

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

The State Performance Plan has been revised to reflect additional Indicators included during FFY 2005 and revised data as noted. The Annual Performance Report (APR) provides the data and information relative to FFY 2005 results, as applicable.

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) assigned staff from across the six branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to 20 internal teams, to correspond to the 20 Part B Indicators for use in developing the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each team was expected to gather, analyze and interpret the data, and review available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data. Draft information and data for each SPP Indicator were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)
- Local Directors of Special Education
- IDEA Partnership Team
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) [Indicators # 6, 7, 8, and 12]

The Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) assists MSDE in examining data and advising MSDE on improvement in specific areas. SESAC is comprised of 22 members. Twelve members represent parents/individuals with disabilities (51%). SESAC is comprised of the following stakeholders:

- Parents of students with disabilities
- Individuals with disabilities
- General or Special Education Teachers
- Representatives of Institutions of Higher Education (IHE's)
- State and local education officials, including officials who carry out activities under McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
- Administrators of programs for students with disabilities
- Representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to students with disabilities
- Representatives of nonpublic and public charter schools
- At least one representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to students with disabilities
- Representative from State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and
- Representative from the State juvenile and adult correction agencies.

Prior to meeting with the SESAC in September 2005, the DSE/EIS, Part B Program Manager, met with the SESAC officers to discuss and review the SPP indicators and develop a presentation for the full SESAC.

In October 2005, the Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services introduced the State Fall Leadership Conference with a presentation to the IDEA Part B local

directors of special education, Part C local lead agencies, SESAC members, SICC members on the Part C and Part B SPP Indicators and requested their input on establishing rigorous and measurable targets and identifying suggested activities to improve State performance. At the November 2005 SESAC meeting the group reviewed the SPP indicators and provided input for targets and improvement activities.

Maryland participates in the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) IDEA Partnership. The purpose of the IDEA Partnership is to facilitate sharing our work with stakeholders in meaningful ways, promote collaboration, build State and local capacity, and develop mutual trust among decision-makers and those affected by decisions. The IDEA Partnership focused on developing professional development for stakeholders on the reauthorization of IDEA and SPP requirements. The MSDE IDEA Partnership Team reviewed the drafts and provided suggestions/input for targets, and improvement activities. The MSDE IDEA Partnership Team is comprised of the following stakeholders:

- Parents of students with disabilities
- Individuals with disabilities
- General or Special Education Teachers
- Representatives of Institutions of Higher Education (IHE's)
- State and local education officials
- Administrators of programs for students with disabilities (School Bldg. Admin.)
- Representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to students with disabilities
- Representatives of nonpublic schools
- Representatives of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to students with disabilities
- Representative from State child welfare agency responsible for foster care
- Representative from the State juvenile and adult correction agencies
- Related service providers
- Other Advocacy groups
- Parents' Place of Maryland, Inc. Representatives
- Representative of Maryland Teacher Association
- Directors of Special Ed / Coordinators / Professional Development staff
- Special Education State Advisory Committee Members; and
- Local Special Education Citizen's Advisory Committee (SECAC) Members.

MSDE embraces a birth to five framework to positively effect smooth transition from Part C to Part B Preschool. Given this framework the Part B 619 Program Specialist participates monthly with the Maryland Infants and Toddlers State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). At the September, October, and November 2005 SICC meetings, the Part B 619 Program Specialist shared draft information and data with the SICC membership and requested their input on Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12.

Upon OSEP approval of the revised SPP and APR, copies will be sent to local superintendents of schools, local directors of special education in each local school system (LSS) and public agency (PA), Parents' Place of Maryland, Inc., Families Involved Together, Inc., SESAC members, and IDEA Partnership Team members. Additionally, the public will have access to the SPP/APR that will be posted on the MSDE web site at marylandpublicschools.org. From this site the public will also have access to a report on the performance of each LSS/PA in the state on the targets in the State's Performance Plan (SPP). Presentations about the SPP will be made at state leadership meetings.

Revisions to State Performance Plan (SPP)

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) made several additions and/or revisions to the State Performance Plan (SPP), originally submitted December 2, 2005. New Indicators, baseline data, and improvement activities, as appropriate were developed for the following:

- Indicator #4B Suspension/ Expulsion of Students with Disabilities by a factor of race and/or ethnicity,
- Indicator #7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator #8 Parent Involvement;
- Indicator #9 Disproportionality (Identification);
- Indicator #10 Disproportionality (Category);
- Indicator #13 Post-Secondary Transition;
- Indicator #14 Post Secondary Outcomes; and
- Indicator #18 Resolution Sessions.

The new indicators, baseline data, and proposed improvement activities have been shared with State stakeholders and subject to public input. The revised State Performance Plan in its entirety will be posted on the Department's website along with the APR submission. Posting the revised SPP as a seamless document will aid parents, educators, and members of the public (including the media) in their efforts to gain a clear picture of the special education services available to students with disabilities between the ages of three and twenty-one years old across the state of Maryland.

On October 18, 2006, DSE/EIS presented "The State of the State" at the annual Special Education Leadership Conference based upon the preliminary data or information on preliminary activities for each SPP Indicator. This conference is attended by local directors of special education, local preschool partners, local SECAC members, and SESAC members. On November 3, 2006, the Assistant State Superintendent for DSE/EIS presented the current status of the progress and preliminary SPP State data in "The State of the State" at the monthly meeting of all local school superintendents. On November 30, 2006 and January 18, 2007, DSE/EIS staff met with the SESAC. At those meetings, data was shared concerning the current status of SPP Indicators. The type(s) of information discussed is summarized in the table below.

SPP Indicator	Discussion with SESAC 11/30/06	Discussion with SESAC 1/18/07
#1 Graduation	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities	
#2 Dropout	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities	
#3 Assessment		Current Data (with revisions to reporting approach) and Status of Improvement Activities.
#4A Suspension/ Expulsion (SWD/ General Education Peers)	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.	
#4B Suspension/ Expulsion	Baseline Data, Required	

SPP Template – Part B (3)

(Race/ ethnicity)	Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities	
#5 LRE		Current Data, Revised Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.
#6 Preschool LRE	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities	Alerted SESAC to change in Data Definitions and potential need to revise targets and improvement activities for future FFY.
#7 Preschool Outcomes	Overview of Phase in of Data Collection.	Discussion of Sampling Plan and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#8 Parent involvement	Overview of Process.	Discussion of Baseline Data, Sampling Plan, and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#9 Disproportionality (Identification)	Baseline Data, Required Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities.	
#10 Disproportionality (Category)	Baseline Data, Required Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities.	
#12 Early Childhood Transition	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities.	Gathered feedback regarding additional Improvement Strategies.
#13 Post-Secondary Transition		Discussion of Baseline Data, Validation Activities, and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#14 Post Secondary Outcomes		Discussion of Sampling Plan (Census) and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#15 General Supervision	Overview of components to General Supervision System.	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Corrective Action Plans, and Improvement Activities.
#16 Complaint Timelines	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.	
#17 Hearing Timelines	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.	
#18 Resolution Sessions	Current Data, Rigorous Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities.	
#19 Mediation	Current Data, Rigorous Targets, and Revision of Improvement Activities	
#20 Timely Accurate Data		Discussion of Current Submission and Improvement Activities.

Additional information regarding public input for specific indicators is included with the discussion of each indicator in the SPP or APR as appropriate.

Submission of Sampling Plans for Indicators for Which Sampling is Permitted

On December 13, 2006, MSDE submitted sampling plans for approval for Indicators #7 Preschool Outcomes, #8 Parent Involvement, and #14 Post-Secondary Outcomes. A detailed discussion of the sampling methodology is incorporated with each indicator in the SPP. A summary for the sampling strategy for the three indicators is included below for ease of reference.

Sampling Plan for Indicator #7

In accordance with the sampling plan for Indicator #7 Preschool Outcomes, all twenty-four local jurisdictions will collect data on Indicator #7 Preschool Outcomes. In the first phase of data collection, the seven early intervention systems with greater than 50,000 children were surveyed during FFY 2005. In phase two, beginning with FFY 2006, the remaining seventeen jurisdictions will also be surveyed. Maryland's Early Childhood Assessment System (ECAS) gathers data on all children of appropriate age including children with and without disabilities.

Sampling Plan for Indicator #8

In accordance with the sampling plan for Indicator #8 Parent Involvement, all twenty four local school systems and every public agency serving students with disabilities will be included in the sample. Maryland's three tiered model includes a sampling plan stratified by local school system size and type of program (preschool or school age). Of note, a representative sample of all school systems at or near an average daily membership (ADM) of 50,000 students will be surveyed every year. Bi-annual sampling consistent with the size in the baseline year will be utilized for Category II systems (with an ADM greater than 15,000 and less than 50,000 students). Category III systems with an ADM of less than 15,000 students will be sampled on a tri-annual basis. In the smallest school systems within Category III, sampling would not likely generate reliable results, a census based approach was used.

Frequency of Sampling

Category I systems will be sampled six times during the SPP, Category II systems will be sampled at least three times during the SPP, and Category III systems and other public agencies will be sampled at least twice during the SPP.

Survey Forms Selected and Sample Size

The survey forms utilized were validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring. A random sample was generated from special education census data collected to meet the requirements of Section 618. The random sample will permit collection of data across disability category, race, age, gender, and other variables. Once baseline data is collected, MSDE will analyze the demographic data patterns that emerge and adjust for any variable not represented appropriately in the sample population for future years of data collection. The measurable and rigorous target was set for maintenance for FFY 2006 in order to use baseline data to inform future data collection efforts and avoid selection bias and address response rates and missing data.

The random sample calculation included an expected response rate. The current amalgamated response rate is 20.8%. The sampling framework was established from a table of the number of responses needed to establish a valid and reliable estimate for each school system. The amount of the sample size for the state is larger than needed to make valid and reliable statewide projections because it reflects a summation of sample sizes that were needed for reliable estimates from each local school system.

Improvement Activities

The improvement activities include: identifying ways to improve response rate, reviewing policies, procedures and practices that address parental involvement, utilizing the local SECACs to identify priorities and barriers to parental involvement within their communities, and reviewing the work of NCSEAM as it relates to target setting and improvement activities and adjust targets and improvement

strategies. MSDE has set targets for improving response rate as well as improving the 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.

Sampling Plan for Indicator #14

A census-based approach will be utilized for Indicator #14. This approach has received preliminary approval from OSEP via a conference call of January 22, 2007.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maryland offers one type of high school diploma. The Maryland State Board of Education establishes performance standards for graduation applicable to all students. Graduation rate is one of the targets used to determine whether the State, local school systems, and/or schools achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). Maryland established a goal that by 2014, 90% of all students will graduate from high school with a Maryland high school diploma. Please see Indicator #3 for additional information relative to local school system AYP and performance and participation of students with disabilities on Statewide assessments.

Maryland defines the graduation rate as the percentage of students who receive a Maryland high school diploma during a reported school year. This is an estimated cohort rate. It is calculated by dividing the number of high school graduates by the sum of the dropouts for grades 9 through 12 respectively in consecutive years plus the number of high school graduates. Maryland uses this measurement for all students.

Maryland high school graduation requirements for the class of 2005 included:

Subject Area	Credit Requirement	High School Assessment	NCLB Test
English	4 credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for English 2.	Maryland High School Assessment for English 2
Math	3 credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for algebra/data analysis.	Maryland High School Assessment for algebra/data analysis.
Science	3 credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for biology.	
Social Studies	3 credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for government.	
Fine Arts	1 credit		
Physical Education	½ credit		
Health	½ credit		
Technology Education	1 credit		

Foreign language or Advanced Technology and electives Or State approved Career & Technology Program and elective	2 credits		
	3 credits		
	4 credits		
	1 credit		

In addition to required course credits, all students are to complete 75 hours of student service. These credit requirements for a Maryland High School Diploma apply to all students. Local school systems may establish additional credit requirements or add endorsements to the diploma as incentives for students to meet locally established requirements beyond the minimums specified by the State. All students are required to take the High School Assessments as a graduation requirement. The requirements related to passing these assessments in order to graduate take effect beginning with the graduating class of 2009.

In April 2002, the Maryland General Assembly enacted the Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act (BTE). This law restructured Maryland's public school finance system and increased State aid to public schools. As a result, Maryland embraced a standards-based approach to public school financing. Under this approach, and consistent with the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) the State sets academic content and student achievement standards to ensure that school and students have sufficient resources to meet those standards and holds local school systems accountable for student performance. In 2003, each local school system submitted a comprehensive master plan that included goals and strategies to promote academic excellence among all students and to eliminate performance gaps that persist based on student race, ethnicity, socioeconomic circumstances, disability, and native language. Each local school system must demonstrate annual progress toward achieving Maryland's academic content and student achievement standards. Staff members from the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services serve on departmental review teams that review each local school system's annual Master Plan Update. Each update includes goals, objectives, and activities to address local data, information, and progress toward achieving established state performance goals for the subgroup of students with disabilities. Below is a table that demonstrates a correlation between State BTE performance goals aligned with the applicable NCLB performance goals and indicators that also align with the following State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators:

BTE Performance Goal	SPP Indicator
<p>Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>	<p>Indicator 3 - Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessment:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p>

<p>Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.</p>	<p>Indicator 4 - Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. (NEW) <p>Indicator 5 - Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. <p>Indicator 6 - Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>Indicator 7 - Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
<p>Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.</p>	<p>Indicator 1 - Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>Indicator 2 - Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p>

The State Board of Education approved a resolution in March 2004 to authorize the State Superintendent of Schools to convene a task force to examine comparable methods of measuring student skills and knowledge in the subjects of English, algebra/data analysis, government, and biology and make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding the feasibility of implementing one or more of those options as a part of the assessment requirements for high school graduation. The Comparable

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Testing Methods for the Maryland High School Assessments Task Force (Comp HSA Task Force) is charged to present final recommendations to the State Board of Education by September 2007.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is State level graduation data. The data can be found at www.mdreportcard.org

Statewide FFY 2004 (School Year 2004-2005) Graduation Rate			
	Comprehensive % (all students)	Special Education %	Regular Education %
Statewide Percentage	84.83	74.80	85.60

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The State graduation rate intermediate goal for the 2004-2005 school year was 83.24%. The State target of 83.24% remains constant for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. The graduation rate of students with disabilities is 8.44% below the established target.

Students in the graduating class of 2009 shall be required to pass the Maryland High School assessments for English, algebra/data analysis, biology and government. The students must achieve one of the following: (1) the passing score on each test, (2) a minimum score for each test and a combined overall score, (3) a specific score on a MSDE-approved comparable assessment(s), or (4) a passing score on the four High School Assessments by a combination of (1) and (3). These requirements may have an impact on the graduation rate of students with disabilities. DSE/EIS staff will monitor the progress of LSS in meeting graduation targets and provide technical assistance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	83.24% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2006 (2006-2007)	83.24% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2007 (2007-2008)	85.50% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2008 (2008-2009)	85.50% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2009 (2009-2010)	85.50% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2010 (2010-2011)	87.75% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The discussion of improvement activities for Indicators #1 and #2 have been combined, when appropriate. When an improvement activity is applicable to Indicator #1 only, it will be so indicated. The following improvement activities directly contributed to this progress:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
Participate in the MSDE review of LSS Bridge to Excellence Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to lead to improving the graduation rate of students with disabilities along with achieving the annual measurable target for the dropout rate. (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)	Annually	DSE/EIS Staff DSFSSS Staff LSS Staff
Monitor LSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities in increasing the number of students who complete their educational programs. (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)	Annually	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Collaborate with the Divisions of Career Technology and Adult Learning (CTAL) and Student, Family, and School Support (DSFSSS) in the development of a career awareness instructional framework to be infused into the Voluntary State Curriculum (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)	2005-2006 school year	DSE/EIS Staff DCTAL Staff DSFSSS Staff LSS Staff Community College Staff
Participate in MSDE professional development on the usage of the career awareness instructional framework. (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)	2005-2006 2006-2007 School years	DSE/EIS staff DCTAL Staff DSFSSS Staff LSS staff
Develop a companion document to the Maryland High School Diploma and the Certificate of Program Completion. The <i>Exit Document</i> meets the IDEA 2004 summary statement requirement. The <i>Exit Document</i> provides useful information on the student's course of study and academic success as well as assistance the student may need as the move toward their post school goals. (Applicable to Indicator #1 only)	Completed January 2006	DSE/EIS Staff
Provide Professional Development to LSS staff on the use of the online computer program used to generate the <i>Exit Document</i> . (Applicable to Indicator #1 only)	Completed February 2006	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
The <i>Exit Document</i> was given to students who completed their educational programs in 2006. (Applicable to Indicator #1 only)	Completed June 2006 and ongoing	LSS staff.
Co-sponsor a statewide transition conference that included breakout sessions on increasing graduation rates of students with disabilities. The conference was attended by 485	Completed November 2006	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

professional, parents, and students with disabilities. (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)		
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices that assure the provision of services, supports, aids accommodations, and interventions assure access to and participation in general curriculum and assessments, and promote high school graduation with a Maryland high school diploma. (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Provide technical assistance on the identification and implementation of appropriate strategies and practices to improve the graduation rate of students with disabilities. (Applicable to Indicator #1 only)	Ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff
Award discretionary grants to LSS to increase graduation rate of SWD. Work with the two LSS to develop best practices that can be sustained after the grant period.	2006-2007 and potentially ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Participate on the Maryland High School Assessment Taskforce (Applicable to Indicator #1 only)	July 1, 2005 – September, 2008	DSE/EIS staff LSS Staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Board of Education establishes the performance standard for dropout rate applicable to all students. Dropout rate is one of the targets the state uses in combination with graduation rate to determine whether the state, local school systems, or schools achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). Maryland established a goal that by 2014, no more than 3.00% of all students will dropout of high school. See page 2-3, "Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process" for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland's BTE Master Plan process.

Maryland defines the dropout rate as the percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students includes those 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 and students dropping out of evening high school and other alternative programs.

The dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of students in grades 9 through 12 served by schools. Students who re-enter school during the same year in which they dropped out of school are not counted as dropouts. The computation is the same for all youth.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The data source is the Maryland State Department of Education. This is State level dropout rate data. The data can be found at www.mdreportcard.org.

