, LSSs, PAs, and IHEs, to narrow the performance gap and enable all children to be kindergarten ready. The DEI/SES works collaboratively with other Divisions within the MSDE to improve performance on statewide accountability measures and achievement of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards.

Team, Analyze, Plan, Implement, Track (TAP-IT)

The TAP-IT process is the universal delivery system for improved results through the DEI/SES Differentiated Framework: Tiers of Engagement. TAP-IT ensures purposeful resource allocation and collaborative effort in support of research-based actions that narrow the achievement gap for children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. Through TAP-IT the DEI/SES partners with LSS/PAs around five (5) levers for change based on State Education Agency (SEA) Levers for Change in Local Education Agencies and Schools, Redding, 2013:

- Opportunity by braiding of resources to support innovative practices;
- Incentives through Statewide recognition of child progress and gap reduction;
- Systemic Capacity by providing Statewide data systems that include the Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS), Maryland Online IFSP, and the Maryland Online IEP (MOIP);
- Local Capacity building through expert consultation, establishing of Communities of Practice (CoP), training, coaching, and opportunities for diagnostic site reviews;
- Intervention through the DEI/SES Differentiated Framework: Tiers of Engagement that include universal support for internal decision-making processes based on implementation science, and dissemination of proven practices with demonstrated results.

The TAP-IT process begins with the formation of an implementation team comprised of LSS/PA and DEI/SES representatives who operate in a clearly defined partnership. The team collects all current, relevant data sources (e.g., SPP/APR, Maryland Report Card, Ready at Five - School Readiness Data, Maryland Online IFSP database, and Family Survey Data). An August 2017 WestEd/NCSI Spotlight highlighted this process with a focus on mathematics in Maryland: <https://ncsi.wested.org/resources/state-spotlights/>

- Team: The LSS/PA leadership selects team members who are decision-makers (programmatic, fiscal, organizational, human capital, and general educator(s) as appropriate) and will represent the LSS/PA in partnership with the MSDE, DEI/SES team (data, fiscal, and programmatic MSDE liaisons). Collaborative team sessions are scheduled face-to-face and/or through technology applications to establish team function, roles, and operating norms. There is attention to building the capacity of the team using implementation science. A partnership is jointly formed by the LSS/PA and DEI/SES team to guide the work that includes outcomes, design, and assessment.
- Analyze: The team studies the processes currently in place to analyze data at the State and LSS/PA levels. The team reviews the available data that include formative, summative, longitudinal summary reports and early warning alert systems that may be in place. The purpose of each data source is reviewed, and the strength and limitations are identified. The team describes/defines the sources and processes to analyze data and identifies opportunities for programmatic support and/or TA. The team analyzes the data using an agreed-upon protocol and reports their finding.
- Plan: The team reviews the effectiveness of existing processes and interventions to narrow the gap between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The team shares current research and research-based practices for narrowing the achievement gap. Allocation of resources is reviewed to determine their effectiveness in narrowing the gap. The team uses evidence-based questioning strategies such as Teams Intervening Early to Reach all Students (TIERS): Asking the Right Questions and implementation science tools that include the Hexagon Tool where information is gathered and organized. These provide the team with a complete picture of the targeted interventions and their use in the LSS/PA (see: <http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/hexagon-tool-exploring-context>). Based on the data analysis, plans are created and resources are aligned to narrow the achievement gap. Strategic, measurable, attainable, results-based, and time-bound (SMART) goals and ideas for sharing success and replication are included in the developed plans.
- Implement: The plan is implemented with the supports and resources identified from the LSS/PA, the DEI/SES, and other external partners. Monitoring of progress, identification and removal of barriers to change, and diagnostic site reviews are conducted.
- Track: Team members meet quarterly face-to-face and/or through technology applications. Assigned monitors provide updates on each data set, financial reports are discussed, and plans are modified as needed (e.g., based on intervention implementation fidelity, child performance, etc.). The team completes an annual review and report of the work through the SMART Process. Success is shared, and the work is scaled up as appropriate. Accessing Technical Assistance by MSDE

The OSEP, in the 2021 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix, identified the MSDE, DEI/SES in need of TA to address the low performance and participation of students with disabilities on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The MSDE, DEI/SES partnered with the MSDE, Division of Assessment, Accountability and Information Technology, including the MSDE NAEP Coordinator, John Hopkins Center for Technology and Education, and stakeholders to provide guidance and TA to LSSs, PAs, and families. The DEI/SES has also continued to receive TA from federal Technical Assistance Centers including the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO), and the Time, Instructional Effectiveness, Engagement, and State and District Support for Inclusive Practices Center (TIES). Information specific to the TIES partnership can be found here: <https://www.marylandlearninglinks.org/ties-center-and-nceo-parent-resource-videos/>

As a result of these collaborations, the DEI/SES has implemented family-friendly strategies that included the dissemination of information to parents and LSSs that clarified the requirements and the importance of students with disabilities, particularly, those students in the fourth and eighth-grade assessments. In addition, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff worked closely with John Hopkins University to revise the MOIEP. The revisions to the MOIEP facilitated discussions between family members and the IEP team regarding the decisions to ensure access for students with disabilities. The MOIEP allows the IEP Team to document and track the decisions being made over time. Preliminary data results indicate that there has been a significant increase in the participation of students with disabilities on the NAEP and the Statewide assessment. The MSDE, DEI/SES staff will continue to facilitate improvement in the participation and proficiency rate of students with disabilities.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

The Maryland State Department of Education's "Stages of Professional Development for All Teachers Teaching Students with Disabilities" ("Stages") is a roadmap that teachers can use throughout their careers, ideally beginning in the final year of a teacher-preparation program and moving all the way through to retirement. There are other matrices available to guide teacher professional development, but "Stages" is unique. It's specifically geared to help teachers improve the performance of their students with disabilities in both the general and special education environments. While "Stages" can be a great self-assessment tool, it's especially useful during the mentoring process. It helps mentors and mentees identify the mentee's particular areas of strength and areas of need. In addition, it provides clear stepping stones to guide the mentee's professional development on an ongoing, career-long basis. The online version of "Stages", accessible through the Professional Development Online Tracker (PDot), includes links to professional development courses, videos, curricula, webinars, books, and other materials that can be invaluable during (and after) mentoring.

In order to improve program quality and services to positively impact student results, the MSDE DEI/SES, in collaboration with numerous partners, provides resources, training, consultation, and TA to local special education directors, service providers, community partners, stakeholders, and parents through numerous formats and forums. Dissemination of these trainings, resources, media, and tools to strengthen student outcomes and the special

education services provided to students with disabilities is supported through the DEI/SES Maryland Learning Links website in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (CTE).

The MSDE provides targeted professional learning activities for local special education leaders. These include the annual DEI/SES Professional Learning Institute (with early childhood, secondary transition, and access, equity, and progress strands), quarterly face-to-face Birth through 21 Leadership professional learning, and monthly Birth through 21 Leadership teleconferences.

As described under Maryland's Technical Assistance System, the Tiers of Engagement provide differentiated program support and TA based on State and local needs related to implementing a high-quality, seamless, Birth through 21 system of services. A specific school-age performance liaison is designated for each LSS/PA and supports data-informed systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation of evidence-based professional learning to enhance the quality of recommended special education practices. The differentiated engagement model focuses on building capacity to improve results and direct State resources to those LSS/PAs that are the lowest-performing while recognizing and providing the support needed to publish and disseminate successful best practices from those LSS/PAs which are achieving success.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

78

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Committees/councils, including the SICC, SESAC, and EAC, support Maryland's comprehensive birth through 21 system of services. Parents and advisory/advocacy committees are engaged in targeted settings, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, in numerous ways. Parents, including representatives from the Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC) in Maryland, PPMD, are actively involved in the SICC, SESAC, and EAC. The PPMD employs eleven (11) parents of children and students with identified delays and disabilities.

The SICC currently has five (5) parent members, all from different LSSs, who attend regularly. Maryland's SESAC has eighteen (18) parent members who attend regularly. Nonmember parents attend both the SICC and SESAC since the meetings are open to the public. The EAC is a diverse coalition comprised of over twenty-five (25) individuals and organizations, including individual advocates, advocacy law centers, disability societies/councils, educational consultants, and other agencies with a focus on empowering and supporting children with disabilities and their families. As mentioned before, the PPMD PTIC is a valuable stakeholder with membership on each committee.

Parents, parent support staff, and advocacy groups are also included in State Professional Learning Institutes (PLIs) and statewide webinars intended to provide stakeholders with up-to-date information on legislation, program strategies, evidence-based practice updates, and progress on program results and APR indicators. Thirty-one (31) of forty-three (43) Family Support providers in Maryland's LSSs are parents of students with disabilities.

Several ongoing committees have regular participation by parents, including:

- The State Implementation Teams (SIT) (Part B and Part C);
 - These teams are responsible for moving SSIP work forward.
 - One (1) parent serves on each Team.
- The Inclusion State Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);
 - This team advances TA activities that are focused on advancing effective evidence-based inclusion policies and practices within the State's comprehensive birth through age 21 education system.
 - Two (2) parents serve on this Team.
- The State Inclusion Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);
 - This team develops State-level guidance and support for the LSSs who were awarded the Preschool Inclusion grants.
 - Two (2) parents serve on this Team.
- The Pyramid Model Leadership Committee, which is not led by DEI/SES, but the DEI/SES serves as partners (Part C and Part B);
 - This committee focuses development, evaluation, and sustainability of a statewide collaborative effort, guided by national models, that supports the local implementation of the Pyramid Model framework.
 - Two (2) parents serve on this Committee.
- The Maryland Certificate of Program Completion (MCoPC) Endorsement Task Force;
 - The task force's charge is to review the requirements for the Maryland Certificate of Program Completion requirements and develop standards for endorsements that can be added to the MCoPC that address employment, postsecondary education, and community/citizenship.
 - Six (6) parents serve on this Task Force.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The MSDE DEI/SES develops State leadership teams for new initiatives, including a diverse membership. Parent members fully participate in the processes, discussions, and are encouraged to take on leadership roles at times. The expectation is that State leadership teams will then be modeled at the local level for each jurisdiction participating in the initiative. The MSDE, DEI/SES provides grant funding to several family organizations, including PPMD and the Maryland Coalition of Families (MCF), to enhance parent leadership and encourage diverse parent participation at all levels of decision-making.

The PPMD has two current grants from the DEI/SES:

1. Baby LEADers – goals of the grant include but are not limited to increasing parent participation in planning for IFSP, Extended IFSP, and IEP services and decision-making; increasing parent knowledge to support young children through the transition from an IFSP to an IEP; increasing parent knowledge of the Division of Early Childhood's Recommended Practices and Family Guides supporting the State's rollout of evidence-based practices and strategies; empowering families to use the resources they need to participate in their own family and community activities; and improving parent/provider communication and family partnerships regarding early intervention and preschool services for children to improve service delivery and substantially contribute to improving child outcomes.
2. Guiding the Journey: A Transition Program for Parents – goals of the grant include, but are not limited to, conducting secondary transition trainings for parents of students aged 14 and older; and increasing parental involvement and expertise in the transition planning process.

Through a DEI/SES grant, the MCF provides training programs to promote family/school partnerships and empower families to advocate for their children, as well as other children, in education and other child-serving care systems. The MCF's annual Family Leadership Institute (FLI) provides an intensive training program to promote the development of local partnerships and community ties. Through the MCF's Family Leadership Program, the MCF seeks to increase parent/caregiver capacity, engagement, and partnership with LITPs and LSSs. Equipping parents/caregivers who care for children with mental health disorders with knowledge, skills, and resources will promote a positive partnership with the school and positive educational outcomes for their child. The SICC facilitates an annual joint meeting with Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs) across Maryland encouraging State-level representation and engagement from parents and various stakeholders. This diverse group of parents and stakeholders advise the State's development of activities that support children and students with special needs. In addition, the collaborative meeting has resulted in the recruitment of additional parents to the SICC.

The DEI/SES provides the EAC an opportunity to review all TABs and parent guides before they are finalized and disseminated. Since the start of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the DEI/SES has developed over thirty-five (35) guidance documents. Ultimately, these documents are published on the MSDE's website to ensure wide dissemination to both providers and families. The DEI/SES TABs and family guides can be found here:

<https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/TAB.aspx>. Of note, the DEI/SES developed two (2) new parent guides to increase the capacity of parents to support their children, including A Parents' Guide: Navigating Special Education during COVID-19 Pandemic and A Parents' Guide to Navigating Compensatory Education/Recovery Services during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Throughout the year, stakeholders are made aware of data analysis, improvement strategies, and program data/progress evaluation in a variety of ways, including through Statewide meetings/webinars, SICC/SESAC/EAC meetings, and family support conferences. Statewide webinars occur frequently, but not necessarily with specific regularity as they are often dependent on hot topics or immediate concerns or initiatives. The SICC, SESAC, and EAC meetings occur frequently and regularly with the schedule set at the beginning of each fiscal year. For both types of meetings, stakeholders can provide feedback on data analysis, improvement strategies, evaluation, and target setting. In addition to Statewide meetings and regular stakeholder workgroups, the State has regular family support conferences and webinars. These meetings are regularly attended by parents and family support professionals. Below are examples of topics discussed at Family Support Conferences/webinars in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020:

- 1) Routines-Based Interview;
- 2) Authentic Assessment;
- 3) Data highlights;
- 4) Parent/Family Survey;
- 5) Improving Family Engagement;
- 6) Early Intervention Personnel Standards;
- 7) Components of IEP Goals;
- 8) Tips to Support Mask-Wearing for Students with Disabilities;
- 9) Helping Prepare Parents Prepare for a Return to In-Person Instruction/Services;
- 10) Review of MSDE TABs;
- 11) Decision-Making for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities;
- 12) Improving Outcomes through Family Support;
- 13) Understanding the IFSP/IEP Process;
- 14) Helping Families Create a Vision for Their Child;
- 15) A review of Parental Rights Maryland's Procedural Safeguards Notice Document; and
- 16) Compensatory Education/Recovery Services Topics.

In addition to the meetings above, the SIT meets regularly to develop, analyze, and evaluate evidence-based practices utilized in Maryland's SSIP jurisdiction and expand the use of the State's evidence-based practices beyond jurisdictions participating in the SSIP. The PPMD, SICC, and SESAC have representatives on the SIT, thus ensuring parent and advisory group participation.

Below is a timeline of the mechanisms used to set targets, baselines, analyze data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate progress for the FFY 2020-FFY 2025 APR Cycle.

Timeline:

July 2021 – October 2021

- Reviewed how each indicator was measured in the past cycle and what changes, if any, are required for data collection and reporting
- Consulted with internal data collection teams at MSDE (inter-departmental) to ensure data availability and a plan for data analysis and reporting

October 2021 - December 2021

- Presented to stakeholders changes to how the indicator will be measured in the new cycle
- Identified and developed proposed baseline year, proposed target options, and improvement strategies to meet the targets
- Solicited input from stakeholders on priorities for APR indicators
- Developed APR Surveys (Part B and Part C) for obtaining feedback from stakeholders

December 2021-January 2022

- Disseminated Part C and Part B Surveys to stakeholders throughout Maryland for feedback on APR Indicators (baselines, targets, and improvement strategies)Solicited additional input from advisory groups, councils, and committees (SESAC, SICC, EAC, etc.)
- Reviewed stakeholder survey responses
- Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies

February 1, 2022

- Submitted SPP-APR FFY2020

April 2022

- Developed a 2nd Part B Survey to obtain feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 5, and 6
- Disseminated 2nd Part B Survey to stakeholders to solicit input
- Reviewed stakeholder survey responses
- Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies
- Submitted Final Part B APR

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

After receiving input from the Part B and Part C target surveys, the State revised the proposed FFY 2020 targets. The revised targets are included in Maryland's FFY 2020 APR submission as Maryland's final targets. To make the set targets available to the public, the State disseminated final targets included in both APRs to the stakeholders (including parents, advocacy groups, Maryland's PTI Center, SICC, SESAC, EAC, and Program Directors/Coordinators, etc.). The final APR, including APR targets, Improvement Strategies, evaluation of indicator data, and local system-specific data, will be posted on mdideareportcard.org no later than 120 days from submission consistent with submission in previous years.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

As required in the IDEA of 2004, the MSDE reported to the public on its FFY 2019 (July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020) performance and will report to the public on the performance of LSS/PAs on Part B Indicators for FFY 2020 (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021). Performance data in numbers and percentages will be reported for each LSS/PA, along with the State target, State performance data, and a narrative description of the indicator. In partnership with the Johns Hopkins University CTE, the MSDE has developed an accessible, state-of-the-art SPP/APR website for local and State performance data. The website currently includes APRs from FFY 2005 to FFY 2019 and can be accessed at <http://www.mdideareport.org>. In addition to the complete SPP/APR, the website includes State and LSS/PA results for all applicable indicators and tools for comparing local performance in relation to the State

targets. The public may see progress and slippage through a combination of tables and graphs populated on the website. In addition, this site also includes the OSEP's annual State determination and the MSDE's annual LSS/PA determinations.

The FFY 2020 APR will be included on this website shortly after the State's submission to the OSEP on February 1, 2022. Copies of the APR and SPP will be provided to LSS/PAs, SESAC, and other stakeholders simultaneously immediately following the submission of the report.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

The State did not submit an introduction with descriptions of the State's: (1) general supervision system; (2) technical assistance system; (3) professional development system; and (4) stakeholder involvement in the SPP/APR reporting platform. The State must include this required information in the SPP/APR reporting platform.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	73.35%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	63.67%	65.91%	68.14%	70.38%	72.62%
Data	63.93%	66.86%	67.48%	66.84%	63.52%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	73.35%	73.85%	74.35%	74.85%	75.35%	75.85%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,954
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	745
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	80
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	975

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,954	6,754	63.52%	73.35%	73.35%	N/A	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Using the required 2019-2020 618 Exit Data 4,954 youth with IEPs out of a possible 6,754 graduated with a regular diploma. Since the State previously utilized 4 Year Cohort data to report on graduation, the State has reset its baseline and set new targets using 2020 data. These targets, like all targets in the State's APR were set with feedback from stakeholders from across Maryland.

The 618 Exit Data calculation is comprised of the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education and are submitted with the State's 618 data submission.

Graduation Conditions

Maryland offers one diploma known as the Maryland High School Diploma. The requirements for a Maryland High School Diploma are applicable to all students, including youth with IEPs. To be awarded a diploma, students, including youth with an IEP, shall be enrolled in a Maryland public school and have earned a minimum of 21 credits that include the following:

Subject Area Specific Credit Requirement

English - 4 credits

Math - 3 credits

1 in Algebra/Data Analysis

1 in Geometry

1 in additional Mathematics credit

Science - 3 credits

1 in Biology

2 that must include laboratory experience in all or any of the following areas: earth science, life science, physical science

Social Studies - 3 credits

1 in US History

1 in World History

1 in Local, State, and National Government

Fine Arts - 1 credit

Physical Education - ½ credit

Health - ½ credit

Technology Education - 1 credit

Other

Two (2) credits of foreign language or two (2) credits of American Sign Language or two (2) credits of advanced technology education and three (3) credits in electives OR four (4) credits by successfully completing a State-approved career & technology program and one (1) credit in an elective

Students must also meet attendance, service-learning, and any local school system requirements.

In addition, all students, including youth with IEPs, must complete the following High School Assessments requirements for Algebra/Data Analysis, English 10, and Biology.

Students who entered grade 9 in the fall of 2005 and later must obtain either a passing score on Algebra/Data Analysis, English 10, and Biology or obtain an overall combined score of 1208 or 1602 (see below) (COMAR 13A.03.02.09). Students who meet specific criteria may use the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation to meet the passing requirement. For more information about the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation, please see questions 20 and 21 (pages 10-11) in the High School Graduation Requirements Questions and Answers at http://hsaexam.org/img/HS_Grad_Q_A.pdf.

Government

Students who entered 9th grade in the 2012-13 school year are not required to pass the Government High School Assessment for graduation but may use it if they pursue a combined score to satisfy the graduation requirements. Students have two options. Students may achieve either a combined score of:

1602 for English, Algebra/Data Analysis, Biology, and Government; or

1208 for English, Algebra/Data Analysis, and Biology

Students entering 9th grade in the 2013-2014 school year and beyond must either pass the Government High School Assessment or include the Government High School Assessment score to meet a combined score of 1602.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept the targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	5.41%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	3.99%	3.51%	3.03%	2.55%	2.55%
Data	4.73%	3.90%	4.21%	3.98%	3.26%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	2.55%	2.50%	2.45%	2.40%	2.35%	2.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

The State recognizes that FFY 2020 will be the final year to utilize Option 2 for Indicator 2 (Dropout) reporting. The State will submit its FFY 2021 data using Option 1, as required. And, given the required change in methodology for FFY 2021, the state plans to reset its baseline and targets with the FFY 2021 submission.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,954
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	745
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	80
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	975

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

The MSDE, DEI/SES is using Option 2 for the final time in FFY 2020. The calculation is an annual event dropout rate that reflects the number of students with an IEP that dropout in grades 9-12 divided by the number of students with IEPs in grades 9-12. The instructions for Option 2 state that Maryland is to "use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data." These data are from SY 2019-2020 as the data for this indicator are "lagged" data. The State did not meet the target of 2.55%, but FFY 2020 data show that the state made progress from the FFY 2019 data submission.

The Annual Dropout Rate is the percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students who leave school for any reason, except death, before graduation or completion of a Maryland-approved educational program and who are not known to enroll in another school or state-approved program during the current school year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer, from evening high school, and other alternative programs. Using the MSDE 2019-2020 school year Annual Dropout Rate data, the MSDE, DEI/SES reports an Annual Dropout Rate of 3.06%, (958/31,342 X 100). These data are from the Maryland Report Card, the official reporting source for Maryland Public Schools. The Maryland Report Card can be found at <http://mdreportcard.org>.

Note: Students who re-enter school during the same year in which they dropped out of school are not counted as dropouts.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
958	31,342	3.26%	2.55%	3.06%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

The Annual Dropout Rate is the percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students who leave school for any reason, except death, before graduation or completion of a Maryland-approved educational program and who are not known to enroll in another school or state-approved program during the current school year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer, from evening high school, and other alternative programs. Using the MSDE 2019-2020 school year Annual Dropout Rate data, the MSDE, DEI/SES reports an Annual Dropout Rate of 3.06%, (958/31,342 X 100). These data are from the Maryland Report Card, the official reporting source for Maryland Public Schools. The Maryland Report Card can be found at <http://mdreportcard.org>.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept the targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	94.81%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	76.09%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	90.62%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	94.43%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	74.85%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	89.65%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	94.81%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	76.09%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	90.62%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	94.43%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	74.85%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	89.65%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee’s membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland’s SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents’ Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions’ priorities, including but not limited to the State’s APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State’s SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

<https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/>

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	8,145	7,830	5,812
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,248	470	370
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5,928	4,938	4,407
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	546	550	490

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	8,146	7,834	5,896
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,005	418	636
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,144	4,903	4,165
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	543	543	485

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the pre-filled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,722	8,145		94.81%	94.81%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,958	7,830		76.09%	76.09%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	5,267	5,812		90.62%	90.62%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,692	8,146		94.43%	94.43%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,864	7,834		74.85%	74.85%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	5,286	5,896		89.65%	89.65%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The State's assessment results can be found at <https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Maryland State Department of Education on May 17, 2021 was approved for a waiver from the accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for the 2020-2021 school year. The State Assessment administration window was extended beyond the normal administration timeline and a shortened assessment was administered in the Early Fall of the SY 21-22 for the prior school year (i.e., SY 20-21). In addition, Maryland underwent a change in its Statewide assessments from SY 18-19 to SY 19-20, moving from PARCC to MCAP, however the emergence of the COVID 19 pandemic affected our testing and data processes greatly. Given the change in assessment, the extended window of administration, the processes involved with collecting assessment vendor data, and preparing the data for reporting, Assessment participation and Academic Achievement data will not be available in time for the EdFacts reporting due date of 12/15/2021. Maryland has requested an extension until February 28, 2022, to submit this file. Data were submitted and available for the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. The State noted that the data would be submitted during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State's submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	6.19%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	6.36%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	13.84%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	6.71%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	1.62%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	7.04%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	6.19%	9.70%	11.00%	14.00%	17.00%	20.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	6.36%	6.90%	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%	14.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	13.84%	14.00%	17.50%	21.00%	24.50%	28.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	6.71%	11.00%	14.00%	17.00%	20.00%	22.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	1.62%	2.20%	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.04%	8.50%	10.50%	13.00%	15.50%	17.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)

- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,176	5,408	4,777
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	208	59	69
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	236	285	592

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,149	5,321	4,801
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	213	24	145
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	267	62	193

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	444	7,176		6.19%	6.19%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	344	5,408		6.36%	6.36%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	661	4,777		13.84%	13.84%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	480	7,149		6.71%	6.71%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	86	5,321		1.62%	1.62%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	338	4,801		7.04%	7.04%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The State's assessment results can be found at <https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Maryland State Department of Education on May 17, 2021 was approved for a waiver from the accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for the 2020-2021 school year. The State Assessment administration window was extended beyond the normal administration timeline and a shortened assessment was administered in the Early Fall of the SY 21-22 for the prior school year (i.e., SY 20-21). In addition, Maryland underwent a change in its Statewide assessments from SY 18-19 to SY 19-20, moving from PARCC to MCAP, however the emergence of the COVID 19 pandemic affected our testing and data processes greatly. Given the change in assessment, the extended window of administration, the processes involved with collecting assessment vendor data, and preparing the data for reporting, Assessment participation and Academic Achievement data will not be available in time for the EdFacts reporting due date of 12/15/2021. Maryland has requested an extension until February 28, 2022, to submit this file. Data were submitted and available for the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. The State noted that the data would be submitted during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State's submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	15.57%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	16.55%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	47.55%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	10.68%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	11.23%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	52.78%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	15.57%	40.00%	42.50%	45.00%	47.50%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	16.55%	50.00%	52.50%	55.00%	57.50%	60.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	47.55%	53.00%	55.50%	58.00%	60.50%	63.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	10.68%	25.00%	27.50%	30.00%	32.50%	35.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	11.23%	33.00%	35.50%	38.00%	40.50%	43.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	52.78%	53.00%	55.50%	58.00%	60.50%	63.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	546	550	490
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	85	91	233