Statewide FFY 2004 (School Year 2004-2005) Dropout Rate				
	2004-2005 Intermediate Target (%)	Comprehensive % (all students)	Special Education %	Regular Education %
Statewide Percentage	3.81	3.69	5.50	3.50

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The State intermediate dropout rate goal for the 2004-2005 school year was 3.81%. The State target of 3.81% remains constant for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. The dropout rate of all students statewide (3.69%) was 0.12% below the intermediate target of 3.81%. For the 2004-2005 school year, the dropout rate of students with disabilities (5.5%) was 1.69% above the established target of 3.81%. The dropout rate of students with disabilities is 2.0% higher than the dropout rate of their nondisabled peers (3.5%).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.81% or less.
2006 (2006-2007)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.81% or less.
2007 (2007-2008)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.54% or less.
2008 (2008-2009)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.54% or less.
2009 (2009-2010)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.54% or less.
2010 (2010-2011)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.27% or less.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
Improvement activities applicable to Indicator #2 delineated under Indicator #1 are incorporated by reference.	As indicated under Indicator #1.	As indicated under Indicator #1.
Provided technical assistance to LSS to increase their capacity in preventing students from dropping out. (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)	2005-2006 school year and ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Provided technical assistance to LSS in the use of local student data in identifying at-risk students. Publications from the National Center on Dropout Prevention for Students with Disabilities(NCDP-SD) were used	2005-2006 school year and ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff LSS staff NCDP-SD Staff
Provided technical assistance on linking proper transition planning to dropout prevention.	2005-2006 school year	DSE/EIS Staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Award discretionary grants to LSS for dropout prevention for SWD. Work with the two LSS to develop best practices that can be sustained after the grant period.	2006-2007 school year and potentially ongoing.	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Developed a Promising Practices Guide on Dropout Prevention highlighting programs that have been successful in local Maryland school systems. The team that attended the National Forum developed the Guide. Assistance to the team has been provided by staff from NCDP-SD.	Will be introduced to LSS in January 2007	DSE/EIS Staff NCDP-SD Staff DSFSS Staff LSS Staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State})] \times 100$. B. Participation rate = <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades; b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$); c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$); d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$). <p>Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.</p> <p>Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.</p> C. Proficiency rate = <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades; b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$); c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$); d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$). |
|---|

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Revised to include data and information not available at the time of the initial SPP submission on December 2, 2005. (Revised April 5, 2007)

In Maryland, consistent with IDEA and the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, entitled the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), all students with disabilities are included in all general state and district wide assessments. IDEA emphasizes providing students with disabilities access to the general curriculum. All students, including students with disabilities, are expected to receive instruction consistent with Maryland's Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC), based on the Maryland Content Standards and Core Learning Goals, and must be assessed on their attainment of grade level reading and math content. To determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) under NCLB, all students, including students with disabilities, are assessed in reading and math in grades 3 through 8, and during one grade in high school. Maryland uses five (5) as a minimum group size for ALL AYP subgroup accountability decisions.

Students with disabilities are expected to participate in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) unless the IEP team determines that even with accommodations the student is to participate in an alternate assessment. Alternate assessments must be available for those students who cannot participate in the MSA even with accommodations as indicated in their IEPs. The alternate assessments include the following:

- Alternate MSA (Alt-MSA) for students with significant cognitive disabilities using alternate achievement standards (limited to reporting 1% of those scoring proficient); or
- Modified MSA (Mod-MSA) for students with academic disabilities who with access to the general education curriculum will participate in modified academic content and achievement standards (limited to reporting 2% of those scoring proficient). For both the 2005 and 2006 assessment years, students who may have been eligible for the Mod-MSA were identified by their respective IEP team and were part of a comprehensive appeals process to MSDE where decisions made impacted AYP performance only. Once federal regulations and guidance are released, Maryland will develop an actual modified assessment against grade level standards. The appeals process is intended as an interim strategy to be used until the modified State assessment is in place.

Maryland is to increase the achievement of all students, including students with disabilities. To reach the target of 100% proficiency by 2014 at the state, local school system and school level, Maryland has established rigorous annual measurable objectives (AMO) to increase the percentage of students with disabilities who make AYP in reading and in mathematics and reduce the gap between the performance of special education students and their non-disabled peers.

Should a school system fail to make AYP in any subgroup, the system will not make AYP for the subgroup or for overall AYP. At the school level, failure to make AYP in a single subgroup of students, such as students with disabilities, will mean that the school will not make AYP overall. For all students, including students with disabilities, schools and LEAs must meet the minimum "N" subgroup size of ≥ 5 . Nineteen group and subgroup cells for the AMO must be met in order for an individual school to achieve AYP. High schools must also meet the AMO for graduation. At the school level, failure to make AYP in a single subgroup of students, such as students with disabilities, will mean that the school will not make AYP overall. Not all schools failing to achieve AYP will be placed in School Improvement. For example, in some instances, a school will not achieve the target or AMO in one reported area (reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) in one particular year. The next year the school may make the target in that same reported area but miss the target in another reported area. Such schools will not typically be designated for School Improvement.

For systems in improvement, the failure for a single subgroup to make AYP may lead to NCLB-defined improvement status if the same subgroup and content area has not met AYP consistently at the elementary, middle and high school levels. This is consistent with Maryland's federally approved accountability plan. If a local school system does not meet the annual performance targets for each subgroup, a provision called Safe Harbor still allows a school system to make AYP if the system meets all performance targets in the aggregate, and the subgroup meets the other academic indicator; and the percentage of students achieving below the proficient level in that subgroup decreases by ten percent.

Maryland publicly reports on the participation and performance of all students, including students with disabilities, by grade and content areas from the 24 local school systems, three schools operated by Edison Schools, Inc., and Special Placement Schools for the MSA and Alt-MSA. The MSA and Alt-MSA assessments conducted at grades 3 through 8 for reading and math and the English 2 and as of 2005-2006 Algebra/Data Analysis during high school are the assessments used for reporting under NCLB. Beginning the spring of 2007, the science assessment will be piloted statewide for students in grades 5 and 8. The field test will serve to set standards for the operational assessment that will satisfy the NCLB to be administered in the spring of 2008. All students, including students with disabilities, must participate in either the MSA or the Alt-MSA. Through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) decision-making process, each student's IEP team determines in which statewide assessments the student will participate. The student's IEP includes documentation of that decision.

The Maryland report card includes the number of students tested, rates of participation and performance data for students with disabilities. Data relative to the participation and performance of students in Special Placement Schools are available on the report card and are also included as part the student's local school district's performance data. Comparisons between the performance of students with disabilities and other subgroups of students, including nondisabled students in general education are presented in detail. These reports are on the Maryland State Department of Education website at www.marylandreportcard.org.

Definitions

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)

The Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA) is the Maryland assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities if through the IEP process it has been determined they cannot participate in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) even with accommodations. The Alt-MSA assesses and reports student mastery of individually selected indicators and objectives from the reading and mathematics content standards. A portfolio is constructed of evidence that documents individual student mastery of the assessed reading and mathematics objectives.

Students with disabilities in grades 3-8 and 10 must participate in either MSA or Alt-MSA. The decision for which assessment is appropriate for an individual student is made by each student's IEP team. A student with a significant cognitive disability will participate in Alt-MSA if he or she meets each of the following criteria:

- The student is learning (at emerging, readiness, or functional literacy levels) extended Maryland reading and extended Maryland mathematics content standards objectives; **AND**
- The student requires explicit and ongoing instruction in functional skills; **AND**
- The student requires extensive and substantial modification (reduced complexity of objectives and learning materials, and more time to learn) of general education curriculum. The curriculum differs significantly from that of their non-disabled peers. They learn different objectives, may use different materials, and may participate in different learning activities; **AND**
- The student requires intensive instruction and may require extensive supports, including physical prompts, to learn, apply, and transfer or generalize knowledge and skills to multiple settings; **AND**

- The student requires extensive support to perform and participate meaningfully and productively in daily activities in school, home, community, and work environments; **AND**
- The student cannot participate in the MSA even with accommodations.

Students not meeting the criteria above will participate in the Maryland School Assessment, with or without accommodations, as appropriate, based on their IEP.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (Updated 2006 per USDE approved process)

Adequate Yearly Progress means the gain that schools, school systems, and states must make each year in the proportion of students achieving proficiency in reading and math. AYP replaces the School Performance Index as the method by which Maryland tracks academic progress and makes accountability decisions.

Maryland school systems do not make AYP if they fail to meet annual measurable objectives in reading and mathematics for the same student subgroup and content area across each school level [elementary, middle and high]. School systems must also meet the AMO for graduation rate for high school or attendance in elementary and middle school for students in the aggregate' and meet the testing participation requirement of 95%. To make AYP, individual schools must meet the annual measurable objective in reading and mathematics for students in the aggregate and for each student subgroup, in graduation rate for high school or attendance in elementary and middle school for students in the aggregate, and meet the testing participation requirement of 95%. See Indicator #1 for more information relative to graduation rate.

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO)

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) means State established performance targets that assess the progress of student subgroups, schools, school districts, and the state annually. This annual measurement ensures that 100% of students achieve proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics by the end of the school year in 2013-2014.

Between the 2002-2003 baseline and the 2013-2014 goal of 100% proficiency, the State has established annual performance targets. These targets, or annual measurable objectives, are set for reading, mathematics, attendance, and graduation rate. Every school and school system will be held to the same annual measurable objectives, although those objectives will be adjusted to each school's grade-level enrollment and structure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, K-8, K-12). Schools with grade structures that do not include tested grades will still be accountable for student performance; e.g., the performance of third-graders who come from K-2 schools will count for both the current school and the K-2 school previously attended.

Confidence Interval(s)

These are statistical procedures used in all tests of AYP determinations to ensure that decisions take into account inherent measurement error present in all accountability systems. The confidence interval is a statistical tool used in Maryland AYP determinations to ensure accurate and reliable accountability decisions. Because the accuracy of scores depends on the number of students in each group, the state uses a statistical test to help ensure that they make fair and valid AYP decisions for groups with different numbers of students.

Maryland School Assessment (MSA)

The Maryland School Assessment requires students in grades 3 through 8 to demonstrate what they know about reading and math and grade 10 students in reading. It is also given in grade 10 mathematics after students complete a high school Algebra/Data Analysis course. The MSA test measures basic as well as higher-level skills. Science will be added to the assessment requirement in grades 3, 5, and 8 in the 2007-2008 test year.

The Maryland School Assessment is reported with three statewide performance standards. These standards are divided into three levels of achievement: Basic, Proficient and Advanced.

Modified Maryland School Assessment (Mod-MSA)

In June 2005 MSDE received approval of a request submitted to the United States Department of Education (USDE) Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) to develop and implement alternate assessments against grade level standards in reading and math for all tested grades. Maryland has instituted an appeals process for students likely to be eligible for a Mod-MSA, pending development of an actual modified MSA to be based on yet-to-be released regulations and guidance from the U.S. Department of Education. In the interim, for 2005 and 2006, MSDE gave school systems the opportunity to appeal the AYP status for an individual school if that school did not achieve AYP in the special education subgroup only. Schools failing to achieve AYP for multiple subgroups are not permitted to appeal. Schools whose 2005 AYP status directly affects their 2006 School Improvement status would be eligible for appeal as well as schools that did not achieve AYP for a special education subgroup for the first time in 2005. Similarly, schools under the same status could appeal for eligible students in 2006.

A student who would have been eligible for the Mod-MSA would be identified based on their individual evaluation information and the instructional and service information on their IEPs. The student would be identified as appropriate for instruction and assessment using modified academic content standards. The student would have been identified as meeting **each** of the following criteria:

- The student is learning using modified academic content standards in reading and mathematics; **AND**
- The student requires modifications during assessments and instruction, in addition to specific accommodations. These testing/assessment and instructional modifications may include: reduced complexity of language, reduced number of test items, reduced amount of content to learn, paraphrasing of reading passages, embedded scaffolding for a written response such as sentence stems, guided response outline, guided questioning to generate response, software such as Co-Writer and Write Outloud, use of calculator, and spell check; **AND**
- The student requires the use of a modified general curriculum that is aligned with the Maryland Content Standards for the student's grade level but is modified (reduced amount to learn, reduced complexity, reduced output) so the student can access the content and demonstrate what he/she has learned; **AND**
- The student must have had at least three consecutive years of individualized intensive instruction (through evidenced-based interventions) in reading and mathematics consistent with his/her IEP (beginning with the most recent), and although progress toward grade level standards was made, he/she is not yet making progress at grade level; **AND**
- The student must demonstrate that he/she cannot attain proficiency in actual grade level MSA, even with accommodations.

Appeals are reviewed by MSDE, and if it is determined that documentation is adequate to demonstrate that the student(s) being appealed would have been eligible to take the Mod-MSA, and if the AYP recalculation shows that the school now meets AYP, then the school will be declared as making AYP. School Improvement decisions will be made based on existing decision rules using the updated AYP status

Participation Rate for AYP

This rate reflects the number of students enrolled on the day of testing. The rate is computed for each subgroup, and in the aggregate, for each of the reading and mathematics assessments by dividing the number of students presenting each testing group by the number of enrolled students in that group. Maryland requires 95% as the minimum criteria to meet the testing participation requirement for AYP.

In March 2004, the U.S. Department of Education announced new flexibilities in calculating participation rates. States are now able to average participation rates over a three-year period. Students who are unable to take the test during the testing and make-up windows because of a medical emergency will not count against the schools participation rate.

Data from the previous one or two years may be used to average the participation rate data for a school and/or subgroup, as needed. If this two- or three-year average meets or exceeds 95 percent, the AYP requirement will be met.

Performance Level Standards

Standards are measures of performance against which yearly results are compared. Standards help to examine critical aspects of instructional programs; help to ensure that all students receive quality instruction; hold educators accountable for quality instruction; and help to guide efforts toward school improvement. Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) performance standards were determined through deliberative processes by educators with involvement of critical stakeholders such as the legislators and members of the business community. The State Board of Education adopted all standards.

Maryland standards are divided into three levels of achievement:

- **Advanced** is a highly challenging and exemplary level of achievement indicating outstanding accomplishment in meeting the needs of students.
- **Proficient** is a realistic and rigorous level of achievement indicating proficiency in meeting the needs of students.
- **Basic** is a level of achievement indicating that more work is needed to attain proficiency in meeting the needs of students.

Student performance is reported in terms of these achievement levels:

Reading:

Basic: Students at this level are unable to adequately read and comprehend grade appropriate literature and informational passages.

Proficient: Students at this level can read grade appropriate text and demonstrate the ability to comprehend literature and informational passages.

Advanced: Students at this level can regularly read above-grade level text and demonstrate the ability to comprehend complex literature and informational passages.

Mathematics:

Basic: Students at this level demonstrate only partial mastery of the skills and concepts defined in the Maryland Mathematics Content Standards at their grade level.

Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate an understanding of fundamental grade level skills and concepts and can generally solve entry-level problems in mathematics.

Advanced: Students at this level can regularly solve complex problems in mathematics and demonstrate superior ability to reason mathematically.

Safe Harbor

Safe Harbor means that if a school does not meet the annual performance targets for each subgroup, a provision called Safe Harbor still allows a school to make AYP if the school meets all performance targets in the aggregate, and the subgroup meets the other academic indicator; and the percentage of students achieving below the proficient level in that subgroup decreases by ten percent. Safe Harbor is calculated using the last two years of test administration data.

Special Placement Schools

Special Placement Schools means schools that are not a part of the 24 regular Maryland school systems. These schools provide educational opportunities appropriate to their student population's abilities and needs. Examples of schools in this category include, Kennedy Krieger Middle and High Schools, the Maryland School for The Deaf, the Maryland School for the Blind, Department of Juvenile Justice schools and centers.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup

In the SPP submitted on February 2007, the baseline used was the number of local school systems making AYP in the 2004 state testing. Of the 24 Maryland school systems, 16 or 66% met AYP for the 2003-2004 school year. DSE/EIS has corrected the 2003-2004 baseline to reflect performance based on the 2005 MSA. The 2005 MSA testing resulted in 29% of LEAs making AYP in the subgroup of special education as the baseline. For all students, including students with disabilities, all of Maryland’s school systems met the minimum “N” size of 5 or greater. The increasing demands on performance of all Maryland students due to the significant increase in the Annual Measurable Objectives for the 2004-2005 testing is the reason for the drop in the number of LEAs making AYP for the subgroup of special education.

A. 29% of districts (7 of 24) met AYP objectives for progress for students with disabilities during 2004-2005.			
For all students, including students with disabilities, all of Maryland’s 24 LEAs met the minimum “N” subgroup size of ≥ 5 .			
LEAs Making AYP for Students With Disabilities (SWD)	Met AYP for SWD in Reading	Met AYP for SWD in Math	Met AYP for SWD in Both Reading and Math
2004-2005	10 of 24 districts 42%	9 of 24 districts 37.5%	7 of 24 districts 29%

B. Participation rate

B.a. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7609	7600
4	8242	8239
5	8656	8645
6	8596	8601
7	8930	8939
8	8949	8960
10	6631	6531
Total	57613	57515

B. b. Number of Children with IEPs in a Regular Assessment with No Accommodations

Maryland did not collect data on this item during the 2004–2005 school year. For the 2004-2005 school year all students with IEPs in a regular assessment are counted as having accommodations. The APR for 2005-2006 includes data on students tested with and without accommodations.

B. c. Number of Children with IEPs in a Regular Assessment with Accommodations
(Updated 2006)

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7047	7041
4	7645	7651
5	7905	7903
6	7740	7693
7	7972	7896
8	8107	8042
10 End-of-Course	5772	5677*

The number of students with IEPs who were assessed in math and reading at grade 10 was made available after submission of the SPP for 2004-2005 and has since been included in the above table. Note that for 2005 the grade 10, end-of-course assessment in mathematics was Geometry and for reading, English 2.

B. d. Number of Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards
(Revised 2006)

Grade	Math	Reading
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
10	0	0

Results from the appeals process for the modified Maryland School Assessment applied only to qualified individual schools in terms of making Adequate Yearly Progress. Individual student performance is not impacted by the appeals process. Student performance data will be available upon the development and implementation of the modified assessment against grade level standards. In Maryland for the 2004-2005 state assessment 859 appeals were granted out of the 1350 submitted.

B. e. Number of Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Achievement Standards

Grade	Math	Reading
3	526	526
4	541	541
5	686	686
6	793	793
7	910	910
8	842	842
10/ End-of-course	858	858
Total	5159	5159

Overall Percentage Account for any children included in a, but not included in b, c, d, or e above

Overall Percent = $b + c + d + e$ divided by a. These are corrected tables for 2004-2005 to show that students (d) that participated in the Mod-MSA appeals process did not receive modified scores, rather the results were applied to eligible schools only in terms of the school meeting AYP. (Revised 2006 to include grade 10 information and to reflect non-duplicated counts for students who participated in the modified MSA process since these students are counted in the general assessment pending development of an actual modified assessment.)

Maryland did not collect data on this item during the 2004–2005 school year. For the 2004-2005 school year all students with IEPs in a regular assessment are counted as having accommodations. The APR for 2005-2006 includes data on students tested with and without accommodations.

Math ($b + c + d + e \div a \times 100 = \text{Percentage}$)							
	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
Grade							
3	0	7047	0	527	7574	7609	100%
4	0	7645	0	542	8187	8242	100%
5	0	7905	0	686	8591	8656	100%
6	0	7740	0	793	8533	8596	100%
7	0	7972	0	910	8882	8930	100%
8	0	8107	0	842	8949	8949	100%
10	0	5772	0	859	6631	6634	99.9%

Reading ($b + c + d + e \div a \times 100 = \text{Percentage}$)							
	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
Grade							
3	0	7041	0	527	7568	7600	99.5%
4	0	7651	0	542	8193	8240	99.4%
5	0	7903	0	686	8589	8645	99.3%
6	0	7693	0	793	8486	8601	98.6%
7	0	7896	0	910	8806	8939	98.5%
8	0	8042	0	842	8884	8960	99.1%
10	0	5677	0	859	6536	6535	100%

C. Proficiency rate

C. a. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed Updated 2006 to include Grade 10

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7609	7600
4	8242	8239
5	8656	8645
6	8596	8601
7	8930	8939
8	8949	8960
10 End-of-Course	6631	6531
Total	57,613	57,515

C.b. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Regular Assessment with No Accommodations

Maryland did not collect data on this item during the 2004–2005 school year. For the 2004-2005 school year all students with IEPs in a regular assessment are counted as having accommodations.

C.c. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Regular Assessment with Accommodations Updated 2006

Grade	Math	Reading
3	3509	3634
4	3645	4318
5	2869	3525
6	1685	2558
7	1434	2268
8	1376	2231
10 End-of-Course	977	895

The number of students with IEPs who were assessed proficient or advanced in math and reading at Grade 10 was not available for last year’s submission pending final resolution of the appeals. Data has since been included in Table C.c.

C.d. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards. (Revised 2006 per earlier discussion of the modified MSA appeals process.)

Grade	Math	Reading
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
10	0	0

Results from the appeals process for the modified Maryland School Assessment applied only to qualified individual schools in terms of making Adequate Yearly Progress. Individual student performance is not impacted by the appeals process. Student performance data will be available upon the development and implementation of the modified assessment against grade level standards. In Maryland for the 2004-2005 state assessment 859 appeals were granted out of the 1350 submitted. Refer to the earlier discussion of the Maryland Mod-MSA appeals process for further clarification regarding results.

C.e. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Alternate Assessment against Alternate Achievement Standards.

Grade	Math	Reading
3	388	378
4	383	393
5	495	509
6	530	547
7	592	617
8	567	576
10 End-of – Course	537	567
Total	3492	3587

Overall Percentage = (b + c + d + e) ÷ a x 100 (Revised 2006*)

Revised 2006 to include grade 10 information and to reflect non-duplicated counts for students who participated in the modified MSA process since student performance is already counted in the general assessment pending development of an actual modified assessment.)

Math (b+ c+ d+ e) ÷ a x 100 = Percentage)							
	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
Grade							
3	0	3509	0	388	3897	7609	51.2%
4	0	3645	0	383	4028	8242	48.8%
5	0	2869	0	495	3364	8656	38.8%
6	0	1685	0	530	2215	8596	25.7%
7	0	1434	0	592	2026	8930	22.6%
8	0	1376	0	567	1943	8949	21.7%
10	0	997	0	537	1534	6534	23.4%

Reading (b+ c+ d+ e) ÷ a x100 = Percentage)							
	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
Grade							
3	0	3634	0	378	4012	7600	52.7%
4	0	4318	0	393	4711	8239	57.1%
5	0	3525	0	509	4034	8645	46.6%
6	0	2558	0	547	3105	8601	36.1%
7	0	2268	0	617	2885	8939	32.2%
8	0	2231	0	576	2807	8960	31.3%
10	0	895	0	567	1462	6536	22.3%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A. AYP

MSDE has determined State level AYP results for 2004-2005 and found that 29% of local school systems made Adequate Yearly Progress. This means that 7 out of 24 local school systems met AYP for the subgroup special education in reading and in math. For all students, including students with disabilities, all 24 LEAs met the minimum “N” subgroup size of ≥ 5. (Updated April 5, 2007)

B. Participation

Participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments ranges from 98% to 100% depending on grade level and content being tested. Therefore, all of the special education subgroups exceed the State established 95% participation rate for schools, local school systems and the State. This participation rate is applicable to all students, including students with disabilities. All students must participate in the MSA or Alt-MSA. Students that meet rigorous eligibility rules may also participate in the State’s modified MSA appeals process after having taken the MSA. Through the decision making process, the IEP team determines the statewide and district-wide assessments in which the child will participate. The IEP includes documentation of that decision. Note that participation in the Mod-MSA appeals process pending development of an actual modified assessment impacts individual school performance only as described previously in the SPP.

Students with disabilities are expected to participate in Statewide assessments. Student count and rate of participation are calculated based on the school enrollment on the day of testing and publicly reported on the MSDE website by subgroup, grade, content area, and assessment. All students are provided several opportunities to take the MSA or the Alt -MSA as per individual student IEPs. A student that fails to take the assessment during these make-up times is assigned a basic score. The differences in numbers of students who took the mathematics and reading tests in grades 3 – 8 are due to the fact that the two content area tests are administered over a 12-day period (8 days from which local school systems select 4 days to schedule a primary administration of reading and mathematics, and an additional 4-day period for make-up testing for both contents). Due to student mobility in Maryland, students come in and out of various schools and school systems during the testing period. While overall it would be expected that approximately the same number of students would take both content areas, because of student withdrawals and enrollments during the testing window, the two content areas are never exactly the same. A student may take reading, for example, and then move out of state, etc. To date, there have been no parental exceptions reported.

MSDE did not collect data on the number of students with IEPs that received accommodations but has begun to do so for the 2005-2006 school year with results reported in this year's APR. For the 2004-2005 school year, all students with IEPs in a regular assessment are counted as having accommodations.

C. Proficiency

Proficiency Levels are determined on a yearly basis. Proficiency can be met in one of two ways. The first is to meet or exceed the AMO; the second is through performance within its confidence interval. The confidence interval widens the target around the AMO and varies by the size of the group, such that the smaller the group tested the larger the interval. Progress in reading and in mathematics is measured by AMO in the aggregate and for student subgroups. AMO are the same for disabled and non-disabled students. AMO have been established for each grade level and content area. The state-established AMO are performance targets that assess annual progress for every student subgroup, school, school system, and the State. Maryland's AMO increase each year and are designed to ensure that 100% of students achieve proficiency in reading and mathematics by the end of the school year in 2013-2014. The AMO for 2005 was a significant increase over the AMO for 2004. The 2005 State AMO for math was 44.1%. The 2005 State AMO for reading was 54.8%.

Using the overall percentage chart for the math portion of all assessments (MSA and Alt-MSA), students in grades three and four demonstrate the highest rate of proficient or above. Students in the eighth grade demonstrate the lowest rate of 21.7% proficient or above. Grades 3, 4, and 5 demonstrate higher rates of proficiency in math (51.2, 48.8 and 38.8 respectively) than grades 6, 7, and 8 (25.7, 21.7 and 23.4 respectively).

The impact of Maryland's participation in the Federal *Reading First* initiative continues to be a factor in the rates of proficiency in reading seen in the primary grades, especially Grade 3 where students with disabilities continue to perform at the AMO. Using the overall percentage chart for the reading portion of all assessments (MSA and Alt-MSA), students in the fourth grade demonstrate the highest rate of 57.1% proficient or above. Students in the eighth and tenth grades demonstrate the lowest rates of proficiency and above at 31.3% and 22.3% respectively.

<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>A. 29% of the State's local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with disabilities will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the content area AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="524 468 1192 751"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>56.96%</td><td>50.91%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>56.71%</td><td>65.35%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>47.15%</td><td>57.05%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>38.08%</td><td>59.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>35.47%</td><td>57.25%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>33.75%</td><td>53.36%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>29.80%</td><td>45.30%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>40.68%</td><td>40.00%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	56.96%	50.91%	4	56.71%	65.35%	5	47.15%	57.05%	6	38.08%	59.50%	7	35.47%	57.25%	8	33.75%	53.36%	10	29.80%	45.30%	12	40.68%	40.00%
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	56.96%	50.91%																										
4	56.71%	65.35%																										
5	47.15%	57.05%																										
6	38.08%	59.50%																										
7	35.47%	57.25%																										
8	33.75%	53.36%																										
10	29.80%	45.30%																										
12	40.68%	40.00%																										
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>A. 33% of the State's local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="524 1003 1192 1289"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>66.53%</td><td>61.82%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>66.33%</td><td>73.05%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>58.89%</td><td>66.59%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>51.84%</td><td>68.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>49.81%</td><td>66.75%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>48.45%</td><td>63.73%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>29.8%</td><td>52.17%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>38.56%</td><td>45.3%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	66.53%	61.82%	4	66.33%	73.05%	5	58.89%	66.59%	6	51.84%	68.50%	7	49.81%	66.75%	8	48.45%	63.73%	10	29.8%	52.17%	12	38.56%	45.3%
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	66.53%	61.82%																										
4	66.33%	73.05%																										
5	58.89%	66.59%																										
6	51.84%	68.50%																										
7	49.81%	66.75%																										
8	48.45%	63.73%																										
10	29.8%	52.17%																										
12	38.56%	45.3%																										
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>A. 38% of the State's local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="524 1541 1192 1824"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>71.31%</td><td>62.27%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>71.14%</td><td>76.90%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>64.76%</td><td>71.36%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>58.72%</td><td>73.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>56.98%</td><td>71.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>55.82%</td><td>68.91%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>38.6%</td><td>59.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>47.33%</td><td>52.2%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	71.31%	62.27%	4	71.14%	76.90%	5	64.76%	71.36%	6	58.72%	73.00%	7	56.98%	71.50%	8	55.82%	68.91%	10	38.6%	59.00%	12	47.33%	52.2%
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	71.31%	62.27%																										
4	71.14%	76.90%																										
5	64.76%	71.36%																										
6	58.72%	73.00%																										
7	56.98%	71.50%																										
8	55.82%	68.91%																										
10	38.6%	59.00%																										
12	47.33%	52.2%																										

<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>A. 50% of the State's local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="522 436 1192 716"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>76.09%</td><td>72.73%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>75.95%</td><td>80.75%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>70.64%</td><td>76.14%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>65.60%</td><td>77.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>64.15%</td><td>76.25%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>63.18%</td><td>74.09%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td></td><td>65.83%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>56.11%</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	76.09%	72.73%	4	75.95%	80.75%	5	70.64%	76.14%	6	65.60%	77.50%	7	64.15%	76.25%	8	63.18%	74.09%	10		65.83%	12	56.11%	
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	76.09%	72.73%																										
4	75.95%	80.75%																										
5	70.64%	76.14%																										
6	65.60%	77.50%																										
7	64.15%	76.25%																										
8	63.18%	74.09%																										
10		65.83%																										
12	56.11%																											
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>A. 54% of the State's local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="522 974 1192 1253"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>80.87%</td><td>78.18%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>80.76%</td><td>84.60%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>76.51%</td><td>80.91%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>72.48%</td><td>82.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>71.32%</td><td>81.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>70.55%</td><td>79.27%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td></td><td>72.67%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>64.89%</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	80.87%	78.18%	4	80.76%	84.60%	5	76.51%	80.91%	6	72.48%	82.00%	7	71.32%	81.00%	8	70.55%	79.27%	10		72.67%	12	64.89%	
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	80.87%	78.18%																										
4	80.76%	84.60%																										
5	76.51%	80.91%																										
6	72.48%	82.00%																										
7	71.32%	81.00%																										
8	70.55%	79.27%																										
10		72.67%																										
12	64.89%																											
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>A. 58% of the State's local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="522 1514 1192 1793"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>85.65%</td><td>83.64%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>85.57%</td><td>88.45%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>82.38%</td><td>85.68%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>79.36%</td><td>86.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>78.49%</td><td>85.75%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>77.91%</td><td>84.45%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td></td><td>79.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>73.67%</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	85.65%	83.64%	4	85.57%	88.45%	5	82.38%	85.68%	6	79.36%	86.50%	7	78.49%	85.75%	8	77.91%	84.45%	10		79.50%	12	73.67%	
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	85.65%	83.64%																										
4	85.57%	88.45%																										
5	82.38%	85.68%																										
6	79.36%	86.50%																										
7	78.49%	85.75%																										
8	77.91%	84.45%																										
10		79.50%																										
12	73.67%																											

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:
(Revised 2/1/2007)

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to improve the performance of students with disabilities that will lead to achieving AMO, AYP and established targets.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff LSS staff
Collect data on students with disabilities with accommodations	July 1, 2005 and ongoing thereafter	DAA staff Local Accountability Coordinators
Complete Mod-MSA appeals process	July 1, 2005 – January, 2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultants
Advise LSS and Special Placement Schools of actions taken by the State Board of Education and Department relative to Statewide Assessments	August 2005 – June 2006 and will remain ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DAA staff Office of Academic Policy State Board of Education
Provide professional development modules regarding IDEA 2004 changes	July 2005 and September 2006 and as needed	DSE/EIS staff Division of Instruction (DI) staff Johns Hopkins University, Center of Technology and Education (JHU-CTE)
Provide professional development modules to LSS and PA on differentiation of instruction, interventions, the Voluntary State Curriculum	July, 2005 – June 30, 2006 and Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DI staff JHU-CTE
Collaborate with general and special educators at the state, local and school levels. Participate in <i>Reading First</i> activities.	July, 2005 – June 30, 2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DI staff JHU-CTE
Provide technical assistance to local school systems regarding the instruction and achievement of students with disabilities	July 2005 - June 30, 2006 school year and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DI staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Award capacity building achievement grants that support promising practices to accelerate the performance of students with disabilities	September 2005 and annually thereafter	DSE/EIS staff JHU
Expand the web-based statewide IEP system currently being piloted to increase development of quality IEP goals and objectives based on the student's present levels of academic performance, and aligned with the VSC indicators.	July 2005 – June 2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Develop and disseminate “A Guide to Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating the Use of Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment of Students with Disabilities”	September 2005 – July 2006 and annually thereafter	DAA staff DSE/EIS staff Local Accountability Coordinators
Continue the development of the www.md.k12 website	July 2005 – June 2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Develop and disseminate Technical Assistance Bulletins as needed	July 2005 – June 2006 ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Support local school system outreach on what was funded through the discretionary grants and is working to accelerate performance of students with disabilities.	October 2005 and annually thereafter	DSE/EIS LSS staffs
Participate in national and state research and policy organizations to ensure current information on what is working to improve performance for students with IEPs NEW	October 2005 – September 2008	Member of: Statewide Technology Advisory Council and National Center for Innovation & Improvement's Advisory Board
Participate in the national NCLB/IDEA Partnership to facilitate development of Title I and Special Education initiatives to accelerate student subgroup performance, including those with disabilities and FARMs.	July 2005-September 2007 and Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff (Title I)

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Develop and disseminate a review of 5 elementary schools that serve diverse student populations and have shown significant progress in achievement for all students, including those with disabilities. To be known as the "Getting Results" document.	July 2005 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Selected principals from LSS
Create revised Alt-MSA Handbook and Condition Code Packet. Provide technical assistance to local school systems and nonpublic schools on request NEW	June 2005-June 2006	DSE/EIS staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

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

Measurement:

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100. |
|--|

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**Indicator 4A**

Beginning with the suspension data for the 2000-2001 school year, Maryland has identified local school systems (LSS) with a significant discrepancy in suspension rates for five school years. Two separate analyses of the suspension data at the State level and the local level have been performed to compare the percentages of children with disabilities suspended to the rates for non-disabled children. The first analysis compares the percentages of each population that had single "extended" suspensions greater than 10 days in duration. The second analysis compared the percentages of each population that had "multiple" suspensions summing to greater than 10 days in duration. The analyses of both extended suspensions and multiple suspensions used a "comparative ratio" approach in analyzing the percentages between the two populations. The percentage of students with disabilities was divided by the percentage of non-disabled students. If the resulting ratio was greater than one (1.00), this indicated that the students with disabilities were suspended at a higher rate than their non-disabled peers. MSDE decided to use a ratio of greater than or equal to 2 to 1 (2.00+) as the first criterion for flagging an LSS as having a significant discrepancy. Since extended suspensions as well as multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days are relatively infrequent occurrences, the problem of small numbers in LSS groups required a further criterion. MSDE decided to use a rule that both groups needed to have at least 20 students in each cell for a finding of a significant discrepancy to be identified by MSDE.

See page 2-3, "Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process" for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland's BTE Master Plan process.

Indicator 4B

Beginning in the 2005-2006 school year analysis of the rates of suspension and expulsion were modified to include the analysis of the data by race and ethnicity. When the suspension data was disaggregated by race and ethnicity the numbers in the various cells were substantially smaller. In order to conduct a more meaningful analysis by race and ethnicity Maryland investigated combining extended suspensions of greater than 10 days and multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days into a single total of “suspensions and expulsions of students greater than 10 days” which included all suspensions summing to greater than 10 days. Maryland continues to compare the rates of suspension of students with disabilities to those of non-disabled students.

With the July 1, 2005 effective date of IDEA 2004 Maryland examined and analyzed available LSS data on suspension by race/ethnicity and identified five LSS required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B allocation for early intervening services in accordance with 20 U.S.C. §1418(d)(2)(B). Data collection and an analysis were conducted for all students suspended, combining extended suspensions and multiple suspensions, as well as separate analyses for students by each race and ethnicity. In each analysis, students with disabilities were compared to non-disabled students. Otherwise the methodology used in this process remains the same. MSDE conducted this combined analysis for the 2005-2006 school year to support the establishment of appropriate targets for future years.

The analyses of combined suspensions used a “comparative ratio” approach in analyzing the percentages between the two populations. The percentage of students with disabilities was divided by the percentage of non-disabled students of the same race/ethnicity. If the resulting ratio was greater than one (1.00), this indicated that the students with disabilities were suspended at a higher rate than their non-disabled peers. A ratio of greater than or equal to 2 to 1 (2.00+) is the first criterion for flagging an LSS as having a significant discrepancy. MSDE applied a rule that both groups needed to have at least 20 students in each cell for a finding of a significant discrepancy to be identified.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Indicator 4A

See the attached suspension data charts. Chart 1 reports “Extended Suspensions Greater Than 10 Ten Days.” Chart 2 reports “Multiple Suspensions Summing to Greater Than 10 Days”. Chart 3 shows the affect of combining “Extended and Multiple Suspension Summing to Greater than 10 Days.” As noted in the preceding section, MSDE has conducted a combined analysis for the 2004-2005 so as to be able to establish appropriate targets for future years. The baseline data for 2004-2005 compared with subsequent years closely resembles the 2004-2005 data for “multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days”.

Indicator 4B

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Number of LSS with disparity ratios greater than 2.0 by race and ethnicity

Racial and Ethnic Group	Number of LSS with Ratios greater than or equal to 2.0	Percentage
American Indian	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	5	20.83%
Hispanic	1	4.16%
White, non-Hispanic	5	20.83%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

When considering significant discrepancy in rates of suspension by ethnicity, between 1 and 5 LSS were identified using the “comparative ratio” method. The differences and their percentages of all districts are presented in the table below. The unit measured in this case was all students experiencing an out-of-school suspension greater than 10 days in length.

Number of LSS with disparity ratios greater than 2.0 by race and ethnicity. Number of suspensions correlates to discussion below chart.

Racial and Ethnic Group	Number of LSS with Ratios greater than or equal to 2.0*	Percentage	Number of extended suspensions for SWD in identified local school systems
American Indian	0	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	5	20.83%	34, 97, 33, 137, 69
Hispanic	1	4.16%	56
White, non-Hispanic	5	20.83%	21, 63, 129, 23, 26

* Some LSS are discrepant for more than one subgroup.