Data Source:

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	543	543	485
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	58	61	256

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	85	546		15.57%	15.57%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	91	550		16.55%	16.55%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	233	490		47.55%	47.55%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	58	543		10.68%	10.68%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	61	543		11.23%	11.23%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	256	485		52.78%	52.78%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The State's assessment results can be found at <https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Maryland State Department of Education on May 17, 2021 was approved for a waiver from the accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for the 2020-2021 school year. The State Assessment administration window was extended beyond the normal administration timeline and a shortened assessment was administered in the Early Fall of the SY 21-22 for the prior school year (i.e., SY 20-21). In addition, Maryland underwent a change in its Statewide assessments from SY 18-19 to SY 19-20, moving from PARCC to MCAP, however the emergence of the COVID 19 pandemic affected our testing and data processes greatly. Given the change in assessment, the extended window of administration, the processes involved with collecting assessment vendor data, and preparing the data for reporting, Assessment participation and Academic Achievement data will

not be available in time for the EdFacts reporting due date of 12/15/2021. Maryland has requested an extension until February 28, 2022, to submit this file. Data were submitted and available for the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. The State noted that the data would be submitted during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State's submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	17.41
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	24.74
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	48.51
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	14.01
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.41
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	35.00

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	17.41	17.00	16.50	16.00	15.50	15.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	24.74	24.00	23.50	23.00	22.50	22.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	48.51	48.00	47.50	47.00	46.50	46.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	14.01	14.00	13.50	13.00	12.50	12.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	6.41	6.31	6.21	6.11	6.01	5.91
Math	C <=	Grade HS	35.00	34.50	34.00	33.50	33.00	32.50

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members

- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	63,320	56,297	54,608
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,176	5,408	4,777
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	14,019	16,014	31,875
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	924	1,496	2,171
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	208	59	69

f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	236	285	592
---	-----	-----	-----

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	63,270	54,820	49,620
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,149	5,321	4,801
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	12,081	4,069	20,040
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,033	332	822
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	213	24	145
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	267	62	193

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6.19%	23.60%		17.41	17.41	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	6.36%	31.10%		24.74	24.74	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	13.84%	62.35%		48.51	48.51	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6.71%	20.73%		14.01	14.01	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1.62%	8.03%		6.41	6.41	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.04%	42.04%		35.00	35.00	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Maryland State Department of Education on May 17, 2021 was approved for a waiver from the accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements for the 2020-2021 school year. The State Assessment administration window was extended beyond the normal administration timeline and a shortened assessment was administered in the Early Fall of the SY 21-22 for the prior school year (i.e., SY 20-21). In addition, Maryland underwent a change in its Statewide assessments from SY 18-19 to SY 19-20, moving from PARCC to MCAP, however the emergence of the COVID 19

pandemic affected our testing and data processes greatly. Given the change in assessment, the extended window of administration, the processes involved with collecting assessment vendor data, and preparing the data for reporting, Assessment participation and Academic Achievement data will not be available in time for the EdFacts reporting due date of 12/15/2021. Maryland has requested an extension until February 28, 2022, to submit this file. Data were submitted and available for the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. The State noted that the data would be submitted during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State's submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	71.43%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	12.00%	50.00%	71.43%	66.43%	61.43%
Data	12.00%	50.00%	71.43%	57.14%	NVR

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	61.43%	50.00%	40.00%	35.00%	30.00%	25.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee’s membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland’s SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents’ Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions’ priorities, including but not limited to the State’s APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State’s SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Please see Introduction.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

25

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State’s minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	NVR	61.43%		N/A	N/A

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The MSDE, DEI/SES's definition of a significant discrepancy is having a Rate Ratio of 2.0 or greater when comparing the rate of suspension of students with disabilities for greater than ten days to the rate of suspension of nondisabled students for greater than ten days. Calculation of the Rate Ratio is the local school system suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities divided by the local school system suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. The Rate Ratio is modeled after a Risk Ratio which is the ratio between two rates of outcomes. If the ratio is greater than 2.0, the local school system is considered to be significantly discrepant. In addition to meeting the Rate Ratio of 2.0 or above, a local school system (LSS) must meet the criteria for the minimum cell size (numerator) and n-size (denominator). The minimum cell size for all LSSs is 5 students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 school days in a school year. The minimum n-size set by the State is 20 students with disabilities in the LSS.

The MSDE, DEI/SES's analysis of the data demonstrated that zero (0) local school systems met the minimum cell size of 5 students in FFY 2020. No, LSSs were excluded due to not meeting an n-size of at least 20. Only seven (7) students with disabilities statewide were suspended greater than 10 days and no local school system suspended more than two (2) students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in FFY 2020.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the number of students suspended for greater than 10 days was significantly impacted by the pandemic since most students with disabilities received special education and related services in virtual or hybrid settings for a large portion of FFY 2020.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For each of the six (6) local school systems (LSSs) identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension identified in FFY 2020 using FFY 2019 (2019 - 2020) data, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff, using a discipline review document, conducted a review of the suspension policies and procedures related to:

- 1) discipline of students with disabilities,
- 2) development and implementation of IEPs,
- 3) the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports; and
- 4) procedural safeguards.

Staff from the MSDE and LSS utilized the discipline review document to conduct a review of policies, procedures, and practices and to ensure compliance with federal and State regulations. Additionally, the MSDE conducted an individual student record review from an additional data period to ensure that the implementation of policies and procedures, and practices were consistent with federal and State regulatory requirements, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The MSDE, DEI/SES did not identify noncompliance with this review.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2020 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State provided valid and reliable data in its FFY 2019. The original APR submission had a typo which was corrected during the clarification period.

4A - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data field that zero (0) LEAs had a significant discrepancy; however, in the narrative, the State reported that "[f]or each of the six (6) local school systems (LSSs) identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension identified in FFY 2020 using FFY 2019 (2019 - 2020) data, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff, using a discipline review document, conducted a review of the suspension policies and procedures." Therefore, OSEP could not determine how many

LEAs were identified with whether State met the target.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

25

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	0.00%	0%		N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services (DEI/SES) utilized a Rate Ratio to compare the district-level suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities from each racial/ethnic group to the suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities in that same district.

If the Rate Ratio is greater than 2.0, the local school system is considered to be significantly discrepant. In addition to meeting the Rate Ratio of 2.0 or above, the local school systems must meet the criteria for the minimum n-size. Beginning in FFY 2017, the minimum n-size has changed to five (5) instead of thirty (30). This change was made as a result of stakeholder concerns about the previous n-size. Significant discrepancy calculations were made for local school systems that had at least five (5) children with disabilities in a particular race/ethnic group suspended for greater than 10 days.

The MSDE, DEI/SES's analysis of the data demonstrated zero (0) local school systems met the minimum cell size to be included in the calculations. Only seven (7) students with disabilities statewide were suspended greater than 10 days. No local school system had more than two (2) students with disabilities suspended greater than 10 days in FFY 2020. Therefore, no local school system met the minimum cell size when looking at suspensions by race.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the number of students suspended greater than 10 days was significantly impacted by the pandemic since most students with disabilities received special education and related services in virtual or hybrid settings for a large portion of FFY 2020.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For each of the seven (7) local school systems (LSSs) identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension by race/ethnicity identified in FFY 2020 using FFY 2019 (2019 - 2020) data, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff, using a discipline review document, conducted a review of the suspension policies and procedures related to:

- 1) discipline of students with disabilities,
- 2) development and implementation of IEPs,

- 3) the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports; and
- 4) procedural safeguards.

Staff from the MSDE and LSS utilized the discipline review document to conduct a review of policies, procedures, and practices and to ensure compliance with federal and State regulations. Additionally, the MSDE conducted a record review to review individual student records from another data period to ensure that the implementation of policies and procedures, and practices were consistent with federal and State regulatory requirements, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The MSDE, DEI/SES did not identify noncompliance with this review.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data field, the State reported that zero LEAs had a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity, however, in its narrative, the State reported that seven (7) local school systems (LSSs) were identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension identified in FFY 2020 using FFY 2019 (2019 - 2020) data. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine how many LEAs had a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity or whether the State met its target.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	69.40%	69.90%	70.40%	70.90%	70.90%
A	70.71%	Data	68.95%	69.73%	70.09%	70.20%	70.24%
B	2020	Target <=	12.26%	11.76%	11.26%	10.76%	10.76%
B	12.00%	Data	12.95%	12.04%	12.04%	12.06%	11.80%
C	2020	Target <=	6.19%	5.94%	5.69%	5.44%	5.44%
C	6.41%	Data	6.93%	6.86%	6.77%	6.85%	6.68%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	70.71%	71.00%	71.25%	71.50%	71.75%	72.00%
Target B <=	12.00%	11.75%	11.50%	11.25%	11.00%	10.75%
Target C <=	6.41%	6.25%	6.00%	5.75%	5.50%	5.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities

- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Please see Introduction.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	100,861
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	71,315
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12,107
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	6,183
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	103
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	176

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	71,315	100,861	70.24%	70.71%	70.71%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12,107	100,861	11.80%	12.00%	12.00%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	6,462	100,861	6.68%	6.41%	6.41%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection and analysis were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2005; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets. In addition, OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above. The State must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	64.50%	64.70%	64.90%	65.10%	65.10%
A	Data	60.02%	60.53%	62.72%	59.67%	61.60%
B	Target <=	18.50%	18.30%	18.10%	17.90%	17.90%
B	Data	19.30%	18.64%	17.50%	20.09%	19.03%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland

- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	69.87%
B	2020	20.92%
C	2020	0.33%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	60.87%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	67.00%	70.00%
Target B <=	20.92%	20.00%	19.00%	18.00%	14.00%	10.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.33%	0.33%	0.32%	0.32%	0.31%	0.30%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,781	5,056	1,246	10,083
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,507	2,825	806	6,138
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	769	1,052	141	1,962
b2. Number of children attending separate school	28	65	53	146
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	0	0	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	8	20	5	33

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,138	10,083	61.60%	60.87%	60.87%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,109	10,083	19.03%	20.92%	20.92%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	33	10,083		0.33%	0.33%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection and analysis were not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic for this Indicator.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this 6A and 6B, using data from FFY 2005; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to exclude five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

The State has established the baseline for 6C, using data from FFY 2020 as baseline and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets. In addition, OSEP cannot determine whether the State's FFY 2025 end targets for 6A and 6B reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above. The State must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2017	Target >=	68.90%	68.90%	68.53%	68.78%	68.78%
A1	68.53%	Data	69.70%	63.08%	68.53%	69.90%	70.44%
A2	2017	Target >=	68.00%	68.00%	52.75%	53.00%	53.00%

A2	52.75%	Data	62.47%	56.35%	52.75%	52.25%	49.41%
B1	2017	Target >=	67.60%	67.60%	72.12%	72.37%	72.37%
B1	72.12%	Data	66.29%	67.10%	72.12%	72.74%	72.91%
B2	2017	Target >=	57.20%	57.20%	50.87%	51.12%	51.12%
B2	50.87%	Data	50.01%	51.56%	50.87%	49.88%	47.90%
C1	2017	Target >=	63.10%	63.10%	71.40%	71.65%	71.65%
C1	71.40%	Data	66.70%	69.00%	71.40%	72.58%	71.14%
C2	2017	Target >=	65.70%	65.70%	59.23%	59.48%	59.48%
C2	59.23%	Data	62.81%	63.89%	59.23%	58.40%	56.71%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	68.78%	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%
Target A2 >=	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%
Target B1 >=	72.37%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%
Target B2 >=	51.12%	51.50%	52.00%	52.50%	53.00%	53.50%
Target C1 >=	71.65%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Target C2 >=	59.48%	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%	61.50%	62.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,581

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	50	1.40%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	766	21.39%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,103	30.80%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,056	29.49%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	606	16.92%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,159	2,975	70.44%	68.78%	72.57%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,662	3,581	49.41%	53.00%	46.41%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	52	1.45%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	710	19.83%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,188	33.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,211	33.82%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	420	11.73%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,399	3,161	72.91%	72.37%	75.89%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,631	3,581	47.90%	51.12%	45.55%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	65	1.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	732	20.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	841	23.49%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,297	36.22%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	646	18.04%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,138	2,935	71.14%	71.65%	72.84%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,943	3,581	56.71%	59.48%	54.26%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools and the decision tree for every COS rating. Revised B-K COS training was implemented in 2017 and this intense focus is contributing to decreases in the child outcomes data, in each of the three childhood outcomes Summary Statements #2 as data quality improves. Local preschool special education providers and leaders recognize that COS ratings have previously been elevated at entry. A new IEP COS Entry report supports data analysis at the program and provider level. For Summary Statement #2, data analysis indicates that significant less children are entering with a COS score of 6 or 7, which overall lowers the percentages across all three indicators. This pattern has continued over the past several years.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B2	The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools and the decision tree for every COS rating. Revised B-K COS training was implemented in 2017 and this intense focus is contributing to decreases in the child outcomes data, in each of the three childhood outcomes Summary Statements #2 as data quality improves. Local preschool special education providers and leaders recognize that COS ratings have previously been elevated at entry. A new IEP COS Entry report supports data analysis at the program and provider level. For Summary Statement #2, data analysis indicates that significant less children are entering with a COS score of 6 or 7, which overall lowers the percentages across all three indicators. This pattern has continued over the past several years.
C2	The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools and the decision tree for every COS rating. Revised B-K COS training was implemented in 2017 and this intense focus is contributing to decreases in the child outcomes data, in each of the three childhood outcomes Summary Statements #2 as data quality improves. Local preschool special education providers and leaders recognize that COS ratings have previously been elevated at entry. A new IEP COS Entry report supports data analysis at the program and provider level. For Summary Statement #2, data analysis indicates that significant less children are entering with a COS score of 6 or 7, which overall lowers the percentages across all three indicators. This pattern has continued over the past several years.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The State uses the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process which has been integrated into the preschool portion of the IEP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	YES
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	YES

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association

- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Please see the Introduction

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Preschool	2016	Target >=	48.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Preschool	82.99%	Data	50.02%	82.99%	80.98%	82.03%	81.98%
School age	2016	Target >=	40.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	72.00%
School age	70.00%	Data	42.07%	70.00%	69.00%	69.00%	72.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	85.00%	85.25%	85.50%	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%
Target B >=	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

Group	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	1,783	2,174	81.98%	85.00%	82.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
School age	7,342	10,197	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	Met target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

107,597

Percentage of respondent parents

11.50%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	9.00%	11.50%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified improvement strategies to increase the response rate of targeted race/ethnic groups for both the preschool aged and the school-aged populations. The strategies to be implemented included: (1) conduct local outreach efforts to inform families of the importance to respond to the parent survey; (2) collaborate with the Local Family Support Coordinator (LFSC) in each of the LSSs/PAs to conduct outreach, training, and supports to address the areas of need gleaned from the annual survey; and (3) collaborate with parent organizations that represent underserved populations using materials that are culturally appropriate and written in the native language. In addition, the State will begin requiring Improvement Plans for LSSs with low response rates.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The Parent Survey results for FFY 2020 and the survey response questions were shared among the LFSCs representing LSS/PAs and who serve on the Special Education Citizens Advisory Council. Data were reviewed, shared, and discussed to increase parent response rates thus increasing the validity of the survey results. In addition, during Fall 2020, the Parent Survey results were shared with the Special Education State Advisory Council to initiate a discussion on how members can assist with increasing parent response rates. The MSDE, DEI/SES staff will continue to track these activities in collaboration with the LFSC to determine their effectiveness and to make modifications, as necessary. School building closures presented a challenge, but virtual meetings and webinars presented an opportunity to meet with parents without the need for them to leave their homes. A bilingual help desk was maintained for the duration of the survey to address parent’s questions about the survey through phone calls or email.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

Pre-school:

Age, Race/Ethnicity: Parents were asked about the age of their child as of September 30, 2020. A majority (77%) of respondents stated that their child was between the ages of three (3) and five (5) years. The parents or guardians of children five (5) years of age are overrepresented in the sample (9%), while parents or guardians of children three (3) and four (4) years of age are underrepresented (-26% and -9%, respectively). The two racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (22%) and Black (17%) children. Parents of White, Black and Hispanic children are underrepresented in the survey (14, 16 and 13 percent, respectively), when compared to the State population data. In addition, parents of Asian children are overrepresented by twenty-one (21) percent in the survey when compared to the State population data. There was less than one percent differences between the sample and multi-racial population data.

Primary Exceptionality/Disability: According to Statewide estimates, the most common exceptionality or disability evident in the Maryland preschool population is developmental delay, which represents sixty-two (62) percent of the population. Although this group did make up one of the largest portions of the sample, compared to the Statewide estimate this group was underrepresented among the respondents by forty-nine (49) percent and represented only thirteen (13) percent of the sample. The second most common exceptionality or disability Statewide is speech or language impairment, and sample estimates were in line with the actual population (26% of the population, 25% of the sample). Students with Autism represent eight (8) percent of the population but represented thirteen (13) percent of the sample; parents of children with Autism were overrepresented by three (3) percent in this year’s survey, compared to eight (8) percent last year. Students with Multiple Disabilities were overrepresented in the sample by twelve (12)percent, as they constituted thirteen (13)percent of the respondents.

School Aged:

All grade levels (Kindergarten – Grade 12) were well represented in the respondent sample. The majority of respondents (83%) indicated that their child had been referred for special education services between zero (0) and eight (8) years of age, and 48 percent had been referred between the ages of two and five. The population demographic data were obtained from the 2020 Maryland Early Intervention and Special Education Services Census Data and Related Tables report.

Six (6) percent of respondents (N=583) indicated that their child attended a non-public school as a result of an IEP team decision for a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE); while eighty-four (84) percent of respondents (N=8,577) indicated that their child attended a public school during the 2020-21 school year. Ten (10) percent of respondents did not answer this question.

Age, Race/Ethnicity: Respondents were asked about the age of their child as of September 30, 2020. Much like last year, the age distribution of children of survey respondents did not significantly differ from the age distribution of the State.

The most common race/ethnic backgrounds of respondents were White (43%) or Black (21%), which is similar to last year’s sample. Parents of Black children were underrepresented by twenty-one (21) percent and parents of White children were overrepresented by nine (9) percent. Hispanic or Latino children were underrepresented by four (4) percentage points.

Primary Exceptionality/Disability: Parents of children identified with Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability were each underrepresented in the survey by eleven (11) and eight (8) percent, respectively. Overrepresented in this year’s Survey were parents of children with Autism by seven (7) percent and Multiple Disabilities by six (6) percent.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The State will begin increased focus on achieving representativeness through improvement plans for LSSs with lower response rates. In addition, survey information, strategies to increase parent response rates, and State assistance is provided through State and Regional Meetings with Local Family Support Coordinators and Special Education Directors, Supervisors, and Compliance personnel.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

A demographic group is classified as being overrepresented in the respondent sample if the percentage of that group in the sample is greater than its percentage in the Statewide estimate by three (3) percentage points or more. Similarly, a demographic group is classified as being underrepresented in the sample if the difference between the percentages of that group in the sample is less than its percentage in the Statewide estimates by three (3) percentage points or more. If the difference between the sample and the Statewide estimate is less than three (3) percentage points in either direction, the respondent sample is not significantly different from the Statewide population.

The demographic categories of survey respondents were generally similar to those in the State Census. Race/ethnicity distribution was similar overall and improved by three percentage points for Black and multi-racial children compared to previous years.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact the State's ability to report or analyze data for this indicator.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

State reported whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services and the steps taken to ensure more representative data in future reporting years. The State also included its analysis, the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	25	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The MSDE's definition of Disproportionate representation is described as having students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i. e., American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic, or Two or More Races) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the local school system (LSS) or in the State.

For consistency and to lessen confusion, the MSDE has changed its Indicator 9 methodology to be similar to the methodology used for identifying Significant Disproportionality. This new methodology was adopted by the State Board of Education in May of 2018 and entered into the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR). In particular, the MSDE identifies disproportionate representation using a risk ratio of 2.0 or greater. Previously, a weighted risk ratio was utilized for disproportionality indicators. In addition to meeting the 2.0 or greater risk ratio, the LSS must meet the criteria for the minimum cell size and n-size, where cell size is the number of students with disabilities in an LSS who are a specific race/ethnicity and the n-size is the number of students of a specific race/ethnicity enrolled in an LSS. The MSDE utilizes a minimum cell size of five (5) and a minimum "n" size of twenty (20). Unlike the calculation for Significant Disproportionality, the MSDE does not consider reasonable progress for Indicator 9. As such, disproportionate representation is identified for any LSS with a risk ratio of 2.0 or greater who meets the minimum cell size and n-size requirements.

MSDE's analysis of the data for the 2020-2021 performance period demonstrated that one (1) LSS was identified as having a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (Black/African American) in special education and related services. No LSSs were excluded from the calculation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

The MSDE, using an examination document, reviewed the policies, procedures, practices, and IEPs of the one (1) LSS impacted, followed by an on site visit to review the procedures, practices, and IEPs, including student records to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 301.311 for the one (1) LSS. The MSDE did not identify noncompliance through this review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2017; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
18	0	25	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The MSDE's definition of disproportionate representation is described as having students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i. e., American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic, or Two or More Races) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the local school system (LSS) or in the State.

For consistency and to lessen confusion, the MSDE has changed its Indicator 10 methodology to be similar to the methodology used for identifying Significant Disproportionality. This new methodology was adopted by the State Board of Education in May of 2018 and entered into the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR). In particular, the MSDE identifies disproportionate representation using a risk ratio of 2.0 or greater. Previously, a weighted risk ratio was utilized for disproportionality indicators. In addition to meeting the 2.0 or greater risk ratio, the LSS must meet the criteria for the minimum cell size and n-size, where cell size is the number of students in an LSS who are a specific race/ethnicity and identified with a specific disability category, and where the n-size is the number of students with disabilities of a specific race/ethnicity enrolled in an LSS. The MSDE utilizes a minimum cell size of five (5) and a minimum “n” size of twenty (20). Unlike the calculation for Significant Disproportionality, the MSDE does not consider reasonable progress for Indicator 10. As such, disproportionate representation is identified for any LSS with a risk ratio of 2.0 or greater who meets the minimum cell size and n-size requirements.

MSDE's analysis of the data demonstrated that eighteen (18) LSSs were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. No LSSs were excluded from the calculation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

The MSDE, using an examination document, reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of the eighteen (18) LSS impacted, followed by an on site visit to review the procedures and practices, including IEPs and student records to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 301.311 for the LSSs. The MSDE did not identify noncompliance through this review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2017; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	77.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.94%	98.00%	98.60%	98.64%	98.51%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
13,677	13,329	98.51%	100%	97.46%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

Indicator 11 showed slippage from FFY 2019. The percentage for FFY 2020 was approximately one (1) percentage point lower than the previous year. Reasons for delay included: staffing and other administrative issues, and school facility closures. The primary reason for slippage was cited as the COVID-19 pandemic. School systems reported that they had increased issues with staff shortages and unplanned staff illnesses related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

348

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

The MSDE, DSE/EIS identified 348 students with "unacceptable reasons for delays", an increase of 130 students from FFY 2019 (FFY 2019 = 218 students).

The unacceptable reasons for delays included provider illnesses, paperwork error, inconclusive testing results, the student was not available (not parent failure/child refusal), staffing issues; and students - due to other reasons.

An analysis of these data identified the following range of days for all unacceptable reasons:

89 (1 day to 15 days) = 25.49%

107 (16 to 45 days) = 30.84%

152 (beyond 45days) =43.68%

The range of days delayed for unacceptable reasons beyond 45 days increased from 21.47% in FFY 2019 to 43.68% which is double the previous year. Again, this was primarily due to issues providing evaluations during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The MSDE uses an electronic data extract from Maryland's SSIS data system which is an online data collection and monitoring tool that captures student and service information from MD online IEP and other sources.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection and analysis were not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
15	14	0	1

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified fifteen (15) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019. Fourteen (14) of the fifteen (15) findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local School System (LSS) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction is verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, after the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each LSS/PA achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Correction for one (1) finding has not yet been completed by the local school system.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual student for which evaluations were not completed within timelines and verified that the evaluation was completed, although late, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LSS. An updated random sample of student records from a subsequent data set was reviewed to determine if those records were also compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE verified that each individual student identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The MSDE, DEI/SES is working with the LSS where compliance has not been corrected. Technical assistance is being provided to new staff who work with schools regarding timeline noncompliance and the identification of appropriate reasons for the delay of assessments. Data review meetings are conducted weekly. The LSS is monitoring IEP team data to ensure policies and procedures are implemented with fidelity.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported on the correction of noncompliance for FFY 2019 in its FFY 2020 APR.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.69%	99.72%	100.00%	99.89%	99.77%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,092
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	116

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	745
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	42
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	180

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	745	754	99.77%	100%	98.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

9

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified nine (9) students with "unacceptable reasons for delays." The unacceptable reason for each student's delay was identified as paperwork errors, administrative errors, and staffing.