Data show that five (5) counties show significant discrepancy for African American students. These local school systems were also identified as disproportionate in Indicator 4A, “Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year” For these LSS, the comparative ratio ranges from 2.05 to 2.55. For Hispanic students, one (1) LSS is significantly discrepant with a comparative ratio of 2.77. That LSS is also discrepant for African American students and is significantly discrepant overall. Finally, for White students five (5) LSS are significantly discrepant. Three of these LSS are also discrepant for African American students and are significantly discrepant overall. Among these LSS, the comparative ratio has a range between 2.07 and 3.23. When considering all subgroups, seven LSS are discrepant for one or more racial or ethnic subgroups.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>A No more than six (6) or 25% of the LSS will show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students.</p> <p>B <i>This is a new indicator (baseline year FFY 2005) and measurable and rigorous targets for 2006-2010 below were based on baseline data.</i></p>
2006 (2006-2007)	<p>A No more than five (5) or 20.83% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students.</p>

	<p>B. No more than five (5) or 20.83% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities students with disabilities by race/ethnicity compared with all non-disabled students of the same race and ethnicity.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>A. No more than four (4) or 16.67% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students.</p> <p>B. No more than four (4) or 16.67% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities by race/ethnicity compared with all non-disabled students of the same race and ethnicity.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>A. No more than three (3) or 12.5% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students.</p> <p>B. No more than three (3) or 12.5% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities by race/ethnicity compared with all non-disabled students of the same race and ethnicity.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>A. No more than two (2) or 8.33% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students.</p> <p>B. No more than two (2) or 8.33% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities by race/ethnicity compared with all non-disabled students of the same race and ethnicity.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>A. No LSS (0) or 0% will show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students.</p> <p>B. No LSS (0) or 0% will show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities by race/ethnicity compared with all non-disabled students of the same race and ethnicity.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Monitor LSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities to decrease the suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity and increase the	February 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultant DSFSSS staff LSS staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

usage of positive behavior interventions and supports.		
Review of LSS student suspension records and report findings to LSS superintendent	November 2007 and annually	DSE/EIS staff Consultant DSFSSS staff LSS staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices relative to suspension/expulsion.	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff LSS staff
Require the revision of LSS policies, procedures, and practices, as appropriate, when a significant discrepancy is identified in the rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity as compared to similarly situated nondisabled peers.	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff LSS staff
Provide technical assistance to LSS related to positive student behavior interventions.	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Collaborate with Division of Student, Family, and School Services (DSFSSS) to implement positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) within LSS.	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Identify and implement best practice relative to reducing/eliminating disproportionate suspension of students with disabilities regardless of racial/ethnic .	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Provide professional development to LSS staff on issues related to suspension of students with disabilities.	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Partner with a national technical assistance agency, National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) to provide assistance to local school systems identified as significantly disproportionate.	December 2006 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Special Education State Advisory Committee State Disproportionality Steering Committee NCCRESt
Review the policies, procedures and practices of local school systems that have not been previously identified as discrepant	January 2007 – ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

in suspensions and/or expulsions.		
Increase the capacity of local school systems to identify trends, patterns and pockets of disproportionate suspension and expulsion practices through the provision of detailed data reports on suspension and expulsion for each local school system.	October 2006 – ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DAA staff DSFSSS staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maryland’s LRE data are collected annually for the October child count and reported in the Maryland Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables document. This document permits local school systems (LSS) and public agencies (PA) to review data, refer to past documents to establish trends, and plan for improvement.

See page 2-3, “Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process” for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland’s BTE Master Plan process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day:
 Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day (57,343) divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs (100,160) times 100
(57,343/100,160) x 100 = 57.25%

Total # Students with Disabilities, 6-21*	Number	Percent (%)
100,160	57,343	57.25%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

B. Children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.

Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day (17,749) divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs (100,160) times 100.
(17,749/100,160) x 100 = 17.72%

Total # Students with Disabilities *	Number	Percent (%)
100,160	17,749	17.72%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

C. Children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements (7,930) divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs (100,160) times 100.
(7,930/100,160) x 100 = 7.92%

Total # Students with Disabilities*	Number	Percent (%)
100,160	7,930	7.92%

	Home	Hospital	Public Day	Private Day	Public Residential	Private Residential	Total
Number	286	17	3,407	3,861	47	312	7,930
Percent	0.29%	0.02%	3.40%	3.85%	0.05%	0.31%	7.92%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Placement of students and youth ages 6-21 in general education has shown improvement in all areas over time. However, while placement in the most restrictive placement, separate school, has shown improvement over time, it continues to remain high when compared to other states and is an area of concern and focus for the State.

- A. LRE data from the October 2004 child count (FFY 2004) indicate that 57.25% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. This is a 2.18% increase over the October 2003 child count and met the Maryland target to increase the number of students in settings designed primarily for students without disabilities. According to 2003 Annual Data Table, published by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education programs, on the IDEA data website at <https://www.ideadata.org/index.html>, Maryland’s data in this category was 55% compared to the national baseline of 50%.
- B. LRE data from the October 2004 child count (FFY 2004) indicate that 17.72% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. This is a 0.37% decrease over the October 2003 child count. According to 2003 Annual Data Table, published by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education programs, on the

SPP Template – Part B (3)

IDEA data website at <https://www.ideadata.org/index.html>, Maryland’s data in this category was 19% compared to the national baseline of 18%.

- C. LRE data from the October 2004 child count (FFY 2004) indicate that 7.92% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, receive specialized instruction and related services in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital settings. No significant changes in the data were noted from the previous year. Although the data has improved over time, Maryland’s data, particularly in public/private separate day schools, the current available national data collected and published by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education on the IDEA data website at <https://www.ideadata.org/index.html> indicates the national average is 2.8% for this category, while Maryland was at 7.1% in this category.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>A. 57.75% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 17.47% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 7.67% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007) REVISED 2/1/07</p>	<p>A. 60.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 16.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 7.42% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008) REVISED 2/1/07</p>	<p>A. 60.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 16.36% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 7.17% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009) REVISED 2/1/07</p>	<p>A. 61.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 16.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 6.92% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

<p>2009 (2009-2010) REVISED 2/1/07</p>	<p>A. 61.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 15.86% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 6.67% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011) REVISED 2/1/07</p>	<p>A. 62.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 15.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 6.42% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to educate students with disabilities in the general curriculum in learning environments that are conducive to learning through the provision of supplementary aids, services, supports, strategies, and accommodations.</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff LSS staff</p>
<p>Include LRE data for students ages 6-21 in local school system report cards.</p>	<p>January 2006- June 2006</p>	<p>IT Staff</p>
<p>Explore the impact of the State funding mechanism for students for whom nonpublic placement is sought.</p>	<p>November 2005-June 2006</p>	<p>Data/Finance</p>
<p>Explore arrangements made with public and private institutions to implement LRE placement options for students with disabilities such as</p>	<p>January 2005 – January 2006</p>	<p>LSS staff PA staff Other agencies</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

memorandums of agreements or special implementation procedures for those arrangements. (34 CFR 300.554) (legal authority reference revised 2/1/07 to reflect final federal regulations)		
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to least restrictive environment.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Review and revise, as appropriate, the Statewide IEP to ensure all requirements related to LRE determination are included and include special provisions for preschool students.	January 2006 - June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JJHU-CTE
Utilize the implementation of the Statewide IEP to review application of IEP decision making requirements to determine the LRE.	January 2006 – June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Explore the use of a data mining program to disaggregate LRE data for preschool for use in improvement planning.	October 2005 – June 2006	Data Mining Program JHU-CTE
Continue the directed use of grant funds toward LRE initiatives.	March 2006- September 2007	DSE/EIS staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices to assure the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions to assure access to and participation in general curriculum in the LRE.	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Provide technical assistance to identify best practices that promote provision of services in the LRE.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maryland’s LRE data is collected annually for the October count and reported in the Maryland Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables document. This document permits LSS/PA to review data, refer to past documents to establish trends, and plan for improvement. For 3-5 year olds, the data is reported by each age group as well as in the aggregate. Accuracy in coding practices remains a problem. LSS/PA continue to struggle with the consistent application of codes.

See page 2-3, “Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process” for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland’s BTE Master Plan process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Total 3-5 year olds*	Settings with typically developing peers	Home	Early Childhood	Combined	Total
12,227	Number	119	2,402	2,436	4,957
	Percent	0.97%	19.65%	19.92%	40.54%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For 3-5 year olds, the data is reported by each age group as well as in the aggregate. LRE data for students ages 3-5 has not demonstrated the desired change the State expects.

LRE data from the October 2004 Child Count (FFY 2004) indicate that 40.54% of students with disabilities receive specialized instruction and related services in early childhood general education settings. The October 2003 Child Count indicated that 37.38% of such students were served in early childhood general education settings. This is a 3.16% increase over the October 2003 Child Count and met the Maryland target to increase the number of students in settings designed primarily for students without disabilities. LRE data from the October 2004 Child Count (FFY 2004) indicate that 23.46% of students with disabilities receive specialized instruction and related services in early childhood special education settings. This is a 2.15% decrease over the October 2003 Child Count. In 2003, Maryland ranked -8 below the national baseline for this category. Maryland continues to explore and promote the use of community based options for preschool students.

Placement of students ages 3-5 in environments with typical peers continues to prove difficult because there are relatively few school based general classes for this age group. The State is working to expand community based options. The State is also looking forward to changes in coding of this population. Consistent and accurate coding for preschool students continues to be a problem. The State will address this issue during data manager training and within its monitoring activities.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	41.00% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2006 (2006-2007)	41.50% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2007 (2007-2008)	42.00% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2008 (2008-2009)	42.50% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2009 (2009-2010)	43.00% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2010 (2010-2011)	43.50% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timeline	Resources
Hire additional state level staff to provide technical assistance to LSS on the preschool LRE continuum and effective strategies to strengthen community partnerships with other public and private early childhood programs	December 2005	DSE/EIS staff MSDE Human Resources Office
Provide technical assistance to LSS and community early childhood programs to implement effective strategies of LRE for 3-5 year olds in community settings	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed for the participation of students with disabilities in appropriate early learning activities with nondisabled peers in environments that are conducive to learning.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DSFSSS staff LSS staff
Include LRE data for students ages 3-5 in local school system report cards.	January 2006- June 2006	DSE/EIS staff MSDE IT staff DAA staff
Explore the impact of the State funding mechanism for students for whom nonpublic placement is sought.	November 2005-June 2006	DSE/EIS staff
Explore arrangements made with public and private institutions to implement LRE placement options for students with disabilities such as memorandums of agreements or special implementation procedures for those arrangements. (34 CFR 300.554) (legal authority reference revised 2/1/07 to	January 2005 – January 2006	DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA/Other agencies staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

reflect final federal regulations)		
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Review and revise, as appropriate, the State-wide IEP to ensure all requirements related to LRE determination provisions for preschool students are included.	January 2006 - June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Utilize the implementation of the Statewide IEP to review the application of IEP decision making requirements to determine the LRE.	January 2006 – June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Explore the use of a data mining program to disaggregate LRE data for preschool data for use in improvement planning.	October 2005 – June 2006	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Continue the directed use of grant funds toward LRE initiatives.	March 2006- September 2007	DSE/EIS staff
DSE/EIS will review LSS policies and procedures for practices that assure access to and participation in general curriculum and appropriate preschool activities in the LRE with the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions as determined appropriate by each child’s IEP team.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Post local program preschool LRE best practices descriptions and related resources/products developed on Early Childhood Gateway website (EC Gateway framework has been developed;	Initiate March 2006 & Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE

SPP Template – Part B (3)

<p>links to professional development modules on the IFSP and EC Transition have been incorporated)</p>		
<p>Design and develop on-line professional development module on the LRE decision making process for preschool students with disabilities for access by local school system preschool special education personnel, community early childhood program staff, and families (link to this module will be on EC Gateway website)</p>	<p>July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE Content Specialist Consultant</p>
<p>Provide technical assistance and professional development resources and activities to local Family Support Services Coordinators in each LSS to build their capacity to support and strengthen family involvement in the LRE decision making process.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Family Support Services Coordinators DSE/EIS staff Local Preschool Partners</p>
<p>Technical assistance to LSS to identify and implement best practices to increase the provision of services in the settings with nondisabled peers.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1. Revisions for this indicator were reviewed by the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SESAC) and the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC: birth-five focus). Both the SESAC and the SICC reviewed the results of the FFY 05 data collection for Maryland's Early Childhood Accountability System, discussed proposed activities to continue statewide implementation and made recommendations for changes or modifications to the system.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children 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))

Measurement:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
 - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):
 - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Department of Education established the Maryland Early Childhood Accountability System (ECAS) for measuring outcomes for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities and their families. Through the ECAS, MSDE will:

- 1) Meet its federal reporting requirements in the Annual Performance Report;
- 2) Evaluate the effectiveness of the State's early interventions and preschool special education systems;
- 3) Improve local service delivery and results; and
- 4) Assist local programs to improve IFSP and IEP decision making and results for individual students.

Through its General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG), MSDE built a system based on child and family change, established a measurement system based on valid and reliable assessment tools and instruments, and for the collection of data for preschool children, created a web-based data collection system for aggregating, analyzing, and reporting outcome data. In addition, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, expanded its partnership with the Division for Early Childhood Development to expand an existing professional development system to support full implementation of the ECAS.

MSDE has built a Birth through Five framework for the ECAS, ensuring collaboration at the State and local levels and building on existing partnerships and initiatives in the State to prepare young children with disabilities to succeed in school and community life. Maryland's ECAS includes specific plans for collecting and reporting outcome data at entry and exit for:

- 1) Infants and toddlers with disabilities based on the collection of present levels of development data from the IFSP process (Part C Indicator #3), and
- 2) Preschool children with disabilities using the Work Sampling System (WSS) (Part B Indicator #7).

ECAS for Preschool:

- The WSS is an age-anchored early childhood assessment that provides a picture of a child's development in relation to typically developing peers. It is a nationally validated instrument, with established protocols for administering and scoring. The WSS takes an individualized approach to learning and assessment, and yields child-specific information that can assist with modifying instruction. It evaluates progress as well as performance, thus allowing children with special needs to demonstrate growth even in areas where their performance is delayed. It is the instrument for use by all of Maryland's local school systems for the annual required fall kindergarten readiness assessment. Additional administrations are voluntarily used by the majority of local school systems throughout the school year in general education pre-k and kindergarten programs. The WSS has been aligned with Maryland's Early Learning Standards and Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC).
- For the ECAS, individual WSS indicators in all domains at each age level (3,4,5) have been linked electronically through the web-based system with one or more of the three broad child outcomes established by OSEP. Local school system personnel complete on-line indicator ratings for the WSS checklist appropriate to the chronological age of the child. The cross-walk of the indicator ratings to the three broad outcomes occurs after the checklist has been finalized and electronically submitted to the ECAS database, hosted by a contractor with the highest level of data security.
- Information on child performance gained through the implementation of the ECAS will be used to inform local program improvement efforts and State level focused monitoring and technical assistance activities. For individual children, this information will also be used to update current levels of performance on the IEP as well as assist with the development of goals and associated instructional strategies as part of each annual IEP review.
- Stakeholder involvement by local school system preschool special education administrators, families, other community early childhood program directors, and the State Interagency Coordinating Council (birth-five focus) for the design of the ECAS has been ongoing.
- The ECAS has two child performance data measurement points:
 - Status at Entry – "New" to preschool special education services; 3, 4 and 5 year old children with disabilities who begin receiving preschool special education services through an initial IEP. The first reporting of Status of Entry data to OSEP is due in February 2007; data to be reported will include the percentage of children entering at the level of same-aged peers, and the percentage of children entering at a level below same-aged peers, for each of the three outcomes.
 - Progress Data at Exit: The first Progress at Exit data collection will occur for children for whom Status at Entry data was collected in FFY 05, who exited from the preschool program during the 2006-2007 school year (FFY 06), and who participated in the preschool program for at least six months.

**Implementation Plan:
Phase 1 and Phase 2 of Statewide Data Collection System**

Maryland's plan for phasing-in a statewide system of child outcomes data collection for the ECAS is consistent with guidance provided by OSEP in a September 2006 document, **Frequently Asked Questions regarding the SPP/APR: Early Childhood Outcomes (Part C Indicator #3 and Part B Indicator #7)**:

F. Can a State phase in its data collection and just collect and report on some programs/LEAs the first year, those plus the second group the next year, etc...?

A State can phase in its data collection and reporting as long as the data reported each year represent the population of children served within the State. For example, a State cannot report data in the first year that only represents one urban district/program, but could report data that represents a handful of districts/programs that represent the State's population of children served. (page 4)

Maryland also received verbal approval for its proposed plan to phase-in data collection from its OSEP State Contact, Michael Slade.

Plan for Phased-In Statewide Data Collection

Consistent with OSEP's September 2006 guidance, statewide data collection for the Maryland ECAS will be phased-in over a two year period, with all local school systems fully participating as of the second year of the phase-in, FFY 06. The two-year phase-in will impact only the number of local school systems initiating data collection, and not effect the population of children (i.e., all ages and disabilities will be included) or types of programs included. **NO SAMPLING WILL BE USED. THIS IS A CENSUS COLLECTION.** All of Maryland's twenty-four local school systems will be implementing the ECAS as of FFY 06.

Data Collection, Phase 1 (FFY 05):

- Of Maryland's twenty-four local school systems, seven districts have been identified as representative of the State utilizing census data for preschool-aged children, size (population) of school district, and geographic locations.
- In accordance with OSEP requirements for Indicator #7, all jurisdictions with an average daily enrollment of 50,000 or more students, include five jurisdictions of Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Montgomery County, and Prince George's County.
- Including two additional jurisdictions enables Maryland to comply with the requirements for geographic representation. The two local school systems are: Allegany County and Charles County.
- The seven identified representative local school systems will initiate Status At Entry data collection on ***all*** three, four and five year olds newly identified, i.e., all children receiving special education and related services under an initial IEP during the FFY 05 data collection period. **NO SAMPLING WILL BE USED BY THESE LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS. THIS IS A CENSUS COLLECTION.**

Data Collection, Phase 2 (FFY 06):

- ***All twenty-four Maryland local school systems will be participating in data collection for the Maryland ECAS as of FFY 06.*** This includes the seven jurisdictions initiating Status At Entry data collection in Phase 1, and the remaining seventeen jurisdictions not participating in Phase 1.
- ***All*** three, four and five year olds newly identified (i.e., with initial IEPs) will be included in data collection in all twenty-four local school systems for Phase 2. **NO SAMPLING WILL BE USED. THIS IS A CENSUS COLLECTION.**
- The LSSs initiating Status At Entry data collection in Phase 1 will be collecting their second set of Status At Entry data for children newly identified (i.e., with initial IEPs) during the FFY 06 time period.

- The seven Phase 1 local school systems will begin collecting Progress At Exit data for all children for whom there is a FFY 05 Status at Entry measure and who have participated in preschool special education for at least six months. Note: Progress at Exit data may be collected when children “age-out” of preschool special education, i.e., they continue under an IEP at age 6, or they no longer require special education and related services due to meeting all of their IEP goals and objectives.