The range of delays were:
 1 to 15 Days = 4 students
 16 to 30 Days = 0 students
 31 to 45 Days = 1 student
 Beyond 45 Days = 4 students

This information is used by the MSDE Monitoring Staff to assist local school systems and public agencies in analyzing data and in providing technical assistance. The MSDE data management and program staff worked closely with local school systems' staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported in FFY 2020.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The MSDE uses an electronic data extract from Maryland's SSIS data system which is an online data collection and monitoring tool that captures student and service information.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified three (3) findings of noncompliance. All three (3) findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local School System (LSS) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction is verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each LSS/PA achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The MSEE, DEI/SES reviewed the IEPs and records for each of individual child with findings of noncompliance in the LSS/PA where the findings of noncompliance were made. The DEI/SES verified that, although late, an IEP was developed and implemented for all those students unless the child was no longer within the local school system or public agency, or the parent had withdrawn consent. An updated random sample of student records from a subsequent data set was reviewed to determine if those records were also compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE verified that each individual student identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported on the correction of noncompliance identified for FFY 2019 in its FFY 2020 APR.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	86.10%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.49%	98.86%	97.86%	92.62%	97.14%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
19,907	19,977	97.14%	100%	99.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The MSDE, DEI/SES requires that the local school systems and the public agencies to submit data for this indicator on a quarterly basis. For the local school systems that utilize the Maryland Online IEP (MOIEP) System, most of the required quarterly data uploads nightly to SSIS from the MOIEP. The local school systems that utilize the vendor-based IEP systems report quarterly data via file submission and Excel spreadsheets. The quarterly data are uploaded to the Maryland Scorecard where the local school systems and the MSDE, DEI/SES staff can track the progress and the impact of the interventions to improve student outcomes. The current version of the Indicator 13 checklist from the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) that was updated in 2012 by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) was utilized.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

The State is responding to the requirements of the IDEA as specified that requirements are met for students with IEPs at age 16.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The collection and reporting of data for this indicator were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	4	1	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local School System (LSS) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction is verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. If the results yield 100% correction is verified consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The correction was made and verified within one year of the date of the issuance of the writing finding of noncompliance to the LSS/PA. For FFY 2019, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified five (5) findings of noncompliance. Four (4) findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance and one (1) finding was subsequently corrected outside the one-year timeline in the first quarter of FFY 2021.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the IEPs and records for each of the individual children identified with noncompliance in the LSS/PA. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that the records of the individual children demonstrated that the goals and services were provided, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the local school system, or the parent had withdrawn consent, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported on the noncompliance identified for FFY 2019 in its FFY 2020 APR.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment":

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%
A	24.87%	Data	23.45%	22.66%	26.46%	28.04%	26.54%
B	2020	Target >=	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	60.00%
B	56.32%	Data	54.63%	58.09%	65.07%	60.64%	61.87%
C	2020	Target >=	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	74.00%
C	56.63%	Data	61.47%	72.93%	76.93%	67.05%	64.66%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	24.87%	25.00%	25.50%	26.50%	27.50%	28.50%
Target B >=	56.32%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	61.00%
Target C >=	56.63%	58.00%	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members

- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, one of the State's data-sharing partners for this Indicator, the Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) has been unable to provide their post-secondary Indicator 14 data. As such, the State has relied on its other two (2) data sharing partners, the Maryland Longitudinal Data Systems Center (MLDSC) and the Department of Rehabilitation Services (DORS) to provide all data for this indicator. The DDA is not certain when they will return to their previous data collection methodology. Therefore, the State will continue to rely on MLDSC and DORS to provide Indicator 14 data. Stakeholders have raised concerns that some of the Indicator 14 targets are not achievable at this time. The State agrees with its stakeholders on this point and believes the data are sufficiently different from previously collected data as to no longer be comparable. As a result, the State is proposing a resetting of its Indicator 14 baseline for FFY 2020. The State has worked with the national TA Center, IDC, for this new baseline proposal and stakeholders have supported the State's proposal.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	6,753
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	6,742
Response Rate	99.84%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,677
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,120
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	21
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,677	6,742	26.54%	24.87%	24.87%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3,797	6,742	61.87%	56.32%	56.32%	N/A	N/A
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	3,818	6,742	64.66%	56.63%	56.63%	N/A	N/A

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	99.85%	99.84%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

In Maryland, Indicator 14 is calculated using an administrative records exchange with the Maryland Longitudinal Data System Center (MLDSC), which is Maryland's State Longitudinal Data System, and two additional state agencies that provide post-secondary education and training to individuals with disabilities that do not supply data to the MLDSC (rather than through an attempt to survey the students, their families, or teachers). Therefore, there is no true "response rate" as there would be for a survey. Instead, the state reports on Census data. All students with disabilities who have Maryland Public School attendance files are intended to be included in MLDS. In practice, however, some students may not be included in the MLDSC due to data entry error or a failure at the LEA level to submit an attendance file for a student. Still, through this process, 99.84% of Leavers were found to be contained within the MLDSC and as such, their associated postsecondary and workforce data is included in the analysis.

After identification of students in the MLDSC, the State then collects training and education information about students from the Department of Rehabilitative Services (DORS) and Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) and adds it to MLDSC information (although DDA has been unable to provide information since the start of the COVID 19 Pandemic). For FFY 2020, however, 11 former students were missing from MLDS and DORS data sets and thus, the State has no data on them.

The State's goal is to identify post-secondary information for all Leavers (full representativeness) to satisfy its Indicator 14 reporting requirement. . This exchange provides data on the number of youth with disabilities no longer in secondary school and who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school (Leavers), and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. At this time, the data contained in MLDSC does not contain any out-of-state employment or college placements, or federal employment placements. However, data sharing agreements are continuing to be developed between MLDSC and other agencies (i.e., State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency, Developmental Disabilities Administration) to reflect additional efforts to match additional students' post-school outcomes.

The State reports on census data, so a response rate (like would be calculated from a survey) is not entirely applicable. Through its partnerships, the State was able to locate information on 6,742 of 6,753 (99.84%) Leavers in the MLDSC. The State was not able to obtain any postsecondary information on eleven (11) Leavers. As noted above, the absence of the eleven (11) leavers in the MLDSC may have been due to data entry errors at the LEA level.

These eleven (11) leavers were located in five (5) LEAs. As such, the state will work with LEAs by providing data entry and analysis technical assistance to ensure that MLDS includes information from all Maryland Public School students.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The State does not use a survey methodology and thus, nonresponse bias is not entirely applicable. As mentioned above, the State makes efforts to obtain information on every Leaver through its partnerships with outside agencies and as a result the State continues to be able to report on a high percentage of leavers. Only eleven (11) Leavers were unable to be located in either the MLDS and/or DORS databases. It is possible that these Leavers would have been identified by the DDA if the DDA was still collecting data with the same methodology used prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past, the DDA provided the State data on Leavers who were receiving a community learning service or supported employment services through the DDA. The State will continue to work with the DDA in an effort to obtain postsecondary data from the agency in the future.

It is difficult to draw conclusions about potential demographic variables for not being included in MLDS due to it being such a small number. Still, the State reviewed the demographic information for these eleven (11) Leavers and found that the eleven (11) Leavers were spread out in five (5) LEAs. White students (5 or 45.5%) were overrepresented in the group of eleven (11) Leavers missing from MLDS, whereas Black students (3 or 27.3%) were underrepresented. Ten (10) of the eleven (11) Leavers were males, whereas only one (1) was female.

The lack of inclusion of these eleven (11) former students in the MLDS is not related a nonresponse bias or to demographic variables, but is likely the result of students not having attendance files submitted by the LEA or by data entry errors of the LEA or MLDS. As mentioned above, the state will work with LEAs by providing data entry and analysis technical assistance to ensure that MLDS includes information from all Maryland Public School students.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The State’s data include almost all Leavers (youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school). Still, the state compared the demographic information of the 6,753 Leavers to the demographic information of the 6,742 students found in MLDS (and thus reported on for Indicator 14). The State’s reported data from the MLDS data set are representative of the group of Leavers as a whole. There were no groups of students who were underrepresented or overrepresented.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

For the purpose of determining representativeness, a demographic group is classified as being overrepresented in the MLDS data set if the percentage of that group is greater than its percentage in the Leaver group by at least 3 percentage points. Similarly, a demographic group is classified as being underrepresented in the MLDS data set if the difference between the percentage of that group in the MLDS data set is less than its percentage in the population by 3 percentage points or more. Differences of 3 percentage points or more indicate areas in which the characteristics of Leavers differed from the state’s MLDS data set. If the difference between the MLDS data set and the Leavers is less than 3 percentage points in either direction, the respondent sample (MLDS data set) is not significantly different from the Leaver population.

As required, the State compared demographic information of the 6,753 Leavers to the demographic information of the 6,742 students found in MLDS (and thus reported on for Indicator 14) and found that no group showed a +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy. In fact, no demographic group (race, gender, age, etc.) was underrepresented or overrepresented by more than 0.04 percentage points. Therefore, no group was considered underrepresented or overrepresented.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State’s data were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) did not provide data to submit their Employment Outcome Data. Therefore, for the second year in a row, Maryland’s FFY 2020 data do not include employment data from the DDA. As mentioned earlier, this change has prompted the state to revise its baseline for FFY 2020.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that baseline revision because the State's FFY 2020 baseline data reported in the Historical Data table is not consistent with the State's FFY 2020 data reported in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data table.

OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because of the discrepancy in the baseline data and because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

OSEP cannot determine whether the State analyzed the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, including steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	46
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	13

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter

of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00%-75.00%
Data	54.24%	52.27%	58.46%	55.21%	58.49%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	64.00%	75.00%	64.00%	75.00%	64.00%	75.00%	64.00%	75.00%	64.00%	75.00%	64.00%	75.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
13	46	58.49%	64.00%	75.00%	28.26%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

MSDE did not meet its target of 64% in this reporting period. Maryland continues to attribute the challenge of meeting the resolution sessions target to the changing perceptions of dispute resolution.

We believe that the strong voice of Maryland's parent advocacy community may contribute to higher expectations from the resolution process and result in the possibility of more difficult communications between the parties. MSDE continues to address the possible lack of understanding regarding the purpose and role of resolution sessions and what parents can expect from their local school systems in this process, particularly during the COVID pandemic.

MSDE is continuing to respond to this issue by focusing upon parent support and parent education. We continue to be committed to providing high-quality parent support through the use of MSDE Family Support Specialists, who respond to parent requests for assistance through telephone calls, email, and written correspondence. The MSDE Family Support Specialists also serve as school system liaisons in order to ensure that parents have access to school system-based information and resources for support.

MSDE also continues to strengthen the training and support provided to its Statewide Family Support Providers, this year, the focus has been upon facilitating meaningful communication between families and school system personnel during this period of school building closures as the result of the

pandemic. MSDE believes that these efforts can have a positive impact on the successful outcome of resolution sessions for families and the school system.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Neither Maryland's data collection nor reporting for Indicator 15 were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept the targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	115
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	24
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	30

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	73.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	75.44%	69.33%	65.22%	70.48%	66.45%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
24	30	115	66.45%	75.00%	85.00%	46.96%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

MSDE did not meet its target of 75% in this reporting period. Maryland continues to attribute the challenge of meeting the resolution sessions target to the changing perceptions regarding Due Process in Maryland.

We believe that the strong voice of Maryland's parent advocacy community may contribute to higher expectations from the mediation process and result in the possibility of more difficult communications between the parties. MSDE is continuing to respond to this issue by focusing upon parent support and school system responsiveness to parental concerns, with a particular emphasis on the need for strong communication during the COVID pandemic.

Additionally, MSDE staff continues to meet regularly with leadership from the Office of Administrative Hearings, the State agency with whom MSDE contracts to serve as IDEA mediators. This collaborative relationship serves to facilitate a robust discussion around the process and protocol, both substantively and procedurally, of the mediation process in order to ensure the best possible outcomes for the parties who participate.

MSDE also continues to strengthen the training and support provided to both the Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) who serve as mediators, and to our Statewide Family Support Providers who assist families. MSDE believes that these efforts will positively impact the successful outcome of mediations for families and the school system.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Neither Maryland's data collection nor reporting for Indicator 16 was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept the targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate progress and narrowing of the gap in mathematics performance.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Four Maryland counties (Cecil, Charles, Queen Anne’s, and Worcester) currently participate in the SSIP. Students from grades 3 to 5 in these four counties are included in these analyses. All elementary schools in each district are used for data collection.

Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/MD_Part_B_SSiP_Theory_of_Action.pdf

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

While Local School Systems (LSSs) report improved teacher proficiency and implementation fidelity, student performance data is not showing the expected gains in mathematics performance. With the need for a change in strategy, MSDE planned and has been awarded funding for a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) which focuses on implementing 3 evidence-based or research-based practices: specially designed mathematics instruction, embedded social-emotional learning supports, and professional learning and coaching across teacher preparation (University), State technical assistance (MSDE) and teacher implementation (LSS/school). Increased stakeholder engagement has been strategically planned to include experts, families, university faculty, advocates, and the participating LSS representatives. Maryland will strengthen efforts to achieve the SiMR with new strategies and partners. The implementation of the new approach through SPDG funding will be effective July 1, 2022, as the current year (Oct. 1, 2021, through September 30, 2022) is focused on design and preparation of evidence-based practices, recruitment of new districts/schools for implementation, and preparations to provide professional learning to university, State, and local partners.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	10.40%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target> =	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	14.00%	15.00%	15.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Third- through fifth-grade public school students with IEPs in the four MD SSIP	Third- through fifth-grade public school students with IEPs in	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage

counties who meet or exceed mathematics grade-level expectations on the annual State assessment (the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program [MCAP]).	the four MD SSIP counties who take the annual State assessment in mathematics.					
28	1,033	9.00%	12.00%	2.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The State experienced slippage for several reasons, including a lower than typical participation rate, the educational impact of COVID, and the time in which the assessments were administered (in Fall of 2021 instead of Spring of 2021).

In addition, the early Fall assessment was a shorter version of the traditional ELA/L, Mathematics, and MISA assessments measuring student performance in content presented during the last school year (2020-2021). Students participated in an assessment for the grade or course in which they were enrolled Spring 2021 when the assessment was postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, a current 4th grader participated in the 3rd grade English Language Arts/ Literacy and Mathematics. Students enrolled in 3rd grade Fall 2021 did not test since the content from the prior year would have not been an assessed year. Student groupings and significant enrollment changes also impacted assessment findings.

The State anticipates that proficiency will increase as a result of the return to in-person instruction.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

While Maryland’s student performance data is much lower than desired for students with disabilities, gradual improvements were showing for the SSIP districts before FFY 2020 data that were performing below State-wide averages at baseline. The FFY 2020 2019 target was not achieved for two (2) of the SSIP districts. In Cecil County, the mathematics curriculum changed in FFY 2019; in Charles County, there was a change in school administrations and sustainable practices were not in place for continuation until later in the year. In FFY 2020, only one (1) SSIP district, Worcester, met the State target.

SiMR data come from grade-level results on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) exam (formerly the PARCC exam) in mathematics. Typically, students take the MCAP exam at the end of each school year, but the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in no testing in Spring 2020, and consequently rescheduling the Spring 2021 administration to Fall 2021.

Reported data are for students in grades 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs in the four SSIP counties. Additional information on mathematic performance based on local assessments is provided below.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

High-stakes test scores are publicly available data. The data are aggregated by district and school and analyzed by district by grade and reviewed for school and grade level. The data are disaggregated for students who have an IEP compared to data for all students. The SSIP target is the percentage of students who are proficient (level 4 and 5) in meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations in mathematics.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The Local School Systems (LSSs) participating in the SSIP also report mathematics performance data on screening/benchmark assessments. LSSs report the number of students with and without disabilities who meet or exceed grade-level expectations in mathematics on these assessments.

FFY 2020:

In Fall 2019, low-stakes mathematics results were reported for 143 children with disabilities, representing the initial schools that were targeted to receive training and coaching to implement a mathematics evidence-based practice. Results indicated that 39% of students with disabilities met or exceeded grade-level standards as defined by local screening data. Disaggregated by grade levels, 42% of 3rd graders with disabilities, 52% of 4th graders with disabilities, and 21% of 5th graders with disabilities met or exceeded grade-level expectations. All districts did not submit fall 2019 data.

In Winter 2020, prior to school closures, achievement levels increased for students with disabilities across the board. Among the data collected from 405 children with disabilities, those meeting/exceeding grade level standards were: 73% of 3rd graders, 67% of 4th graders, and 64% of 5th graders with disabilities. Note that all districts reported data for their students with and without disabilities.

No data was collected in Spring 2020 as a result of school closures and changes to remote teaching.

FFY 2021:

In Spring 2021, low-stakes mathematics results were reported for 547 children with disabilities, indicating that 18% of students with disabilities (grades 3 through 5) met or exceeded grade-level standards. This is significantly lower than in previous years. In one district, the measure that was used to screen and report this data was changed to a different screener. Other LSSs did not consistently measure all students and also included schools that were newly implementing mathematics instruction and doing so remotely rather than in person. Disaggregated by grade levels, 22% of 3rd graders with disabilities, 17% of 4th graders with disabilities, and 16% of fifth graders with disabilities met or exceeded grade-level expectations. Of the 1,947 students without disabilities for whom data was reported, 38% met or exceeded grade level standards, indicating a 20-point gap in performance.

FFY 2022:

In Fall 2021, benchmark data was reported for 1,073 students with disabilities, as more schools within each district received training and joined in the SSIP implementation. It is notable that the percentage of students with disabilities as well as the students without disabilities who met or exceeded grade-level expectations in mathematics decreased. Specifically, 7% of students with disabilities (grades 3 through 5) met or exceeded grade-level standards. Disaggregated by grade levels, 4% of 3rd graders with disabilities, 11% of 4th graders with disabilities, and 4% of 5th graders with disabilities met or exceeded grade-level standards. Of the 8,179 students without disabilities (grades 3 through 5) for whom data was reported, only 16% met or exceeded grade-level mathematics standards, indicating a 9-point gap in performance.

Students with and without disabilities experienced declines in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade-level standards after the summer 2021 break, which may be related in part to a summer regression but is more likely influenced by the transition back to full-time in-person schooling after a year of remote learning.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

MSDE identified two data quality issues specific to the SiMR data.

1. Comparability of local assessments. MSDE collects low-stakes assessment data from the LSSs, and the LSSs participating in the SSIP each use different low-stakes assessments to measure mathematics performance throughout the school year. Because each assessment has its own cut score for meeting grade-level standards, the threshold may not be comparable. For example, a student may meet standards using one assessment but not another due to content variations or different criteria for pass scores. While this may inform instruction within the schools or districts, it is less useful for evaluation purposes across districts. More valid conclusions can be reached when individual student data is collected and when MCAP test scores are available, since these allow for direct comparisons across the State.

2. Reporting on professional development. A major implementation activity related to the SSIP is the delivery of professional learning opportunities (PL). While MSDE provided PL to all LSSs (such as a data literacy course and coaching webinars and previously specially designed mathematics instruction), the LSSs began to take ownership and provide most of the professional learning in mathematics instruction and adaptations. LSSs also received funding to provide all of the coaching to educators in their schools, beginning with a few target schools and expanding across their districts. Assigned MSDE staff consequently supported LSSs in reporting feedback on PL activities and through coaches, using the SSIP reporting survey developed by the external evaluator. There was great variability in the extent to which the LSSs utilized the survey tool to provide evaluation data. As a result, data about PL participation and feedback may not be representative of all PL participants, depending on the response rate of each LSS. Of note, respondents to the survey may be those who a) are more likely to comply with data submission requests; b) are in LSSs that more frequently requested participants to submit feedback; or c) were extremely satisfied or dissatisfied with the PL offered. With the new SSIP implementation in 2022-23 and beyond, a central tool will be designed specifically for all PL evaluation, with guidance from our national expert in professional learning, Dr. Thomas Guskey.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

State Assessment Data:

Because of Covid-related school closures and change to remote learning in FFY 2020, MSDE did not administer the State assessments in Spring 2020 or in the 2020-2021 school year. While some districts did implement low-stakes assessments (e.g., universal screeners or progress monitors), they were inconsistently applied in the Spring of 2020 and the 2020-2021 school year with concerns for decreased student availability for assessment and the validity of results. We believe the data to be a reliable indicator of performance for those assessments under unusual conditions, but not useful for overall evaluation of the SSIP work. As a result of the data collection challenge, MSDE staff increased their communication and support to LSSs to understand the assessment administration and data collection barriers.

For FFY 2022, LSSs are once again more consistently reporting data for all students with and without disabilities in the participating schools. In the future, MSDE will collect individual student data directly from LSS accountability staff through a data collection agreement, ensuring that the necessary information is provided accurately, timely, and thoroughly.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/SSIP_Part_B_Evaluation_Plan.pdf

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The infrastructure improvements reflect the five key strategies outlined in the Strategic Plan, initially developed in 2012, and updated in 2016 and 2021. These are:

- Strategic Collaboration
- Engaged, Informed Family Partnerships.
- Data-Informed Decisions
- Systems Coaching for Implementing Evidence-based practices with Fidelity

STRATEGIC COLLABORATION

1. Cross-Departmental Collaboration:

In FFY 2020, MSDE conducted three cross-departmental meetings and had to re-prioritize the work of team members in Spring 2020. Guidance on remote learning, recovery plans, and methods to ensure the delivery of special education services were required. Meetings were not continued from March 2020 to the current date. Instead, in Fall 2021, a Stakeholders Advisory Group, which is composed of members across the Department as well as national and local experts, and advocates and educators has been convened as a part of the SPDG work with a focus on SSIP implementation for FFY 23. The Stakeholder Advisory Group will meet as a whole group four times a year, with between-meeting committees working on the design of implementation strategies, overseeing the development of the practices that will be implemented and aligning implementation across the Department as well as with Towson University and the (newly) participating districts. Participating LSSs will need to meet requirements for selection and commit to engagement in the Stakeholder Group, implementing evidence-based practices, and providing individual student data as well as fidelity data related to implementation.

2. Division Implementation Team:

The Part B Division Implementation Team is composed of the MSDE Division of Early Intervention and Special Education Services (DEI/SES) staff who provide direct technical assistance (TA) and support to LSSs involved in the SSIP work. The team met only in the fall of 2019 as a whole group but did not continue meetings in Spring of 2020 due to remote work and the need for team members to focus on Covid recovery and other related concerns. The work of each SSIP (Parts B and C) were coordinated through the SSIP staff with subsequent in-person meetings in late fall 2020 and January 2021. Discussions result in enhanced understanding of the focus of SSIP work, problem-solving, identification of TA or supports, and considerations for dissemination and stakeholder engagement. The number of schools involved in implementation has expanded from only 9 schools across 4 districts to all elementary schools across the 4 LSSs. Since current LSSs have scaled up across their elementary schools and considering limited improvements in mathematics performance and other concerns related to curricula and progress monitoring, MSDE has developed a new approach to supporting improved especially designed mathematics instruction.

In addition to the revised Stakeholder Advisory Group (launched in the fall of 2021), MSDE is:

- a) Recruiting new LSSs, with specific readiness requirements, and agreements for participation in professional learning of evidence-based math specially designed instruction (SDI), with readiness criteria developed by the Stakeholder Group.
- b) Requiring a MOU for engagement with MSDE and national experts to collaborate on a universal professional learning and coaching approach to implementing targeted math SDI.
- c) Developing a partnership with Towson University to contribute to the development of evidence-based teacher preparation and coaching methods, design of research-based practices in mathematics instruction and adaptation for students with disabilities, and design of research-based methods of embedding social-emotional supports in instruction.
- d) Engaging national experts to contribute knowledge and guidance to the Stakeholders and the evidence-based practice Design Team.
- e) Enabling partnerships across the Department and with local experts to promote effective and efficient use of State resources and provision of technical assistance.

FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

The SSIP has produced two series of parent engagement modules: one general for establishing family partnerships, the second focused on mathematics. These have been made available to all LSSs in Maryland. Going forward, a Family partnership focus group will be conducted, with family organization representatives that are part of the Stakeholders group as well as family members from the participating (to be selected) districts engaged in the SPDG work. The Stakeholders have already made preliminary recommendations for parent engagement, and these will be formalized through SPDG efforts.

DATA-INFORMED DECISIONS

Because data use has been a struggle for many schools and districts, MSDE offered continuing professional development credits for a data-literacy course offered in 2020, as well as highlighted data literacy in the November 2019 State-wide Professional Learning Institute. Moving forward, MSDE will focus on data use through grade level intervention teams that align student learning needs with appropriate interventions and explicit specially designed instruction specific to individual students based on their disability. These will involve the design of protocols for data-informed decisions and the use of data systems that provide disaggregated reports in which data is visualized for team members to use. MSDE has designed a protocol for the use of data through its TAP-IT cycle of improvements (Team-Analyze-Plan-Implement-Track).

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH SYSTEMS COACHING

The MSDE DEI/SES continues to refine its differentiated framework to address the unique strengths and challenges that individual LSSs and public agencies have in regard to compliance requirements and implementation of effective practices. Technical Assistance (TA) with coaching is provided by Program Specialists and Section Chiefs in the Performance Support and Technical Assistance Branch.

Each jurisdiction receives support defined in tiers described in the State's system of General Supervision in the Introduction:

- ? Universal
- ? Targeted
- ? Focused
- ? Intensive

The SSIP LSSs are in the "Focused" Tier. A short-term outcome is professional learning scale up to promote the implementation of math evidence-based practices across their districts. An intermediate-term outcome is the continued focus on the SiMR and consistent implementation of the selected evidence-based practice.