ECAS Web-Based Data Entry Tool

In partnership with the Johns Hopkins Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE) a web-based data entry system for collecting, aggregating, and reporting outcome data was designed and implemented:

- For the ECAS web-based data entry system, individual WSS indicators in all domains at each age level (3,4,5) were linked electronically with one or more of the three broad child outcomes. Local school system personnel from jurisdictions included in Phase 1 of data collection entered into the web-based data entry system, completed ratings for all indicators on the WSS checklist appropriate to the chronological age of the child.
- The cross-walk of the WSS indicator ratings to the three broad child outcomes established by OSEP occurs after the checklist has been finalized by the local school system and electronically submitted to the ECAS database, hosted by a contractor with the highest level of data security. Points are assigned to each of the 3 possible ratings for each WSS indicator: Fully Ready/Proficient (3); In Process (2); or Needs Development (1). To reach an overall score for each of the 3 broad outcomes, ratings submitted for all WSS indicators cross-walked to that particular outcome are aggregated and the average of the total calculated. On a scale of 1 to 3, 2.5 was determined as the “cut-off” score for reporting a child’s performance as comparable to typically developing peers (i.e., 2.5-3.0 resulted in a “yes”, while 2.4 and below resulted in a “no”).
- **Progress at Exit** results for each child will be determined according to a protocol developed by Maryland that will report levels of growth/progress in keeping with the framework established by OSEP. The decision to use all indicators at each age level of the Work Sampling System was made to enable a level of sensitivity that could reflect varying rates of growth for preschool children with disabilities and still demonstrate progress made towards achieving performance comparable to that of typically developing peers.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be reported in the APR due February 1, 2008. For FFY 05, the results of the first collection of Status At Entry data are reported in the table below.

Status At Entry*:

**Performance of Preschool Children Comparable to Typically Developing Peers
(n=704 for all outcomes)**

Outcome	Comparable: Yes	Comparable: No
Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	25%	75%
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	7%	93%
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	22%	78%

*Phase 1 representative LSSs: Allegany, Anne Arundel, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Charles, Montgomery, Prince George’s

Discussion of Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

- Maryland identified seven of its twenty-four local school systems as representative of the State to initiate the first round of Status at Entry data collection (Phase 1). All jurisdictions with an average daily enrollment of 50,000 or more students, were included. These representative school systems began collecting Status at Entry data on all 3, 4 and 5 year-old preschool children newly identified (i.e., with initial IEPs). **NO SAMPLING WAS USED. THIS IS A CENSUS COLLECTION.** Results of their aggregated data collection are reported in the table above. The seven local school systems included in Phase 1 are: Allegany, Anne Arundel, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Charles, Montgomery, and Prince George’s.
- Procedures and protocols addressing the 3 and 4 year old levels of the Work Sampling System were developed and disseminated by the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services to all twenty-four local school systems as a part of professional development sessions.
- An ECAS professional development plan was developed and implemented beginning Spring 2006; this plan will be updated annually and delivery of training on the WSS will continue to be conducted in collaboration with the MSDE Division for Early Childhood Development.
- Training on the ECAS web-based data entry system was developed and training sessions for the seven local school systems in Phase 1 conducted. Training on the data entry system will be completed for all local school systems by the end of January 2007. As reporting features of the web-based data entry system are added, additional training as well as technical assistance will be provided.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>New Indicator: Baseline data (Status At Entry data for FFY 05 + Progress At Exit data for FFY 06) along with measurable and rigorous targets for FFY 07-2010 will be provided in the APR due February 1, 2008.</i>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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))

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has developed and submitted a Request for Consultant Services (RFP R00R7200001) to provide a “Comprehensive Design and Implementation of a System to Collect, Validate, Aggregate, Analyze, and Report Parent Outcome Data.” This system will allow the State to collect data on the percent of parents participating in Part B (ages 3 through 21) who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. This contract began on October 15, 2006 and concludes on February 15, 2007.

Nature of Work for the Consultant includes:

- 1) Use the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Family Survey measurement tools for parents of students with disabilities ages 3 through 21.
- 2) Provide information to the MSDE, DSE/EIS, Part B Program Manager, related to collecting, aggregating, and analyzing valid and reliable data as it relates to parents participating in special education services.
- 3) Use the NCSEAM Parent Survey as a measurement tool.
- 4) Revise survey items as needed.
- 5) Customize the measurement instrument to include Maryland specific requirements, including cultural/diversity issues.
- 6) Establish and deliver a sampling plan with an appropriate degree of accuracy and confidence level (95% Confidence with 5% confidence interval per local school system) with a total of 111,565 students as reported on 10/29/05.
- 7) Mail the survey to every parent in the sample with return reply at no cost to the parent.
- 8) Monitor the returns and re-contact parents who have not replied in order to achieve the desired confidence levels.
- 9) Complete processing the data and verify the data from the survey.
- 10) Produce an electronic filing system for the DSE/EIS.
- 11) Generate an on-line report that includes benchmarks, goal setting, and action planning.
- 12) Provide assistance in interpreting the survey data, compiling final reports, and analyzing data to improve services.

Additionally, MSDE has initiated programs focused on parental involvement. DSE/EIS has funded Special Education Citizen’s Advisory Committees for each LSS in Maryland. There is continued funding for teams of parents and school staff in each jurisdiction as Partners for Success, and a State Partnership

Committee including parents and professionals meeting on a monthly basis. The survey being developed will provide a broad based response to the level of satisfaction parents have with the services provided. The SESAC will use the information to advise the Division as it prepares policies and regulations for the local school systems. The survey will provide clear, quantifiable baseline data to utilize in developing action plans for the local school systems.

Survey Selection

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) used survey items for Indicator 8 that were developed and screened for statistical validity through the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) under the Leadership of Dr. W. Alan Coulter, Project Director. MSDE replaced one item from each survey. The replacement item came from a pool of items that measure the same issue. Copies of the Part B Preschool survey and Part B school-age survey are attached to this submission.

MSDE is gathering and analyzing data on both a statewide basis and disaggregated by local school system. One of the difficulties inherent in disaggregating data in this manner is that in order to have statistically valid and reliable representation, the percentage of a school system's population included in the random sample is inversely proportionate to its size. Accordingly, in smaller jurisdictions the percentage of the population sampled is larger even though the raw number in the sample may be smaller.

Implementing the mandated State of Maryland procurement process resulted in a delay in initiating the Request for Consultant Services described in the previous State Performance Plan submission. It had been anticipated that the consultant's work would begin in December of 2005. However, due to procedural barriers, the consultant's work began in November of 2006. MSDE is currently working with an external vendor (ORC Macro) to gather and analyze parental involvement in the special education process. Timelines have been compressed such that analysis of data from Indicator 8 will be completed prior to the Annual Performance Report submission due on February 1, 2007. In subsequent years, data gathering will occur in the Spring of each school year after administration of statewide assessments.

Sampling Model and Principles

Upon consultation with the vendor and consistent with guidance available through the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) website, MSDE is gathering data from a random sample of parents of preschool and school aged students with disabilities. In order to gather baseline data for State Performance Plan Indicator 8, MSDE has utilized a sampling plan stratified by local school system and type of program (preschool or school age). In smaller school systems, sampling would not likely generate reliable results. Accordingly, a census was used for those systems. For example, all seventy-five children that received preschool special education services during the 2005-2006 school year in Caroline County Public Schools were included in the sample to enhance the likelihood of receiving accurate data from which conclusions may be drawn. Similarly, parents of students with disabilities in Kent, Talbot, Garrett, Dorchester, Somerset and Worcester Counties were also sampled in full. For larger systems, sampling was used to gather data from a statistically valid proportion of parents.

The sampling model is designed to generate results with a 95% confidence interval of .50 plus or minus .05. The size and randomization of the sample derived from Child Count Data reported through our Special Services Information System gives us an opportunity to gather data across all relevant demographic criteria. If the random sample results in any statistical anomalies, the sampling strategy will be adjusted consistent with commonly accepted principles within the fields of research and measurement.

Gathering Baseline Data

To establish an accurate baseline, surveys were sent to more than 11,000 parents in proportionate share for preschool and for school-age students with disabilities. A copy of the vendor's sampling plan as well

as the number of surveys to be sent for each jurisdiction stratified by program type was submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs on December 13, 2006.

The following is a chronology of activities used to gather information from families regarding the survey:

- On November 2, 2006, MSDE alerted local school systems of the need for address information to be appended to a random sample of students with disabilities served during the 2005-2006 school year as indicated by SSIS data.
- On November 8, 2006, an initial meeting was held via conference call with MSDE and the vendor to clarify scope of work and key timelines for data analysis.
- On November 9, 2006, ORC Macro (and REDA, International) executed Confidentiality Agreements with MSDE for the purpose of completing the Parent Survey data gathering and analysis. MSDE and ORC Macro staff finalized survey and reminder postcard language.
- School systems were asked to provide the address information on or before November 17, 2006.
- Address information was provided to the vendor on November 17, 2006.
- Additional address information was provided to the vendor on November 21, 24, and December 5, 2006 upon receipt from local school systems.
- Postcards were mailed to parents on November 28th informing them of their inclusion as part of the sample.
- On November 30, 2006, MSDE staff updated the Maryland Special Education State Advisory Committee on our progress regarding Indicator 8 and encouraged members to update their respective local Special Education Citizens Advisory Committees.
- Surveys were sent to parents of preschool and school-age students with disabilities on December 1, 2006
- Additional surveys were sent out by December 6, 2006 based on addresses provided on December 5, 2006.
- Surveys are to be returned by December 22, 2006.
- Parent Support staff at MSDE were available to answer questions regarding the surveys and to appropriately facilitate resolution of student-specific concerns that fell under the general supervisory responsibilities of the State Education Agency.
- A second mailing to all parents was sent out during the week of January 2, 2007. The second mailing was initiated in an effort to improve response rate overall and gather sufficient responses such that data could be disaggregated by local school systems.
- Preliminary data was shared with the Maryland Special Education State Advisory Committee on January 18, 2007 so broad stakeholder involvement and target setting can occur prior to the APR submission of February 1, 2007.

Key Characteristics to the Maryland Sampling Strategy

MSDE is gathering baseline data from a larger sample of parents in School Year 2005-2006 than should be needed to produce valid and reliable results in the subsequent years of the State Performance Plan cycle. As new data is available, it will serve to replace prior data gathered from each school system or public agency. Each school system and public agency will be sampled at least twice during the State Performance Plan cycle of 2006-2011 and the six largest school systems will be sampled six times in succession. MSDE has created a three tiered model of selection for school system review beginning with the 2006-2007 school year.

Categories of systems based on overall student enrollment are grouped as follows:

Category I systems: (with an average daily membership (ADM) greater than 50,000 students):

Annual sampling consistent with the size in the baseline year will be utilized. Category I systems (based on September 30, 2005 enrollment data) are: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Montgomery, and Prince George's County along with Baltimore City. Howard County will also be grouped with Category I because their student population is approaching 50,000 and has trended upward during the past decade. The six Category I systems will be surveyed six times during the State Performance Plan cycle.

Category II systems: (with an ADM greater than 15,000 and less than 50,000 students) Bi-annual sampling consistent with the size in the baseline year will be utilized. Category II systems (based on September 30, 2005 enrollment data) are: Calvert, Carroll, Cecil, Charles, Frederick, Harford, Saint Mary's and Washington County. Wicomico County will also be sampled in Category II because their student population is approaching 15,000 and has trended upward during the past decade. The eight Category II systems will be surveyed three times during the State Performance Plan cycle.

Category III systems and other public agencies: (with an ADM less than 15,000 students) Tri-annual sampling consistent with the size in the baseline year will be utilized. Category III systems (based on September 30, 2005 enrollment data) are: Allegany, Caroline, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot and Worcester County. Our largest non-school system service provider (the Edison Schools) was included in the baseline data for the 2005-2006 school year. All other public agencies that provide special education services (i.e. the Maryland School for the Deaf, the Maryland School for the Blind, Department of Juvenile Services, and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene) will be surveyed in the Spring of 2007 and again in 2010. The ten Category III systems and other public agencies will be surveyed two times during the State Performance Plan cycle.

Additionally, any local school systems or public agencies that have a satisfaction rate below 25% in a sampled year, will engage in additional activities to improve parental satisfaction upon consultation with their local Special Education Citizens Advisory Committee (SECAC). If any unanticipated shifts in enrollment data occur during the State Performance Plan Cycle, the impacted local school system(s) will be re-grouped according to enrollment bands as indicated in the applicable category's definition outlined above.

Random and Representative Sample

The random sample will permit collection of data across disability category, race, age, gender, and other variables. Once baseline data is collected, MSDE will analyze the demographic data patterns that emerge and adjust for any variable not represented appropriately in the sample population for future years of data collection. The measurable and rigorous target was set for maintenance for FFY 2006 in order to use baseline data to inform future data collection efforts and avoid selection bias and address response rates and missing data. The baseline data demonstrated a lower than anticipated response rate among parents African American SWD. Accordingly, MSDE will over-sample among this group for future survey administrations. Additionally, our efforts to increase response rate among any underrepresented group(s) will include the SESAC and local SECAC(s). Additional analysis by the vendor will also assist us in effectively targeting these groups.

The random sample calculation included an expected response rate. The sampling framework was established from a table of the number of responses needed to establish a valid and reliable estimate for each school system. The amount of the sample size for the state is larger than needed to make valid and reliable statewide projections because it reflects a summation of sample sizes that were needed for reliable estimates from each local school system.

Anticipated Schedule of Parent Survey Data Gathering Activities

Winter 2006 (based on the 2005-2006 school year): All twenty-four local school systems and the Edison Partnership Schools.

Spring 2007 (based on the 2006-2007 school year): Category I systems: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, and Prince George's County along with Baltimore City. Public Agencies not previously surveyed including: the Maryland School for the Deaf, the Maryland School for the Blind, Department of Juvenile Services, and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

Spring 2008 (based on the 2007-2008 school year): Category I systems: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, and Prince George's County along with Baltimore City. Category II systems: Calvert, Carroll, Cecil, Charles, Frederick, Harford, Saint Mary's, Washington and Wicomico County.

Spring 2009 (based on the 2008-2009 school year): Category I systems: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, and Prince George's County along with Baltimore City. Category III systems based on September 30, 2005 enrollment criteria are: Allegany, Caroline, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot and Worcester Counties along with the Edison Partnership Schools.

Spring 2010 (based on the 2009-2010 school year): Category I systems: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, and Prince George's County along with Baltimore City. Category II systems: Calvert, Carroll, Cecil, Charles, Frederick, Harford, Saint Mary's, Washington, and Wicomico County. Public Agencies including: the Maryland School for the Deaf, the Maryland School for the Blind, Department of Juvenile Services, and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

Spring 2011 (based on the 2010-2011 school year): Category I systems: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, and Prince George's County along with Baltimore City.

Spring 2012 (based on the 2011-2012 school year): All twenty-four local school systems and the other public agencies that serve students with disabilities will be sampled to generate a new baseline and facilitate additional target setting.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Results reported in this SPP are based on responses from 1,396 parents of school aged children receiving special education services and 862 parents of preschool children receiving special education services. The data for Indicator # 8 was calculated using a Rasch analysis where standardized anchors are provided for the 25 questions in the survey of parents of school-aged children and 17 anchors are used for the 50 questions in the survey of parents of preschool children. MSDE used a standard of 600 for calculating the OSEP Indicator # 8 in accordance with the recommendation of the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM).

Overall the data indicate 27 percent of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Responses range from 56 percent to 13 percent. Two of the jurisdictions had local estimates whose 95 percent confidence limits went below 0 or above 1 an indication of an unstable estimate due to a small number of respondents. Similar data for the preschool population is 32 percent. Responses range from 67 percent to 0 percent. The number of responses from parents of preschool students in three of the smallest jurisdiction was fairly low. Therefore, these estimates are "unstable" in the manner described above. The amalgamated response rate was 20.8% for FFY 2005.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Maryland's baseline data on the parent involvement survey appears fairly comparable to other states. However, both collection and analysis of the data are new for our state. With additional years of data collection, trends and amount of progress and slippage will have appropriate context. MSDE will work with stakeholders to identify strategies to improve response rate and ensure collection of valid and reliable data free of selection bias. MSDE also enhanced collaboration with local Special Education Citizens Advisory Committees (SECAC) to identify strategies to facilitate enhanced parental involvement based upon unique system characteristics and priorities.

MSDE will focus its improvement efforts on those survey items which fall within one standard deviation of the NCSEAM standard of 600. Items which fall into this category for Part B respondents include examples such as: "the school offers parents training about special education issues" and "the school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school" For Section 619 respondents, comparable examples include: "People from preschool special education provide me with information on how to get other services" and "People from preschool special education offer supports for parents to participate in training workshops."

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MSDE will adopt recommendations for improving response rates in future administrations of the survey suggested by the vendor. These recommendations include:

1. *Limit the questions to only those needed for the indicator.* Response rates are higher for shorter questionnaires. This impacts the Part B questionnaire more than the 619 questionnaire, but both could be significantly reduced in size.
2. *The questionnaire should be mailed in the school year for which the indicator is being calculated.* People have a hard time responding when events occurred in the past. They do better with contemporaneous events.
3. *Stakeholder groups should be involved so they can notify parents of the survey and the importance in responding.* Parents were alerted to the survey from the postcard. If stakeholder groups were involved the parents would be more likely to respond and to respond accurately.
4. *Do not survey all the LSS every year.* In the smaller LSS all the individuals are asked to participate. These individuals will grow weary of this if asked year after year to participate. MSDE has already noted they will use a rotating sample of LSS.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>27% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>32% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>22% of the parents of preschool and school-aged students with disabilities sampled will respond to the Parent Involvement survey.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>29% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>34% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>24% of the parents of preschool and school-aged students with disabilities sampled will respond to the Parent Involvement survey.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>30% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>35% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>25% of the parents of preschool and school-aged students with disabilities sampled</p>

	will respond to the Parent Involvement survey.
2009 (2009-2010)	<p>32% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>37% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>27% of the parents of preschool and school-aged students with disabilities sampled will respond to the Parent Involvement survey.</p>
2010 (2010-2011)	<p>33% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>38% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>28% of the parents of preschool and school-aged students with disabilities sampled will respond to the Parent Involvement survey.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
The SESAC will continue to meet to identify ways to improve response rate and review policies, procedures and practices that address parental involvement.	January 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members
MSDE and SESAC (and the selected vendor) will review the results from the survey each year and adjust sampling approach to ensure that valid and reliable results are generated. Areas typically considered will include race/ethnicity and type of disability. Initial vendor recommendations for improving response rates will be implemented in the Spring of 2007.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members Selected Vendor
Utilize the local SECACs to identify priorities and barriers to parental involvement within their communities.	February 2007 - annually	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members SECAC members
Utilize the SESAC to identify priorities and barriers to parental involvement within their communities with a focus on items within one standard deviation of the NCSEAM standard.	February 2007 - annually	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members SECAC members

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Review results from surrounding states and share effective strategies identified in Maryland and gather effective strategies from other state.	March 2007 – ongoing	DSE/EIS staff MSRRC staff OSEP State Contact
Support new family training modules developed in collaboration with Parent’s Place of Maryland and Partner’s for Success Centers around the state that address improving Parental	December 2006-ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Partner’s for Success Centers, Parent’s Place of Maryland
Review the work of NCSEAM as it relates to target setting and improvement activities and adjust targets and improvement strategies, as appropriate.	February 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff NCSEAM staff and publications
Utilize IDEA Partnership team to review analysis of data and provide input on parent modules.	December 2006-ongoing	DSE/EIS staff IDEA Partnership team

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
--

Indicator 9: 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))

Measurement:

<p>Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.</p>

<p>Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."</p>

<p>Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.</p>
--

To address Part B Monitoring Indicator #9, the MSDE, DSE/EIS:

- Contracted with an outside consultant to review and analyze LSS data to recommend a risk ratio index to define significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.
- Designated a State team to review available data to determine how districts are identified as having significant disproportionate representation.
- Utilized the State team to report, make recommendations, and acquire recommendations from the SESAC and the IDEA Partnership Team related to how the State would make determinations of overall significant disproportionate representation.
- Collaborated with the State team to make recommendations for data views and other appropriate data sources to use in analyzing overall significant disproportionate representation at the State and LSS level.
- Utilized QAM with assistance and review by the State team, to develop a written overview and self-assessment rubric for use by LSS that have been determined to be significantly disproportionate.
- Utilized the State team to determine how significant disproportionate representation would be used to trigger the identification of LSS that are required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for early intervening services.
- Provided training to LSS identified as significantly disproportionate to complete self-assessment activities and generate a written report of findings to MSDE.
- Reviewed LSS written reports and verified the findings.
- Reported the percent of districts that have significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07.