In Phase III, Year 5 (FFY 2020), professional learning and coaching from the State focused on systems coaching and data use. MSDE discovered that having a consistent coaching model represented one of the greatest areas for improvement in the Part B SSIP. MSDE provided intensive and explicit training opportunities for SSIP leaders and school-based educators on specially designed mathematics practices. Each district then created their own approach to internal professional learning and their own coaching approach. Having enabled the LSSs to create their own strategies also allowed inconsistency across districts and difficulty in comparing coaching methods and results.

Consequently, MSDE's revision to the approach to SSIP is to create an evidence-based PL and coaching model that will be implemented in the new districts and revised for implementation at the university, State, and local levels. An outcome of the new SSIP approach will be professional learning standards and a coaching system to be implemented at the State and local levels across schools and districts as well as at the University level in teacher preparation programs.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Outcomes for each infrastructure improvement strategy:

STRATEGIC COLLABORATION objectives:

- ? Peer systems coaching by DEI/SES staff members with LSS partners (engagement in monthly local implementation team meetings, initially on-site and then remotely) - technical assistance
- ? Coordination and collaboration on development/dissemination of math resources within MSDE and across LSSs - professional development
- ? Increase the knowledge of stakeholders and acquire stakeholder input into SSIP strategies through regular participation in the SESAC quarterly meetings - accountability

How these strategies support system change:

Considering various changes in school and district administration, which occur annually, these strategies are critical for consistent messaging from

MSDE and across local implementers, which will impact both sustainability of the system as well as achievement of the SiMR. MSDE staff members who are providing technical assistance need to have a shared understanding of coaching methods, mathematics instructional approaches, and coordination of communications to districts. Within MSDE, knowledge and capacity need to be developed on an ongoing basis as staff assignments change, contributing to MSDE's ability to sustain improvement efforts. Stakeholders are critical for grounding improvement plans in the realities of school life, impacting implementation and sustainability efforts.

ENGAGED AND INFORMED FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS objectives:

? Parent/teacher partnership and mathematics learning modules were updated and shared for increased capacity of families to support their child with a disability in learning mathematics concepts - technical assistance

How these strategies support system change:

Information for family members enhances the potential for achieving the SiMR. We realize that training in itself is insufficient, however. As we move to the SPDG redesign of the work to achieve the SiMR, specific parent engagement strategies are being designed for local implementation, supported by MSDE staff and local coaches.

DATA-INFORMED DECISIONS objectives:

? In Fall 2019, MSDE sponsored webinars on data literacy conducted by AnLar. In March 2020, a scheduled follow up in-person 2-day training on data usage was canceled due to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and revised as an asynchronous course. MSDE staff as well as 15 local coaches and administrators participated in the data literacy course of 15 modules. This data course will enable coaches and administrators to increase their ability to utilize data to make decisions, which in turn will support instruction and learning that caters to the unique needs of students with disabilities. Increases in data-driven decision-making will therefore boost the ability of SSIP-participating LEAs to close achievement gaps between students with and without disabilities - achievement of the SiMR

? The TAP-IT cycle of data analysis and infrastructure and implementation improvement continues to be implemented by selected districts and schools - sustainability efforts

How these strategies support system change:

Without a valid and usable data system, and without the talent and skill to use data reports for instructional decisions and to evaluate the impact of the EBP, local school systems will not be able to decide if they are being effective and will not be able to attribute any change in student performance to actual change in teacher instruction. Data use for decisions is critical to both achieving the SiMR and for sustaining use of EBPs over time.

SYSTEMS COACHING FOR IMPLEMENTING EBPS WITH FIDELITY objectives:

? Conduct 3 webinars on instructional coaching methods (follow up in person planning with districts had to be canceled due to Covid restrictions) - professional learning

? Increased quality and consistency in coaching through MSDE coaching conversations across SSIP districts to support fidelity of EBP implementation - technical assistance

How these strategies support system change:

One of the lessons learned in FFY 2020 is that the lack of a clearly specified coaching approach across districts resulted in great discrepancies in support to schools. In an effort to provide some local control, MSDE did not require the design and use of a specific coaching protocol or approach to supporting new implementers and sustaining implementation with practicing teachers. This need became apparent and became an important part of MSDE's revised approach as written into the SPDG approved application.

FFY 2021 Local Professional Learning Activities:

In the Spring of 2021, professional learning opportunities were attended by local teachers, coaches and administrators. There was near unanimous support that the PD opportunities were useful and high-quality in supporting students with disabilities. Of those responding to an evaluation survey, 89.8% agreed that the training substance was "high quality and grounded in evidence and professional practice," Further, 90.0% of respondents agreed that "the content is important to my students."

Continued PD opportunities will support the efficacy of teachers, coaches, and administrators to support mathematics instruction and specially designed instruction for students with disabilities, which in turn will increase the percentage of students with disabilities who meet or exceed mathematics grade-level standards.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

1. Strategic Collaboration

The Stakeholders' Advisory Group representing university, State, and local representatives as well as stakeholder who represent various MD constituents and national experts will convene quarterly and work to design, advise, and support local implementation. This large group will represent members of sub-groups:

- Design Team to craft the features of the evidence-based practices, using implementation science approach to defining a "Usable Innovation"
- State Implementation Team composed of university, State, and local implementers of professional learning/coaching for instructional EBPs
- Focus Groups (which may include members outside of the Stakeholders Advisory Group) to identify best and evidence-based practices, resources for implementers, and make recommendations regarding fidelity measurement,

2. Professional Learning and Systems Coaching/Coaching model

The Stakeholder Design team will work to develop an approach with consistent applications across teacher preparation (university), State Systems coaching, and local instructional coaching to both train through professional learning and coach through ongoing support. Professional learning will be offered on the mathematics especially designed instruction and the embedded social-emotional supports in FFY 22 for implementation in FFY 23. Ongoing coaching through a protocol applied across schools and districts will be offered in FFY 23 and will be refined with feedback from implementers.

3. Family Partnerships

Family partnerships are a strategic area for the Stakeholder Group work. Recommendations from initial meetings have contributed to both HOW families can be better engaged as a preliminary definition of future expectations for implementing districts. A focus group is being developed that will specifically address family engagement strategies at the school and district level.

4. Data-Informed Decisions

The Design Team (national experts, local experts, university faculty) for professional learning will make specific recommendations for ongoing school-

based professional learning and instructional decisions based on student data and fidelity data. In addition, criteria for new districts will include the presence of valid and reliable data systems that disaggregate data based on the characteristics of concern to the local schools.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The evidence-based practices (EBPs) critical to achieving the SiMR are specially designed mathematics instruction within an Integrated Tiered System of Supports (ITSS). MSDE continues to work with current participating LSSs to make sure that there is clarity related to the definition of specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities in the areas of: adapting content, teaching methods, and/or delivery of instruction to:

- ? Address the unique needs of a child that results from their disability,
- ? Ensure access to the general curriculum, and
- ? Accelerate progress in achieving grade level standards to reduce the performance gap.

In the current SSIP approach, each LSS was given the opportunity to design their EBP based on research and learning through workshops and coaching led by mathematics experts.

In 2020, the four LSSs continued to implement selected EBPs to promote mathematics proficiency for students with disabilities in targeted elementary schools AND scaled up implementation to other schools within their districts:

Cecil County: "Targeted Mathematics Instruction" designed through a practice profile and fidelity tool.

Charles County: Team Based Cycle of Instruction (TBCI) and Structured Cooperative Learning (SCL) with embedded culturally responsive practices within math instruction.

Queen Anne's County "Do The Math" Intervention scaled up across all elementary schools (<https://www.hmhco.com/products/do-the-math/>)

Worcester County: Main Lesson, Menu Lesson Instructional Framework based on John Tapper's instructional strategies and Concrete, Representational, Abstract (CRA) assessments.

In future SSIP work, the Stakeholder Design team will work with national experts to create an approach to adapting a math EBP for students with disabilities that can be applied with integrity and fidelity across districts, with evidence-based embedded social-emotional supports.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

TARGETED MATH INSTRUCTION

Core Components:

1. Formative Assessment
2. Math Content and Pedagogy
3. Intervention Design

Formative Assessment:

High Leverage Assessments: are a progress monitoring tool that assess student understanding related to High Leverage Concepts at each grade level.

- o Administer 3 times per school year
 - o Analyze student responses using the OGAP Learning Progressions
 - o Identify students in need of targeted instruction
- Formative Probes: are a formative assessment administered during instruction to assess progress toward the High Leverage Concepts

o Administer as part of the instructional process

- o Analyze student responses using the OGAP Learning Progressions
- o Analyze to determine the areas of need for targeted instruction

Analysis of Student Work: involves teachers and teacher teams analyzing student work and strategies used in alignment with the OGAP Learning Progressions to inform instruction

- o Analyze and sort student work to determine the applied student strategies and possible misconceptions
- o Determine the next step for targeted instruction using the OGAP Learning Progressions

Results of Formative Assessment Analysis: are used to inform targeted instruction to narrow the gap between where students are on the OGAP Learning Progression and the current learning goal.

- ? Identify current levels and student strengths based on formative assessment
- ? Utilize the results of the formative assessment and identify the student's placement on the OGAP Learning Progression.
- ? Identify the appropriate instructional pathway along the OGAP Learning Progression

Unique Student Needs: must be considered when planning targeted instruction. Universal Design for Learning, accommodations, modifications, and/or supplementary aids and services are critical instructional design considerations.

- ? Identify the learning characteristics and unique needs of students and utilize them in planning instruction
- ? Adhere to accommodations, modifications, and/or supplementary aids and services that are identified within the IEP

Standards-Based IEP Goals: in mathematics are identified and written based upon assessments that determine student understanding of high leverage concepts and readiness for major grade level content clusters.

- ? Identify instruction level mathematics goals addressing high level concepts in which students demonstrated difficulty
- ? Identify grade level mathematics goals addressing major grade level content clusters when necessary
- ? Main Lesson-Menu Lesson Plan

DO THE MATH ADAPTATIONS

Materials and Time

- ? Teacher and student materials ready
- ? Teacher organized and familiar with lesson

Instructional Routines

- ? The gradual release model is used to teach explicitly
- ? Concrete manipulatives are used to demonstrate concepts
- ? Mathematical representations are modeled and recorded on the board
- ? Accurate math vocabulary is modeled and consistently used during instruction

Student Engagement

- ? Students are focused and participate throughout all steps of the gradual release model
- ? Students work cooperatively with partners as directed for assigned instruction, games, Think-Pair-Share, etc.

- ? Manipulatives are utilized appropriately during instruction and partner work
- Ongoing Evaluation/Check for Understanding
- ? The math content is modeled, and students are asked clarifying questions to demonstrate understanding before being released to work in pairs
- ? Student responses are acknowledged with appropriate feedback provided during direct instruction
- ? Students are monitored for understanding during partner work to assess readiness for release to independent work
- ? Students demonstrate the ability to apply concepts taught from the first lesson to other lessons throughout the week.
- General Observations of the Group
- ? Student success rate is high
- ? Transitions between activities are smooth
- ? Teacher uses evidence from student work as a means to evaluate student understanding
- ? Teaching goals adjusted for each child as needed

MAIN LESSON-MENU LESSON

Launch (5-10 minutes):

- Introduces main lesson, activates prior knowledge, and engages all learners (one step word problem or number talk)
- Teacher activates prior knowledge by engaging students with prior skills or understanding
- Teacher uses Launch to introduce Main Lesson (key concepts/strategies in Launch appear in Main Lesson)
- Teacher uses Launch to engage all students

Main Lesson (20-30 minutes):

- Lessons and learning targets usually come from a school or district mathematics program. Main lessons include a problem or task focused on a key math concept, makes strong use of student discourse, and uses heterogeneous grouping for the purpose of inclusion.
- Teacher provides problem solving experiences in heterogeneous groups
- Teacher provides multiple opportunities for student-to-student discourse
- Teacher communicates learning target(s) through verbal and visual strategies
- Teacher checks for student understanding of learning target(s)
- Teacher refers to learning target throughout lesson

Menu (30-35 minutes):

This part of the lesson plan is dedicated to differentiating instruction to meet the specific individual learning needs of students in the class. Teacher works with small groups or individual students while the rest of the class is engaged in a variety of learning activities. Students self-select from a variety of activities from a "menu."

Must Do's/Can Do's (Structural)

- An observable system for assigning required and optional activities
- Teacher provides choice of activities for students to take ownership of their learning

Targeted Instruction (Content)

- Teacher uses formative assessments to modify instruction

During Menu, teacher meets with individual and/or small groups of students to provide differentiated instruction

Problem Solving (Content) Must Do - 1 per week

- Teacher provides problems or tasks with rich context
- Teacher requires evidence of student thinking (manipulatives, tables, decomposition, drawings, equations)
- Teacher provides a folder for each student to collect their weekly problems

Skills Practice (Content) Must Do - 1 per week

- Teacher provides a short set (4-6) of leveled arithmetic problems (one-dot/two-dot)
- Teacher provides immediate feedback on student work from skills practice

Math Games (Content)

- Teacher selects math games that serve an instructional purpose
- Teacher/Paraprofessional uses games as review of mastered skills or an exploration of new learning

Journal Prompt (Content)

- Teacher provides a journal prompt that emphasizes student reflection on key math concepts
- Teacher provides written feedback to students on a rotating basis
- Teacher provides a journal for each student to write their reflections in

Closure (5-10 minutes):

Questions or problems are posed that are related to the learning goal to focus attention and discussion on the work completed during main lesson and/or menu. These can sometimes take the form of exit slips or probes.