MSDE measures disproportionality using weighted risk ratios calculated according to the instructions provided in the IDEA publication, "Methods For Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality In Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide."

<http://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

The state of Maryland identifies LSS with weighted risk ratios of 1.5 or higher for a particular racial and ethnic group as significantly disproportionate. The application of the weighted risk ratio is limited to LSS that have more than 20 students of a particular racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability. When there are 20 or fewer students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability, the following criteria are applied to measuring discrepancy:

- If there are more than 10 students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability, the “expected number of students” in the disability category is calculated by multiplying the total number of students classified with a disability by the proportion of all students in a racial and ethnic group. If the difference between the observed number of students classified with that disability and the expected number of students is greater than 10 then the LSS is deemed to be disproportionate.
- If there are 10 or fewer students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability, then that LSS is not determined discrepant since the number is too small for the calculation to be meaningful.

Maryland determines the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification through an analysis of data from the Maryland Student Services Information System (SSIS). Results of Due Process complaints were reviewed and no local school systems were identified with this criterion.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Maryland determines the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification through an analysis of data from the Maryland Student Services Information System (SSIS) and the results of Due Process Complaints, written SEA complaints, on-site and off-site monitoring.

Based on those analysis no local school systems were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

The number of LSS with disproportionate representation of different racial and ethnic groups that is the result of inappropriate identification is summarized in the two tables below. These tables are based on calculations for students age 6 to 21 as required for this SPP Indicator.

Weighted Risk Ratio and Inappropriate Identification

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of Inappropriate Identification		
Racial and Ethnic Group	Number of LSS	Percentage
American Indian	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	0	0
Hispanic	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0

.20 Index and Inappropriate Identification

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of In appropriate Identification according to the to the .2 Index		
Racial and Ethnic Group	Number of LSS	Percentage
American Indian	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	0	0
Hispanic	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0

The DSE/EIS disaggregated and analyzed the data using both the weighted risk ratio and the .20 Index to reduce the risk of overlooking potential or actual disproportionality. However, when reviewing the data for disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification, no LSSs were identified. The number of LSS with disproportionate representation of different racial and ethnic groups based solely on data review is summarized in the two tables below. These tables are based on calculations for students age 6 to 21 in any category of disabling condition as defined for this indicator.

MSDE is committed to ensuring that students with disabilities are appropriately identified regardless of race/ethnicity. Accordingly, MSDE uses standardized data analysis to identify potential instances of inappropriate identification.

Weighted Risk Ratio (Data Analysis Only)

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services according to the weighted risk ratio		
Racial and Ethnic Group	Number of LSS	Percentage
American Indian	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	0	0
Hispanic	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0

.20 Index (Data Analysis Only)

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services according to the .20 index		
Racial and Ethnic Group	Number of LSS	Percentage
American Indian	1	4.16%
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	14	58.33%
Hispanic	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	2	8.3%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The application of the weighted risk ratios when based solely on data analysis did not identify any LSS as having a disproportionate identification as a child with a disability in any racial or ethnic subgroup: Asian, Pacific Islander; African American, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; or White, non-Hispanic students. However, a data analysis based on the .20 index identified groups in need of additional scrutiny. Based on the .20 Index, 14 of 24 LSS showed the potential for disproportionate identification among African American students with disabilities. Similarly, two LSS were identified with disproportionate representation for White students and one (1) LSS was identified with disproportionate representation for American Indians.

Analysis of data and reports noted in the overview of this indicator included:

- Reviews of local policies, procedures and practices for those LSS where disproportionate representation was identified based on data analysis;
- Discussions with LSS special education staff to determine the level of monitoring and professional development regarding access to the general education curriculum;
- LRE decision making for determining if exclusion from the regular classroom is required;
- Provision of supports and interventions provided to students at risk of being identified as requiring special education and related services;
- student progress monitoring;
- Assessments used as part of the evaluation and reevaluation processes, and the results of LSS monitoring.

In addition, on-site and off-site monitoring of Discretionary grants that are targeted to the prevention and/or reduction of disproportionality identified the use of strategic and targeted interventions, practices and analysis of data by LSSs. Some of those interventions and practices include focused record reviews of evaluations and reevaluations in conjunction with student observations by central office staff; establishment of a formal review process for IEPs of all students who transfer into the LSS; implementation of scientifically research-based academic and behavioral interventions; and establishment of protocols for monitoring student progress.

When comparing all LSS identified as significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based solely on data analysis using the .20 Index, to those LSS weighted risk ratios, the weighted risk ratios were all below the threshold of 1.50. The range of risk ratios was between .60 and 1.17. Of those, all but one (1) American Indian student group (1.17) were .88 or lower.

Maryland's 24 local school systems represent student enrollments ranging from 2,440 to 139,398 in rural, suburban and urban settings. The enrollment also includes a range of racial and economic subgroups of varying proportions. Due to these impacting factors Maryland determined that it would use the weighted risk ratio as the measure to determine significant disproportionality because it adjusts "for district variability in the racial/ethnic composition of the comparison group". IDEA publication, "Methods For Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality In Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide."

State Designation as Significantly Disproportionate:

Based on school year 2004-2005 data Maryland determined that five of its 24 local school systems were significantly disproportionate. Using the methods detailed above, a matrix was developed that indicated any area(s) in identification, placement and/or extended suspensions and expulsions where data exceeded the established weighted risk ratio (identification) or the .2 Index for placement and extended suspensions and expulsions. Local school systems were notified of the identification, and once identified each local school system was required to submit an amendment to its local application for federal funds to reflect how it planned to expend 15% of the local school system's passthrough allocation of IDEA Part B federal funds. This process was repeated with data from the 2005-2006 school year and identified five (5) LSS as significantly disproportionate. Two systems from 2004-2005 school year were no longer designated significantly disproportionate and two systems were newly designated as such.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

In accordance with 34 CFR 300.646, DSE/EIS staff conducted on-site visits to each of those identified LSSs to discuss and implement the provisions of the regulations as follows:

(1) Provide for the review and, if appropriate revision of the policies, procedures, and practices used in the identification or placement to ensure that the policies, procedures, and practices comply with the requirements of IDEA. Revisions to policies, procedures and practices will be submitted to MSDE after the effective date of revised State regulations.

(2) Require any LSS identified to reserve the maximum amount of funds under 20 U.S.C. §1413(f) of IDEA to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to serve children in the LSS, particularly, but not exclusively, children in those groups that were significantly overidentified. All budgets were amended and expenditures monitored as part of the regularly scheduled semi-annual fiscal monitoring; and

(3) Require the LSS to publicly report on the revision of policies, practices, and procedures described in (1) above.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>FFY 2005 was the baseline year for this indicator.</i>
2006 (2006-2007)	0% of local school systems are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	0% of local school systems are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	0% of local school systems are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of local school systems are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of local school systems are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
The State Disproportionality Steering Committee will	February 2007 -	DSE/EIS staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

continue to meet to identify areas of disproportionality, investigate possible root causes and effective interventions and review policies, procedures and practices that address disproportionality.	ongoing	State Steering Committee
Utilize the State Steering Committee to report, make recommendations, and solicit recommendations from the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) and the IDEA Partnership Team related to State determinations regarding overall significant disproportionate representation.	February 2007 - annually	DSE/EIS staff State Steering Committee
Collaborate with the State Steering Committee to make recommendations for data views and other appropriate data sources to use in analyzing overall significant disproportionate representation at the State and LSS level.	February 2007 – ongoing	DSE/EIS staff State Steering Committee
Develop and disseminate self-assessment documents to LSS that have been determined to be significantly disproportionate or identified through analysis of data to be at risk of becoming significantly disproportionate.	In process and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Utilize the State Steering Committee to determine how significant disproportionate representation will be used to trigger the identification of LSS that require use 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for early intervening services.	February 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff State Steering Committee
Provide training to LSS identified as significantly disproportionate to complete self-assessment activities and generate a written report of findings to MSDE.	April 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Review LSS written reports and verify the findings.	June 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Report the percent of districts that have significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff
Partner with a national technical assistance agency, National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) to provide assistance to local school systems identified as significantly disproportionate.	December 2006 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Special Education State Advisory Committee State Steering Committee NCCRESt

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Review the policies, procedures and practices of local school systems that have not been previously identified as discrepant in identification.	January 2007 – ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Increase the capacity of local school systems to identify trends, patterns and pockets of disproportionate identification practices through the provision of detailed data reports on identification for each local school system.	October 2006 – ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DAA staff DOSFSS staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: 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))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

With the July 1, 2005 effective date of IDEA 2004, Maryland examined and analyzed available LSS data on identification of students as students with disabilities by three disability categories by race/ethnicity and identified five LSS required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B allocation for early intervening services in accordance with 20 U.S.C. §1418(d)(2)(B).

To address Part B Monitoring Indicator #10, the MSDE DSE/EIS will:

- Contract with an outside consultant to review and analyze LSS data to recommend a risk ratio index to be used to define significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Designate a State team to review available data to determine how LSS are identified as having significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Utilize the State team to report, make recommendations and acquire recommendations from the SESAC and the IDEA Partnership Team related to how the State will make determinations of significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Collaborate with the State team; make recommendations as to data views and other appropriate sources to be used by the State and LSS in analyzing significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Utilize QAM, with assistance and review by the State team to develop a written overview and self-assessment rubric for use by LSS that have been determined to be significantly disproportionate within disability categories.
- Utilize the State team to determine how significant disproportionate representation will be used to trigger the identification of LSS that will be required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for early intervening services.
- Provide training to LSS identified as significantly disproportionate within disability categories to complete self-assessment activities and generate a written report of findings to MSDE.
- Review LSS written reports and verify the findings.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

- Report the percent of LSS that have significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07.

Maryland determines the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disabilities that is the result of inappropriate identification through an analysis of data from the Maryland Student Services Information System (SSIS). Results of Due Process complaints were reviewed and no local school systems were identified with this criterion.

Maryland uses weighted risk ratios calculated according to the instructions provided in the IDEA publication, "Methods For Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality In Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide."

<http://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

The state of Maryland identifies LSS with weighted risk ratios of 1.5 or higher for a particular racial and ethnic group as significantly disproportionate. The application of the weighted risk ratio is limited to LSS that have more than 20 students of a particular racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability. When there are 20 or fewer students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability, the following criteria are applied to measuring discrepancy:

- If there are more than 10 students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability, the "expected number of students" in the disability category is calculated by multiplying the total number of students classified with a disability by the proportion of all students in a racial and ethnic group. If the difference between the observed number of students classified with that disability and the expected number of students is greater than 10 then the LSS is deemed to be disproportionate.
- If there are 10 or fewer students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability, then that LSS is not determined discrepant since the number is too small for the calculation to be meaningful.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Maryland determines the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification through an analysis of data from the Maryland Student Services Information System (SSIS) and the results of Due Process Complaints, written SEA complaints, on-site and off-site monitoring.

Based on those analysis no local school systems were identified were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Weighted Risk Ratio and Inappropriate Identification

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the weighted risk ratio							
Racial and Ethnic Group	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language Impairments	Multiple	Other Health Impairments	Autism
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

African American, non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

.20 Index and Inappropriate Identification

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the .20 index							
Racial and Ethnic Group	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language Impairments	Multiple	Other Health Impairments	Autism
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The DSE/EIS disaggregated and analyzed the data using both the weighted risk ratio and the .20 Index to reduce the risk of overlooking potential or actual disproportionality. However, when reviewing the data for disproportionate representation in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, no LSSs were identified. The number of LSS with disproportionate representation of different racial and ethnic groups by specific disability categories based solely on data review is summarized in the two tables below. These tables are based on calculations for students age 6 to 21 in each category of disabling condition as defined for this indicator.

MSDE is committed to ensuring that students with disabilities are appropriately identified regardless of race/ethnicity and disability category. Accordingly, MSDE uses standardized data analysis to identify potential instances of inappropriate identification.

Weighted Risk Ratio (Data Analysis Only)

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the weighted risk ratio							
Racial and Ethnic Group	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language Impairments	Multiple	Other Health Impairments	Autism
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
African American, non-Hispanic	12 (50%)	11 (45.83%)	5 (20.83%)	4 (16.6%)	1 (4.16%)	0	0
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	1 (4.16%)	8 (33.3%)	4 (16.6%)	4 (16.6%)	6 (25%)

.20 Index (Data Analysis Only)

Number of LSS significantly disproportionate in the representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the 20 index							
Racial and Ethnic Group	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language	Multiple	Other Health Impairments	Autism
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian, Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
African American non-Hispanic	11 (45.83%)	13 (54.16%)	7 (29.16%)	4 (16.6%)	0	2 (8.3%)	0
Hispanic	0	1 (4.16%)	0	0	0	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	1 (4.16%)	1 (4.16%)	4 (16.6%)	3 (12.5%)	3 (12.5%)	4 (16.6%)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The DSE/EIS disaggregated and analyzed the data using both the weighted risk ratio and the .20 Index to reduce the risk of overlooking potential or actual disproportionality. However, when reviewing the data for disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification, no LSSs were identified.

Analysis of data and reports noted in the overview of this indicator included:

- Reviews of local policies, procedures and practices for those LSS where disproportionate representation was identified based on data analysis;
- Discussions with LSS special education staff to determine the level of monitoring and professional development regarding access to the general education curriculum;
- LRE decision making for determining if exclusion from the regular classroom is required;
- Provision of supports and interventions provided to students at risk of being identified as requiring special education and related services;
- student progress monitoring;
- Assessments used as part of the evaluation and reevaluation processes, and the results of LSS monitoring.

In addition, on-site and off-site monitoring of Discretionary grants that are targeted to the prevention and/or reduction of disproportionality identified the use of strategic and targeted interventions, practices and analysis of data by LSSs. Some of those interventions and practices include focused record reviews of evaluations and reevaluations in conjunction with student observations by central office staff; establishment of a formal review process for IEPs of all students who transfer into the LSS; implementation of scientifically research-based academic and behavioral interventions; and establishment of protocols for monitoring student progress.

Patterns of disproportionate representation by racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories based solely on data analysis are apparent. In analyzing the data based solely on data analysis, 50% of LSS were identified as disproportionate in the representation of African American students in the Mental Retardation category and 45.8% of LSS were identified as being disproportionate in the representation of African American students in the Specific Learning Disability category. For other racial and ethnic groups the modal category differs. For White students, 25% of LSS (6) are identified as disproportionate in the Autism category, 33.3% (8) for Speech or Language Impairments category; 16.6% (4) are identified as disproportionate in Other Health Impaired and Multiple Disabilities categories. One LSS (4.16%) is identified as disproportionate in Emotional Disturbance for White students compared to five (5) - 20.83% for African American students identified as disproportionate in Emotional Disturbance.

No LSS were identified with disproportionate representation for American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander or Hispanic students using the weighted risk ratio. One LSS was identified significantly disproportionate for Asian/Pacific Islanders using the .20 Index. The results were similar when using either the Weighted Risk Ratio or the .20 Index as the basis for analysis.

State Designation as Significantly Disproportionate:

Based on school year 2004-2005 data Maryland determined that five of its 24 local school systems were significantly disproportionate. Using the methods detailed above, a matrix was developed that indicated any area(s) in identification, placement and/or extended suspensions and expulsions where data exceeded the established weighted risk ratio (identification) or the .2 Index for placement and extended suspensions and expulsions. Local school systems were notified of the identification, and once identified each local school system was required to submit an amendment to reflect how it planned to expend 15% of the local school system's Passthrough allocation of IDEA Part B federal funds. This process was repeated with data from the 2005-2006 school year and identified 5 LSS as significantly disproportionate. Two systems were no longer designated significantly disproportionate and two systems were newly designated as such. Onsite monitoring visits were conducted with all identified LSS to review local policies and practices regarding the identification of students as students with disabilities, as well as early intervention services provided to students to reduce the inappropriate identification of students.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

In accordance with 34 CFR 300.646 DSE/EIS staff conducted on-site visits to:

- (1) Provide for the review and, if appropriate revision of the policies, procedures, and practices used in the identification or placement to ensure that the policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA;
- (2) Require any LSS identified to reserve the maximum amount of funds under section 613(f) of the Act to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to serve children in the LEA, particularly, but not exclusively, children in those groups that were significantly overidentified; and
- (3) Require the LSS to publicly report on the revision of policies, practices, and procedures described under (1) above.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	0% of LSS are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. <i>(FFY 2005 was the baseline year for this indicator.)</i>
2007 (2007-2008)	0% of LSS are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	0% of LSS are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of LSS are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of LSS are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines/	Activities Completed as planned	Resources
The State Disproportionality Steering Committee will continue to meet to identify areas of disproportionality, investigate possible root	February 2007 - ongoing	A Disproportionality Steering Committee was established in 2005. The committee is comprised of representatives of higher education, the adult disabilities community, local school systems, advocates, public health experts, special educators, parents, and State Department of Education staff. The Steering	DSE/EIS staff State Steering Committee

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

causes and effective interventions and review policies, procedures and practices that address disproportionality.		Committee attended the National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) Disproportionality Conference in February 2006. It met to develop a vision statement, charge and preliminary plan of action.	
Expand the stakeholder input to the Disproportionality Steering Committee to gain a broader perspective	April 2007 - ongoing	New activity	DSE/EIS staff State Steering Committee
Utilize the State Steering Committee to report, make recommendations, and solicit recommendations from the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) and the IDEA Partnership Team related to State determinations regarding overall significant disproportionate representation.	February 2007 - annually	The State team, through the DSE/EIS leadership, presented overall status of disproportionality to the Special Education State Advisory Committee and the criteria developed to identify and address significant disproportionality.	DSE/EIS staff State Steering Committee
Collaborate with the State Steering Committee to make recommendations for data views and other appropriate data sources to use in analyzing overall significant disproportionate representation at the State and LSS level.	February 2007 – ongoing	Initial recommendations completed.	DSE/EIS staff State Steering Committee
Develop and disseminate self-assessment documents to LSS that have been determined to be significantly disproportionate or identified through analysis of data to be at risk of becoming significantly disproportionate.	In process and ongoing	An overview of significant disproportionality and a rubric for self assessment were developed and disseminated to local school systems identified as significantly disproportionate for their use. The documents are intended to assist LSS investigation of possible root causes and effective interventions to address disproportionality.	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Utilize the State Steering Committee to determine how significant	February 2007 - ongoing	New activity	DSE/EIS staff State Steering

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

disproportionate representation will be used to trigger the identification of LSS that require use 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for early intervening services.			Committee
Professional Development to LSS regarding the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	July 2006 – ongoing	Activity 1 - MSDE staff provided on-site technical assistance using the self assessment and planning documents to each local school system identified as significantly disproportionate. Activity 2 - MSDE staff provided technical assistance to local school system staff regarding the disaggregated data that identified the rates and numbers of students identified for special education by disability, placement, and suspensions or expulsions of more than 10 days. This included the mathematical formulas used to determine the significant disproportionality and potential methods of disaggregating data at the school and classroom levels.	DSE/EIS staff
Identify resources, research and professional development for LSS that address cultural diversity and differentiated learning and teaching styles	April 2007 – ongoing	New activity	DSE/EIS staff NCCREST
Provide training to LSS identified as significantly disproportionate to complete self-assessment activities and generate a written report of findings to MSDE.	July 2006 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff provided training to 8 individual LSS to complete the self-assessment activities.	DSE/EIS staff
Review LSS written reports and verify the findings.	June 2007 - ongoing	MSDE staff has reviewed progress reports and conducted site visits and analyzed achievement and identification data to verify information provided by local school systems.	DSE/EIS staff
Partner with a national technical assistance agency, National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) to provide assistance to local school systems identified	December 2006 - ongoing	New activity	DSE/EIS staff Special Education State Advisory Committee State Steering

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

as significantly disproportionate.			Committee NCCREST
Review the policies, procedures and practices of local school systems that have not been previously identified as discrepant in identification.	January 2007 – ongoing	New activity	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Increase the capacity of local school systems to identify trends, patterns and pockets of disproportionate identification practices through the provision of detailed data reports on identification for each local school system.	October 2006 – ongoing	New activity	DSE/EIS staff DAA staff DOSFSS staff
Provide funding through discretionary grants to LSS to address identified disproportionality.	2001- Ongoing	Funds have been awarded to LSS based on competitive grant process. The one year grants have generally been limited to no more than \$25,000 and have enabled LSS to implement interventions targeted to specific areas of disproportionality i.e. supports to students to increase achievement, behavior intervention, inclusion.	DSE/EIS staff IDEA Part B discretionary funds

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator that required collection of baseline data during FFY 2005 (2005-2006). The State is required to collect valid and reliable data from each LSS/PA on the number and percent of students with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent. DSE/EIS staff members, in collaboration with Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU-CTE) identified existing data fields within the new Enhanced Special Services Information System (SSIS) that contribute to this measurement and additional fields to be added to the data system to assure accurate data collection. The Enhanced SSIS data system will be revised to include the additional data fields. In addition to the Enhanced SSIS data system, the Statewide IEP and Online IEP will be revised to include all necessary data fields. See Indicator #20 for more information relative to the Enhanced SSIS data system.

All LSS/PA are required to report LSS/PA level data for students during FFY 2005 (2005-2006) the number of students who had initial evaluations. This includes students who were determined eligible as well as those who were not found eligible. The required data was provided by LSS/PA on forms and Excel spread sheets. MSDE, LSS/PA reviewed the data for indicator 11 which will be used for setting a baseline for the next five years of trend analysis. MSDE staff provided technical assistance to help LSS/PA comply with submission of the required data.

In addition to defining and developing a data matrix for the collection of quantifiable data, DSE/EIS staff collaborate with QAM staff, LSS data managers, and local directors of special education to develop methods for accounting for the reason for any delays that resulted in the evaluation not being completed within 60 days of parental consent.

During the revisions to the data system, DSE/EIS Data Specialists collaborated with QAM staff to identify methods and activities to be completed during the 2005-2006 school year in connection with scheduled monitoring visits in order to collect data for the development of baseline.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Summary data for Indicator 11 has columns added - for indication of "Range Days" (from 1 day to Max # of Days). There are also 2 columns labeled "Acceptable Reason for Delay" (only 2 reasons are considered acceptable reasons for delay: Student Not Available or Parent Requested Delay).

Baseline Data for FFY 2005(2005-2006)

Measurement:

a = # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b = # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days

c = # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days

b¹ = # determined **NOT** eligible whose evaluations were **NOT** completed within 60 days

c¹ = # determined eligible whose evaluations were **NOT** completed within 60 days

b¹AR = # determined **NOT** eligible whose evaluations were **NOT** completed within 60 days, yet an Acceptable Reason for Delay provided

b¹NAR = # determined **NOT** eligible whose evaluations were **NOT** completed within 60 days and **NO** Acceptable Reason for Delay was provided

c¹AR = # determined eligible whose evaluations were **NOT** completed within 60 days, yet an Acceptable Reason for Delay provided

c¹NAR = # determined eligible whose evaluations were **NOT** completed within 60 days and **NO** Acceptable Reason for Delay provided

Number of students for whom parental consent was received (a)	Number determined NOT eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (b)	Number determined NOT eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were NOT completed within 60 days (b ¹)		Range of days beyond 60 days	Number determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (c)	Number determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were NOT completed within 60 days (c ¹)		Range of days beyond 60 days
16,597	3,381	1,177		1-192	8,660	3,374		1-274
		AR	NAR			AR	NAR	
16,597	3381	224	953		8660	653	2721	
16,597	3605		953		9313		2721	

Adjusted Data:

(b¹AR) = Not Eligible with Acceptable Reason for Delay: 224

(c¹AR) = Eligible with Acceptable Reason for Delay: 653

(b¹AR) + (c¹AR) = 877

(4,551 - 877) = 3674 (23%)

$[(b) + (b^1AR)] + [(c) + (c^1AR)] \div (a) \times 100 = \text{Percent}$

$[(3381+224)] + [(8660+653)]$

$[3605 + 9313] \div 16,597 \times 100 = 77\%$

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

b	b ¹ AR	+	c	c ¹ AR	÷	(a)	X 100 =	Percent
3,381	224		8,660	653		16,597		
3605			9,313			0.77		77%
12,918								

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY 2005 (2005-2006) was the first time for MSDE to require this data from LSS/PA. This collection procedure will need improvement in the areas of reason for delay and range data. Not all LSS/PA were able to determine for the baseline data the number of acceptable reason for delay for determination of eligibility which were not completed within 60 calendar days (Student Not Available or Parent Requested Delay). If an LSS/PA was unable to provide documentation for why an evaluation and eligibility determination did not occur within 60 calendar days of parental consent for evaluation, the delay was considered unacceptable. Revised forms/Excel spread sheets addresses more discrete details in order to more closely examine reasons for delay and the range of days beyond 60 calendar days for each LSS/PA in the FFY 2006 collection period (2006-2007).

Of all students identified with (a) [16, 597] a total of 12,918 or 77% of evaluations were completed within 60 calendar days of parental consent for evaluation. LSSs/PAs reported a total of 877 students as having "Acceptable Reasons for Delay" beyond the 60 days from date of parental consent or evaluation. An adjusted total of 3,674 students did not receive evaluations within 60 calendar days of the parent consent for evaluation with no acceptable reason for delay, resulting in 23% of evaluations not being completed within the required timeline. The range of days beyond 60 calendar days from the date of parental consent for evaluation for all students ranged from 1 day to 274 days.

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c.

The number of students in (a) but not included in (b) or (c) are accounted for in (b¹) and (c¹) = (1,177 + 3,374) = 4,551. There are two acceptable reasons for delay: 1) The child was not made available; and 2) The parent requested the delay. Within b¹, LSS provided documentation of acceptable reasons for delay for 224 students which reduces (b¹) to 953 students. Within (c¹), LSS provided documentation of acceptable reasons for delay for 653 students which reduces (c¹) to 721. Adding (b¹) + (c¹) equals an additional 877 students to be included within categories b and c and reducing the number of students categorized as not receiving evaluations and eligibility determination within 60 calendar days of parental consent to 3,674.

Following the collection and verification of LSS/PA data, MSDE worked with each LSS/PA to review the Indicator 11 data to determine the summary numbers for the "Range of Days" and "Acceptable Reasons for Delay". MSDE scheduled 4 regional Data Manager's Technical Assistance Meetings in January, 2007, with LSS Director of Special Education, Data Managers, and Special Education Preschool Personnel (working with 3 to 5 year old students). The participants utilized examples from other states to review the manner in which "Reason for Delays" are collected and reported. The reporting of the "Range of Days" will also be reviewed and procedures for the collection and reporting will be recommended. Staff involved in the collection, verification, and review of data has provided information to the Quality Assurance and Monitoring (QAM) Office on the LSS/PA that did not meet compliance in order to advise LSS/PA of their obligation to correct noncompliance within one year.

MSDE is researching the feasibility of developing a web-based data entry system (integrated with MDSSIS.org) to report these data to MSDE. MSDE required LSS/PA to complete a paper or Excel copy of these reports and keep the completed paper report until the systems are developed to report these data using a web-based data entry system. If MSDE decides to develop and implement a web based system,

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

the earliest that would be completed would be FFY 2007 (2007-2008). The paper or Excel system will be utilized until that time.

Beginning July 1, 2007 LSS/PA will be required to use the Maryland Statewide IEP form. LSS/PA using a web-based case management system are required to work with private vendors to make any needed changes in their tools so that the printed form matches the Maryland Statewide IEP form. Additionally, MSDE will complete an alignment of the Statewide IEP Process Guide with the Maryland Online IEP User Guide, State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators, SSIS Manual, and Accommodations Manual.

Beginning July 1, 2008 LSS/PA will be required to use a web-based IEP program that will generate students' IEPs that match the Statewide IEP form and format for data collection. A system that generates IEPs that match the Statewide IEP form and format will allow for more frequent data submission to the Special Services Information System (mdssis.org)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>Baseline year FFY 2005</i>
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of children were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Review LSS/PA policies, procedures, practices to ensure children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated within 60 days in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.300.	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Researching the feasibility of developing a web-based data entry system to report these data to MSDE	From Present to July 2007	DSE/EIS Staff Center for Technology in Education DataLab USA
Enhancements to SSIS or mdssis.org.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff Data Managers LSS/PA LSS/PA Director of Special Education
Share the new Excel form with Data Managers, for input on proposed changes to fields in SSIS record layout and discuss the consideration of cumulative data collection using mdssis.org.	Regional meetings held January 17,18,19, and 22-2007	SSIS Data Managers Directors of Special Education QAM Preschool Staff
Recommendations to MSDE Leadership, QAM (monitoring), Special Education State advisory Committee (SESAC), and data staff regarding procedures for collecting and reporting data for Indicator 11.	Present to May 2007	MSDE Leadership, QAM SESAC Data Collection staff / LSS/PA Data Managers

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: 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))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. 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)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

MSDE has implemented multiple strategies to address the requirement that students transitioning from Part C who are determined eligible for Part B will have an IEP in effect by their third birthday. The most critical aspect of achieving compliance for this SPP indicator lies in the capacity of a statewide data collection and reporting system to collect, aggregate and report this data to inform local lead agency and LSS improvement efforts in conjunction with the State quality assurance and monitoring system activities. In Spring 2005, the SSIS data system was modified to collect data to track the effective dates of initial IEPs for students transitioning from Part C. Data fields were added to the system to identify a child transitioning from Part C, the initial IEP meeting date, and the date Part B services will be initiated. Statewide data on the number of students transitioning from Part C to Part B whose IEPs were in effect by their third birthday will be available following the October 2005 SSIS data collection from local school systems. The State recognizes that in addition to gathering and reporting data on the number of IEPs in effect by the third birthday, it must also address the expanded requirement for this SPP Indicator of reporting the total number of students referred by local Part C lead agencies to Part B for eligibility determination, and of those students referred, how many were determined to be NOT eligible for Part B prior to their third birthdays. This information will ultimately be collected through the demographics section of the online IEP, which will document the outcome of the eligibility determination process for all children and youth referred to Part B. This data will not be collected through the Statewide SSIS system, as this system reports on students with active IEPs as of the end of October of each year. For the purpose of including baseline data on the number of children found to be NOT eligible prior to the third birthday out of the total number of children referred by Part C to Part B, the State will utilize data captured through the online IFSP/Part C component of the statewide database. Although this field on the IFSP was to have been eliminated it will now be temporarily retained to collect this data for Part B reporting of baseline data for the SPP, with the demographics section of the online IEP fully implemented by June 30, 2006.

Revised Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

State Total of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	# of children determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays	# of children found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their birthdays	# of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services	Percentage of children determined eligible whose IEPs were developed and implemented by the third birthday
*3,368	Data Not collected for baseline period	209**	0	6.21%

*Total as reported from the Part C database.

**Total verifiable from Part B SSIS October data collection

Discussion of Revised Baseline Data:

At the time of the first State Performance Plan submission (December 1, 2005), data to address Indicator 12 were not being systematically collected as part of Maryland’s annual Student Services Information System (SSIS). MSDE submitted what was referred to at the time as data from the web-based Part C database to address this indicator. In a March 2006 letter, OSEP indicated that Maryland must report Part B data for FFY 2004, and that this data would constitute appropriate baseline data for this Indicator.

By way of clarification as to the relevance of the data submitted with the first SPP, the following explanation is offered, and should have been included with the original submission.

Prior to a site visit conducted by OSEP in March 2004 for both Part C and Part B, Maryland had in place jointly developed Part C/Part B Transition At Age Three State Policies and Procedures that allowed local lead agencies and local school systems to conduct the Part C Transition Planning Meeting and the initial Part B eligibility determination meeting as a combined meeting, as long as each part of the combined meeting met respective regulatory requirements (e.g., informed parental consent, personnel present). In conjunction with this provision, the MSDE and MITP agreed that, since the Part C database was web-based and “real-time” Part C would collect and enter the outcome of each eligibility determination meeting, i.e., Part B data would be collected and maintained in the Part C database. With MSDE as the lead agency for Part C, this coordinated approach to data collection was intended to assist with oversight of the Transition At Age Three process. In response the findings resulting from the March 2004 site visit by OSEP, the MSDE and MITP determined that by allowing the two meetings to be combined, issues of programmatic responsibility had become confused, and therefore remedies to address full compliance were difficult to implement. The MSDE and MITP subsequently revised the State Policies and Procedures to clarify the distinct responsibilities of both programs, separating the formerly combined meetings into separate Part C and Part B functions, and eliminating the collection of outcome data for Part B eligibility determination from the Part C database.

To fully comply with OSEP’s March 2006 Directions, Maryland instituted the following procedures to collect and validate data to establish the baseline for FFY 2004:

- Identification of the timeframe of July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 as the baseline data period; (this is consistent with the established period for cumulative Exit data collection).
- The Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program provided a data set from the Part C web-based database covering the same time period; this data set included all children entered into the Part C database by Local Infants and Toddlers Program staff as having been referred to local school systems for Part B eligibility determination and found eligible. Social Security numbers are used as the child identification number for the Part C database however parents are not required to provide SSN.

- The MSDE Part B data manager conducted a comparison of the Part C data set with the SSIS data set, using Social Security numbers as the basis for making a match. Part B data includes SSN and pseudo-SSN. Though limited in terms of comparability of the information in both data sets, it was the selected approach due to the lack of connectedness between the Part C and Part B databases. The lack of a consistent assignment of student identification numbers between Part C and Part B, as well as across local school systems contributed to matching inconsistencies.

Results of procedures:

- 209 (6.21%) out of a total of 3,368 children reported by Part C as referred to Part B for eligibility determination could be verified by Part B as having been found eligible with an IEP in effect at age 3.
- Data on the number of children reported by Part C as referred to Part B and determined *NOT eligible* prior to the third birthday were not collected for July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005. It was not until August 2005 that States were advised at a national meeting on State Performance Plan requirements sponsored by OSEP that these data must be collected and reported. Maryland established data collection procedures for local school systems to capture these data beginning with the July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006 collection period. Results are reported as part of Actual Target Data for FFY 2005.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Hiring of new Part B 619 Monitoring staff position	April-May 2007	DSE/EIS – MITP/PS Branch staff MSDE Human Resources Office
Joint Part C/Part B process for conducting shared monitoring of Early Childhood Transition will be developed.	October 2005-August 2007	MITP Part C Monitoring staff Part B 619 Monitoring staff DSE/EIS Part B Monitoring Branch (Quality Assurance and Monitoring – QAM) DSE/EIS Staff
Joint Part C/Part B process for conducting shared monitoring of Early Childhood Transition implemented, including coordinating oversight of associated corrective action plans.	February 2006 and Ongoing	MITP Part C Monitoring staff Part B 619 Monitoring staff DSE/EIS Part B Monitoring Branch (QAM)
New demographic data collection section of the Statewide IEP implemented.	July 1, 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Completed revision of joint Part C/Part B state technical assistance bulletin on Early Childhood Transition	March 2007	DSE/EIS staff MITP Part C staff
Early Childhood Transition data will be included in local lead agency and local school system report cards	January-June 2007	DSE/EIS staff MITP Part C staff
Provide training and technical assistance to local school system data managers, local directors of special education, and local preschool special education coordinators related to reporting Early Childhood Transition data.	January 2006 & ongoing	Part B 619 and Part B staff
Continue to monitor, direct	Ongoing	MITP Part C Monitoring staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

<p>improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to Early Childhood Transition.</p>		<p>Part B 619 Monitoring staff DSE/EIS Part B Monitoring Branch (QAM)</p>
<p>Review LSS policies and procedures for practices to ensure 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 in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.124.</p>	<p>February 2007 and ongoing</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff LSS Preschool Coordinators LSS directors LITP Coordinators</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

To collect the data required to establish a baseline during FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006) MSDE will evaluate the feasibility and validity of existing data sources in order to identify the procedures the State and LSS shall use to gather the required data. DSE/EIS will solicit participation and input from a variety of stakeholders, including DSE/EIS, CTAL, and DORS staff members, LSS transition coordinators, local directors of special education, advocates, SESAC members, and the IDEA Partnership Team to review existing sources of data, methods of data collection and reporting in order to assure the collection of accurate, valid, and reliable data. Information and existing procedures to consider include, but are not limited to the consideration of:

- Modification of the SSIS to add a data field to identify transition goals and activities on the IEP of students with disabilities, age 16 and older;
- Review of self-assessment, validation, verification, and monitoring results, including findings as the result of due process hearings, and written complaints relative to IEP content of transition goals and activities. This review will document whether there is non-compliance in this area;
- Participation of transition specialists on on-site monitoring teams;
- Review of LSS policies and procedures relative to secondary transition; and
- Data from the Maryland Exit Document on transition goals and activities.