- ? Teacher poses question or problem to guide student to student discussion related to the learning goal
- ? Teacher asks students to reflect on the question or problem in small groups or partners
- ? Teacher asks groups or partners to share their thinking on question or problem
- ? Instruction and Assessment Strategies in Math Menu (throughout the lesson)
- ? Teacher asks questions to probe and deepen student understanding or uncover misconceptions.
- ? Teacher assists students in clarifying and assessing their thinking with one another.

Student work is used to inform the planning of future menus

Activities are offered at different levels of complexity

Formative assessment is used to identify and support struggling learners

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The mathematics EBPs were designed by teams following intensive year-long training during Phase 2 of the SSIP. Implementation science strategies (e.g., using a practice profile and fidelity check) were used to define the EBP and train implementers to initial fidelity. The theory of action was employed to identify if medium term objectives (teacher implementation) were achieved, as a path to achieving the long-term objective of the SiMR. Rates of fidelity were collected; initial ratings ranged from qualitative summaries to a checklist to a rubric; inconsistency in measures made it difficult to evaluate. This will change with the new SPDG work in which a State-level design team will create the definitions for the EBP and create the methods for measuring fidelity of implementation.

Through consistent descriptors of an EBP, it is expected that teacher instruction will be consistent and measurable, allowing the SSIP leaders to evaluate the impact of the EBP on student performance.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Evaluating Fidelity of Implementation and Change in Practice:

Beginning in FFY 2019, MSDE's external evaluator created an online tool that all SSIP stakeholders used to input data. This tool was a branching survey, such that participants indicate their role and the activity on which they are reporting. The tool then opened to the questions specific to that activity and role. The external evaluator partnered with MSDE to ensure the LSSs were using the online tool throughout the school year to track implementation of SSIP activities. MSDE and the external evaluator tracked response rates by LSS and role and ensured participants were submitting data at least three times per school year.

Coaches reported:

- a) the percentage of their teachers who are implementing evidence-based practices (EBPs) and
- b) what percentage are implementing EBPs to fidelity.

In FFY 2020, the median response for both measures increased from Fall 2020 (26-50%) to Winter 2021 (51-75%). The data support those coaches and teacher as interacting more often, and as a result, teachers are more effectively implementing EBPs in their instruction, even during the pandemic.

Across both Spring and Fall 2021, coaches agreed that most teachers were using mathematics EBPs. Specifically, the median response in Spring 2021 was that 76-99% of teachers were using mathematics EBPs, and the median response in Fall 2021 was 51-75%. Coaches believed a slightly lower percentage of teachers were using the EBPs to fidelity. In Spring 2021, the median response was that 51-75% of teachers were using mathematics EBPs to fidelity, and in Fall 2021, the median response was 26-50%.

Teachers also indicate the extent to which they

- a) understand and
- b) use their school's mathematics EBPs.

In Spring 2021, 6% of teachers considered themselves an expert in their school's mathematics EBP, and an additional 72% believed they had a solid understanding of this practice. Further, most teachers report that they use the EBPs regularly in their classroom. Specifically, 45% of teachers report using their school's identified mathematics EBP at least daily, 31% report using it at least twice per week, and an additional 18% report using it at least weekly. In sum, 94% of teachers in Spring 2021 reported using their school's mathematics EBP at least once per week, with the majority using it multiple times weekly. These numbers match the data submitted by coaches, validating that roughly three-fourths of teachers are regularly and appropriately using the EBPs.

In addition to teachers' uses of the EBPs, coaches report the extent to which they understand their district's mathematics EBP. In Spring 2021, 89% of coaches considered themselves either an expert in their EBP or had a solid understanding of the practice, while in Fall 2021, 100% of coaches considered themselves either an expert in their EBP or had a solid understanding of the practice. These data indicate that coaches became more comfortable with the practice, thereby improving their efficacy at supporting teachers.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Local Professional Learning Activities: From Spring 2021 through Fall 2021, ten professional development sessions related to the SSIP were held and feedback was submitted in the SSIP tool by an average of seven educators per session. Among those who attended these sessions, participants rated the sessions strongly across all indicators. For example, in Spring 2021, more than 90% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the substance in the PD sessions was "high quality and grounded in evidence and professional practice" and that "the content is related to my students' success." In Fall 2021, a greater percentage of teachers across all indicators agreed or strongly agreed that the PD sessions were high-quality, understandable, and important to student success. Further, in Fall 2021, all participants agreed that the "session is applicable to diverse groups of students" and that the "session is easy to understand." Thus, the feedback that SSIP participants had been providing to coaches was enabling the coaches and PD presenters to refine and meet the needs of the teachers receiving PD.

Local Instructional Coaching: In Spring 2021, 70% of coaches reported interacting with each teacher at least monthly, while in Fall 2021, this percentage increased to 80%. The development in efficacy that coaches were reporting was associated with an increase in the frequency with which coaches were interacting with all of their assigned teachers.

High-quality Instruction for Students with Disabilities: Staff were asked to reflect on the extent to which they believed their school was implementing high-quality instruction for students with IEPs. This question was general to their entire school, and it did not ask teachers to reflect on the extent to which they personally were serving students with IEPs. (The question was purposely framed this way in order to get more valid responses from teachers, rather than asking about their own teaching and introducing an upward bias to the data.) In Spring 2021, 60% of staff believed their school was providing high-quality instruction to children with IEPs to a great extent, and an additional 34% believed they were providing high-quality instruction to children with IEPs to a good extent. Only 5% believed they were providing high-quality instruction to children with IEPs to a limited extent. While staff were recognizing that more work needs to be done to ensure children with IEPs were being delivered high-quality instruction to a great extent, these data are promising and indicate the SSIP is benefitting children with disabilities in these districts.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

It is expected that the current SSIP districts will continue using their EBPs and continue their ongoing coaching efforts. However, as noted above, the strategies to achieve the SiMR will change:

1. Evidence-based Professional Learning and Coaching: under the guidance of Dr. Thomas Guskey and other experts in coaching and professional learning, as well as input from stakeholders, MSDE will design a professional learning system or standards that can be applied across university, State TA, and local levels to support the development of personnel capacity to implement and sustain implementation of math and social-emotional instructional practices. Standards based on research will be designed for initial and ongoing professional learning as well as job-embedded coaching.
2. Evidence-based specially designed mathematics instruction: under the guidance of Dr. Jenny Root, Dr. Paul Riccomini, and another national expert in teaching mathematics to students with disabilities in general education settings, and with stakeholder input, MSDE will design a standard approach to adapting an evidence-based mathematics curriculum and daily lessons for learners with varying disabilities.
3. Research-based, embedded social-emotional supports: under the guidance of Dr. Doug Fisher, and with input from our stakeholders, MSDE will design an approach for addressing the social-emotional needs of mathematics learners with disabilities during mathematics instruction and across the school day as appropriate.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel. In Maryland, this panel is called the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). Under federal law, students with disabilities and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. The majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

- 18 Parent Members
- Juvenile Services Education
- The Parents' Place of Maryland
- Maryland Higher Education Commission
- 4 LEA Representatives (administrators, service providers, etc.)
- Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
- Maryland Department of Labor
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council
- Division of Rehabilitation Services/Department of Disabilities
- The ARC of Maryland
- Title I-Program Improvement & Family Support, MSDE
- Maryland State Education Association
- Maryland Department of Human Services
- Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services, MSDE

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2020, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2020. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

Please see the Introduction for additional information about mechanisms and timelines for obtaining stakeholder feedback.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The primary method for stakeholder engagement in the current SSIP work has been through the State Special Education Advisory Committee and through regular structured interviews and feedback loops with local school systems.

In the future, MSDE will be engaging a variety of stakeholders in numerous ways:

Design Team: These members are the National Experts, Towson University faculty from the Departments of Special Education, Mathematics, and Professional Learning and Innovation, along with MSDE experts in elementary mathematics, specially designed instruction, family engagement, and social-emotional learning. The team will bring in members of the overall Stakeholders Advisory Group or Focus Group, for input as needed to accomplish SPDG objectives

Stakeholder Advisory Group: These members are composed of all partners listed above, most of whom participate in other teams, as well as organizational representatives and MSDE leaders. This group will meet for a half-day quarterly for facilitated discussion to review data and plans of the Design Team, develop a shared understanding of evidence-based practices, advise the Design, and make relevant connections with other individuals or organizations for input on the SPDG work.

State Implementation Team (SIT): These members are State TA partners and MSDE staff who will meet on a monthly basis, work directly with LSSs participating in the SPDG in order to gather information, create and support local implementation teams, assist the LSSs and schools in developing school and student profiles, develop supporting material for the Design Team, and assist the SPDG Coordinator with overall professional communications. The SIT members will facilitate or host Focus Groups.

Focus Groups: These members will review literature, make recommendations, provide input on the current realities, and offer feedback on SPDG

progress to the SIT and informing the work of the Design Team. Members of this group will include members of the Stakeholders Advisory Group and may include others as well. For example, the Family Engagement Focus Group may include stakeholders from the Parents Place of Maryland or SESAC and may include other family representatives in the field. Focus Groups will address the following areas:

- Family Engagement
- Evidence-Based mathematics instruction
- Social-Emotional Learning
- Professional Learning and Coaching

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

NA for FFY 2020; however the new Stakeholder Advisory Group that met in the Fall of 2021 has already made specific recommendations related to family engagement, thinking about future implementation. These include:

Share with parents the “Why”

Share with Families how they can help (Everyday Learning)

- Recommend using Families Daily Routines
- Find ways to disseminate information to families about how to incorporate math into daily life and make math comfortable for them

Use project-based approach – help families understand how math fits into everyday life

Sometimes schools aren’t welcoming

- Support school staff to make them welcome
- Go to where families are comfortable
- Set up activities/events in community
- Consider “math” events at libraries or other ongoing events

Ensure parent/family representations on teams.

- Meetings need to occur at times/location convenient for families
- Stipends-child care/ transportation
- Include parents on school and district implementation teams
- HELP them become involved

Does the school have staff capacity/expertise related to family support?

- PPW or Partners for Success
- Consider using existing parent liaison staff at the school to help craft family communications

Publish information for parents

- Videos/You Tube, Websites
- Video someone from school
- Include information on how to include lesson in routines. If applicable

Ensure home-math lessons are relevant

- Address math options for home use for children with learning/neurological disabilities

Don’t forget students with significant cognitive disabilities – stop with money/change and time with an analogue clock - and teach relevant mathematical concepts!

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

With a greater emphasis on the role of the university in teacher preparation, it is anticipated that Towson University can take a larger role in support of local school systems and can become a university model for integrating specially designed instruction with standards-based mathematics instruction with embedded social-emotional supports. This will be the work of the Design Team and focus groups in 2022.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

By the end of the 2022, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will identify and design the EBPs associated with evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by Stakeholders’ ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (very low – very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.

By the end of the 2022, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will define and establish the fidelity of implementation of EBP measures associated with specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (very low – very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.

By the end of the 2023, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will revise the specially designed math and SEL EBP process based on implementation fidelity and coaching input, as measured by a 4 out of 5 QUR rating on a 1 – 5 scale) by teacher implementers.

By the end of the 2024, Towson University faculty will have embedded EBP in math SDI and SEL practices in special education teacher preparation coursework, as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, and 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.

By the end of the 2024, MSDE and Loyola University will pilot and refine micro-credential courses in IEP Chairperson support for, and educator implementation of, math SDI and SEL EBP as measured by 80% fidelity for each course.

By the end of Years 2022 - 2026, participants receiving PL services from PL implementers (University, State, and local) will demonstrate a 25% increase in knowledge as measured by pre-post course/PL activity assessments.

By the end of the 2026, all general and special education elementary teachers participating in professional learning and coaching activities will demonstrate improved implementation of math and SEL EBPs as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

As previously stated, inconsistent data collection, inconsistent coaching methods, and pause in support due to Covid restrictions have impacted implementation. The objectives, strategies, and partnerships in the SPDG will be used to revise the overall approach and design/implementation and monitoring of EBPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's description of its stakeholder process does not include the mechanism and timelines for soliciting public input for setting target.

The State did not provide any data, aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR), for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action.

The State did not provide an Evaluation Plan. The State must provide a working link or narrative description of the current Evaluation Plan.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Marcella Franczkowski

Title:

Assistant State Superintendent

Email:

marcella.franczkowski@maryland.gov

Phone:

4107670238

Submitted on:

04/28/22 4:04:38 PM