To evaluate the efficacy of various data sources Maryland will review transition probes within the State's policies and procedures to assure it includes appropriate secondary transition probes that will lead to accurate, valid, and reliable data. This includes the following documentation:

- A statement of the transition service needs of the student that focuses on the student's course of study;
- Measurable post secondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, when appropriate independent living skills;
- A description of transition services;
- Course of study;
- Student preferences and interests are included;
- Strategies to promote access to and progress in academic (e.g. math, language arts, science, etc.) and nonacademic content (e.g. career development, community access, travel training, etc.) are incorporated into transition planning; and

- Plans for collaboration with other agencies to ensure the delivery of transition services are incorporated in transition planning.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

	Number of students with disabilities age 16 and older with an IEP	Percent who had post secondary goal(s) in their IEP	Percent who did not have a post secondary goal(s) in their IEP	Percent who had measurable annual goal(s) in their IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet post secondary goal(s).	Percent who did not have measurable annual goal(s) in their IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet their post secondary goal(s).	Percent of students who had coordinated transition services listed in their IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet their post secondary goal(s)	Percent of students who did not have coordinated transition services listed in their IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet their post secondary goal(s).
State of Maryland	17,473	90.23%	9.77%	89.07%	10.93%	63.54%	36.46%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data used to establish the baseline for this indicator was reported by Local School Systems (LSS). This baseline is FFY 2005 (2005 – 2006) and it is census data. Each LSS used their own method to gather the data. Several LSS are using online computer programs to generate IEPs and those programs give the local staff to capture specific data as was the case for Indicator # 13. The LSS that did not have this capability completed student record reviews. Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services staff conducted validation and reliability audits. Random selection was utilized to select the LSS, specific schools, and specific students for the audit.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>New Indicator with baseline data collected in FFY 2005 (2005-2006)</i>
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of youth with disabilities, aged 16 and above, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of youth with disabilities, aged 16 and above, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of youth with disabilities, aged 16 and above, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2009	100% of youth with disabilities, aged 16 and above, have an IEP that includes

SPP Template – Part B (3)

(2009-2010)	coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of youth with disabilities, aged 16 and above, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices to ensure youth with disabilities, aged 16 and above, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.	February 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Developed a statewide online IEP. By July 2007, all LSS must develop local online IEP that have the identical appearance of the Statewide IEP. This will improve the capacity of LSS to complete appropriate transition planning documentation in the IEP.	July 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff.
Utilize the online IEP and consider other strategies to assist the LSS to mine existing data for coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.	July 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Provide Technical Assistance, professional development and support to LSS staff to improve measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable students to meet the post-secondary goals.	July 2007 and on-going	DSE/EIS staff Representatives of IHE and Adult Service Providers

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

On November 10, 2005 Maryland received permission from OSEP to use the data generated by the Maryland Longitudinal Transition Study (MDLTS) as the baseline for the percent of youth in competitive employment, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both. The Maryland Study is a companion to the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 funded by the USDE and conducted by SRI Inc. The state level study will be identical to the national study, with a few exceptions in sample construction and the timing of initial data collection activities. The MDLTS was begun in December 2000. The MDLTS is investigating the number of domains that influence student achievement and post school outcomes. The domains include student characteristics, family characteristics, school characteristics and policies, school programs, and non-school factors.

The sampling approach for the MDLTS had two goals:

1. To generate a sample of students that is representative of students who were receiving special education services throughout Maryland and who were ages 13 to 17 on December 1, 2000. Findings of this study will generalize to this population as a whole. The sample required to generalize to specific disability categories would be beyond the resources of MSDE.
2. To select a large enough student sample to ensure that estimates of important factors have sufficient statistical precision at the end of the study to meet information needs, taking into account attrition over time, likely response rates to the study's multiple data collection instruments, and the multiple analysis goals of the study.

To attain the goal of state representation, students were selected from a sample of LSS that represent the diversity within the state, and were selected in the same proportions that their disability categories occur in the statewide population. One thousand students were selected to participate distributed by disability category. Students from Baltimore City and Baltimore, Allegany, Harford, Kent, Montgomery, Prince Georges, and Queen Anne's Counties participated. Baltimore, Montgomery, Prince George's Counties and Baltimore City each have total student populations that exceed 50,000.

SRI Inc. will report to MSDE in January 2006 the data that will be submitted as baseline. The data will address the post school outcomes of study participants as of August 2005. The report will contain data on the number of young adult participants enrolled in postsecondary education, the number employed, and the number who had dropped out and earned a GED.

DSE/EIS will release a Request for Proposal (RFP) to provide a “Comprehensive Design and Implementation of a System to Collect, Validate, Aggregate, Analyze, and Report on Postsecondary Outcomes.” DSE/EIS will consult with the National Center on Postsecondary Outcomes during the development of the RFP.

Nature of RFP includes:

1. Develop an instrument that examines the activity of young adults one year after exiting school.
2. Establish and deliver a sampling plan with appropriate degree of accuracy and confidence level and one that meets the criteria as established by OSEP.
3. Provide information to the DSE/EIS Part B Program Manager, related to collecting, aggregating, and analyzing valid and reliable data as it relates to employment and/or continuing education of students who have exited school.
4. Conduct phone interviews of young adults one year after exiting secondary school.
5. Complete processing the data and verify the data from the survey.
6. Produce an electronic filing system for the DES/EIS.
7. Generate an online report that includes benchmarks, goal setting, and action planning.
8. Provide assistance in interpreting the data, compiling final reports, and analyzing data to improve transition services.

Maryland will also investigate the use of demographic data from the Exit Document that will be used to gather the postsecondary outcome data. The postsecondary goal, address, phone number and other pertinent information will be gathered from the Exit Document data base.

Gathering Baseline Data

The baseline data for this indicator will be submitted as part of the Maryland Annual Performance Report on February 1, 2008. On November 10, 2005 MSDE received permission from OSEP to use data generated by the Maryland Longitudinal Transition Study (MDLTS) as the baseline for the percent of youth in competitive employment, enrolled in post-secondary education, or both. The Maryland Study is a companion to the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 funded by the USDE and conducted by SRI Inc. SRI Inc. reported to MSDE in January 2006 the data that will be submitted as baseline. The data will address the post school outcomes of study participants as of August 2005. The report will contain data on the percentage of young adult participants enrolled in post secondary education and the percentage of young adult participants employed.

Maryland’s Census Plan for Subsequent Data Collection

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has utilized suggestions from the National Post-School Outcomes Center *Post-School Data Collection Protocol* in the development of this data collection plan. Accordingly, MSDE will conduct a census survey to address Indicator # 14.

MSDE will use the following recommended definitions:

- Competitive Employment means work - (1) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full time or part time basis in an integrated setting; and (2) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals who are not disabled. (Authority: Sections 7(11) and 12 C of the Rehabilitation Act.
- Post-Secondary school means education or training that leads to employment of choice. The young adult may be enrolled in vocational training program, 2 or 4 year college, adult basic education and/or the GED preparation program.

Chronology of Activities used to Gather Information from Exited Students

1. MSDE will use the Post-Secondary Data Collection Survey (PSS). This survey protocol was

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Developed by the National Post-School Outcome Center and recommended by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

2. Scope of Exited Student Population for the Census Survey:
 - A. The respondent group will be students who have exited Maryland Local School systems and public agencies. The number of respondents will be established from the data contained in the MSDE Special Services Information System Exit Reason Report that is published every June 30th.
 - B. The respondent group will come from the four categories that pertain to Indicator # 14.
 1. Graduated with a Diploma,
 2. Graduated with a Certificate,
 3. Reached Maximum Age, or
 4. Dropped Out.
3. The primary source of contact information will be the Maryland Exit Document (MED). The MED is the MSDE Summary of Performance Document. All Students with IEPs receive the MED as a companion to the Maryland High School Diploma or the Maryland High School Certificate of Program Completion. The MED contains point of contact information within the demographic section. Local Education Agencies (LEA) will provide the point of contact information for those students who dropped out of school during the survey year or for those students who did not receive a MED.
4. MSDE, using the Request for Proposal method, will hire a contractor to gather the data for the Indicator #14 Annual Performance Report. The contractor will be required to make three survey contacts. The first contact will be in the form of a letter with the survey and return envelope attached. If the survey is not returned, there will be two phone attempts made to encourage the exited student to complete the survey. The survey will be conducted during the month of September of the year following the student's exit from school.
5. MSDE will work with the contractor to analyze the data collected on the Post-Secondary Data Collection Survey.
6. MSDE will work with the Maryland Special Education Special Education State Advisory Committee to reflect on activities designed to improve performance on the indicator and adjust the performance targets, as appropriate.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	<i>FFY 2006 (2006-2007) is the baseline data year. Baseline data to be reported on February 2, 2008.</i>
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	

2010 (2010-2011)	
----------------------------	--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
MSDE, using the Request for Proposal method, will hire a contractor to gather the data for the Indicator #14 Annual Performance Report. The contractor will be required to make three survey contacts. The first contact will be in the form of a letter with the survey and return envelope attached. If the survey is not returned, there will be two phone attempts made to encourage the exited student to complete the survey. The survey will be conducted during the month of September of the year following the student's exit from school.	To Be Determined	DSE/EIS staff Selected Contractor
MSDE will work with the contractor to analyze the data collected on the Post-Secondary Data Collection Survey.	To Be Determined	DSE/EIS staff Selected Contractor
MSDE will work with the Maryland Special Education Special Education State Advisory Committee to reflect on activities designed to improve performance on the indicator and adjust the performance targets, as appropriate.	To Be Determined	DSE/EIS staff Maryland Special Education Special Education State Advisory Committee
MSDE will work with the other members of the Interagency Transition Council to assist young adults to apply for education, training, and employment assistance services for which they may be entitled.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DORS staff DDA staff MHA staff DLLR staff WIA staff
MSDE will rewrite and publish the <i>Maryland Transition Planning and Anticipated Services Guide</i> . This Guide provides students and families information on the services available from State agencies that may assist the student in meeting their postsecondary goals.	July 2008	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff DDA staff DORS staff Families MHA staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MSDE, DSE/EIS monitoring functions cross branches within the Division. As a result of an OSEP March 2005 visit, an office dedicated to coordinating activities for monitoring LSS and PA was established. The DSE/EIS, Office of QAM was established on March 21, 2005 and reports directly to the State Assistant Superintendent in the DSE/EIS. At that time the QAM office consisted of two full time appointed employees, and three part-time employees that were assigned to specific tasks. Between March 24, 2005 and June 17, 2005 QAM staff met eleven times and focused efforts on developing the self-assessment form, self-assessment verification desk-audit instrument, policies and procedures manual and revision of the record-review form. Meetings have been scheduled between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006. In Maryland, the monitoring for continuous improvement and results (MCIR) process has undergone significant changes and is designed to ensure improved performance results for students with disabilities and compliance with IDEA 2004, Part B requirements. The MSDE structure encompasses a cyclical system of general supervision, verification, program improvement, monitoring for compliance, public reporting and enforcement. The LSS and PA engage in MCIR activities listed below in their efforts to increase the performance results for students with disabilities and ensure compliance with the IDEA 2004 requirements:

- Self-Assessment of performance on priority indicators;
- Collect accurate quantitative and qualitative data;
- Involve broad stakeholder input in self-assessment and improvement planning;
- Develop and submit to MSDE, DSE/EIS a Local Performance Plan (LPP) and subsequent Local Annual Performance Report (LAPR);
- Participate in MSDE, DSE/EIS monitoring activities;
- Complete required "Corrective Action Plans" (CAP) or requirements based on MSDE monitoring functions; and
- Report local performance annually to the public.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

On April 29, 2005, The Division held a statewide technical assistance meeting in Columbia, Maryland. LSS and PA attended this meeting to learn about the revised monitoring process which emphasizes the Self-Assessment as the foundation for future improvement activities. As a follow up to the meeting the same power-point presentation developed and used by MSDE was made available to all LSS and PA for the purpose of providing LSS or PA on-site technical assistance training for staff. Self-assessments were submitted as required by all LSS and PA in June 2005. Self assessments were reviewed by July 2005 and meetings were scheduled for an on-site overview of the self-assessment and provide technical assistance prior to the desk audit to verify information. All self-assessments will be reviewed on-site by December 31, 2005. As of December 2, 2005, 21 onsite visits will be completed and the desk audit verifications for LSS will begin on October 11, 2005. The order in which LSS and PA were selected to be visited was based on a rank order of self assessment information provided and the need for technical assistance in addressing priority areas and initiatives. Those LSS identified in the need of the most technical assistance and supervision were scheduled to be visited first.

In June 2004, the Program Administration and Staff Development (PASD) Branch of DSE/EIS completed the first Enhanced Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (EMCIR) report for one LSS concerning the 2003-2004 school year. Staff from MSDE and the LSS developed the initial CAP through extensive negotiation. The initial CAP was scheduled for completion by October 9, 2005. This represented a one-year timeline for implementation of the agreed upon CAP. Although the LSS completed the activities required to address the findings, sufficient progress toward the goals was not realized. Additional technical assistance, redirection and restriction of funds and other sanctions have been imposed upon the system.

DSE/EIS continues to monitor the system in the same areas and expands its activities where additional areas of noncompliance are identified. Additional monitoring reports were issued in January and June of 2005. A new CAP based on the June 2005 EMCIR report has been developed with a completion date of June 13, 2006.

In September 2005, the Maryland State Superintendent of Schools appointed an Intensive Management and Capacity Improvement (IMCI) team. The IMCI team consists of nine members in key areas of special education and financial management to oversee and provide on-site technical assistance to the LSS. Due to continued noncompliance, DSE/EIS redirected the use of the LSS carryover funding to address noncompliance identified through monitoring or written complaints. DSE/EIS requested a resubmission of the SFY 2006 Local Application of Federal Funds to include modifications necessary to implement CAP. DSE/EIS will continue to monitor provision of FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE), the provision of related services, grants management, discipline, student achievement, and exit data and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Annually, the Maryland State Department of Education and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene monitor 24 LSS for compliance with the Medicaid health related services requirements. A standardized monitoring instrument is utilized that includes frequency of service on the IEP, dates of service provided, provider qualifications and description of service. At the conclusion of each monitoring visit, a written monitoring report is provided to each LSS and the report is shared with QAM staff. The report describes the team procedures, the local self-monitoring process, the sufficiency of record documentation, findings, and a CAP, if appropriate.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Revised 2-1-07 to meet OSEP revised reporting measurement.

Statewide Correction of PA Systemic Noncompliance: Status Report of Correction due between July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005	
a. Number of findings of noncompliance.	21
b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	19

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Percent corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year. Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.	90%
--	------------

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data is based on complaints filed between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2004 (FFY03) for which the completion of corrective actions were due in FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005). The findings of systemic noncompliance include:

- 2 agencies - implementation of behavior intervention regulations
- 1 agency – C to B transition IEP in effect
- 1 agency – FAPE during disciplinary removal
- 2 agencies - ESY proper, timely determination
- 1 agency – IEE proper procedures
- 1 agency - IEP development parent participation
- 3 agencies- IEP implementation (timely)
- 2 agencies - accommodation district wide testing
- 4 agencies - proper procedures home and hospital teaching
- 1 agency -related services speech
- 2 agencies related services transportation (MSD, nonpublic schools)
- 1 agency - implementation of settlement agreements
- 1 agency - proper written notice

During the 04-05 reporting period systemic correction of noncompliance data was reported separately for monitoring activities and complaint investigations. During that time period there were 21 findings of noncompliance that were identified through complaint investigations that were due. Of those, 19 were corrected within one year (90%).

During the same time period there were no corrective actions due as a result of monitoring activities. Note: During this period of time monitoring activities were focused on redesign and implementation of the system to identify noncompliance.

During the period July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005, eight of 24 LSS were monitored for compliance with requirements for the placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and the provision of related services in accordance with individual student IEPs. Of these, five had findings of noncompliance. Completion of corrective actions and findings, based on verification of correction, will be reported in the APR due February 2007.

Time Period	Total # Number of LSS in MD	Total # LSS Monitored for FAPE in the LRE	# LSS Monitored Compliant	# LSS Monitored Noncompliant	# LSS Monitored with CAP for LRE and/or related services	# with completed CAPs
July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005	24	8	3	5	6*^	1^

*One CAP of the State's monitoring was added as the result of a LSS self-assessment.

^One CAP in the State's monitoring was added as a result of the EMCIR process. One CAP was completed for this system. Desired progress was not achieved and an additional CAP and other sanctions are being implemented.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant LRE	CAP Completion Date
06-01-05	√	06-01-06
01-18-05	√	01-18-06
03-01-05	√	03-01-06
03-11-05	√	03-11-06
04-14-05	√	04-14-06
06-30-04	√	10-09-05+

+ CAP completion date is one year from the negotiated start date. Subsequent CAPs for this system are limited to one year from the report date identifying the area of noncompliance.

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant Suspensions	CAP Completion Date
01-18-05	√	01-18-06
06-30-04	√	10-09-05

During the period July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005, 14 LSS and PA were monitored by the QAM Office and/or PASD Branch in areas not included in the State's priority areas. The following chart shows areas of noncompliance outside of the monitoring priority areas. In addition, one LSS self-identified the provision of related services as noncompliant and self-initiated a CAP.

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant Related Services	CAP Completion Date
06-01-05	√	06-01-06
01-18-05	√	01-18-06
03-01-05	√	03-01-06
03-11-05	√	03-11-06
04-14-05	√	04-14-06
06-14-05	√	06-13-06
06-14-05	√	06-13-06

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant	CAP Completion Date
03-01-05	-IEP team participation -IEP content -IEP team responsibilities	03-01-06
04-13-05	- Assessment/Reevaluation	04-13-06
06-13-05	-IEP team responsibilities IEP content	06-13-06
06-14-05	Grants Management	06-13-06

MSDE has implemented the strategies identified through the CAPs that were submitted to OSEP in September 2004. MSDE continues to require LSS and PA to provide documented evidence of actions taken to address identified corrective actions. MSDE provides technical assistance and monitors and verifies correction of noncompliance through telephone contacts, site visits, review of multiple data sources, including complaints, due process hearings and MCIR self assessment data, and verification data.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

The LSS CAPs for the monitoring priority areas of LRE and suspensions are not required to be completed at the time of this report. Therefore, the State can not provide documentation verifying that correction of noncompliance has occurred. Data and analysis to support the conclusion that the identified noncompliance by MSDE related to LRE and suspensions have been corrected will be reported in the February 2007 APR and in correspondence to OSEP as required by special conditions in the MSDE FFY 2005 Grant Award. Data and analysis of corrections associated with CAPs of other monitored indicators will also be provided, as appropriate.

MSDE will continue to ensure correction of systemic noncompliance through Division wide activities to enhance general supervisory capacity. MSDE will continue to implement processes that involve staff from all branches of the Division in order to track status of identification and correction of noncompliance, needs for and provision of technical assistance and monitoring activities to address correction of systemic noncompliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Increase dedicated Quality Assurance and Monitoring	July 1, 2005- December 30, 2005	Position Approval

SPP Template – Part B (3)

staff by three full time positions and three part-time positions for a total of five full time and six part time staff members.		
MSDE will continue to enhance general supervisory capacity through coordinated planning activities that involve staff from all branches of the division to enhance coordinated tracking of data, TA and monitoring to address correction of systemic noncompliance.	July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS Staff
Focused Monitoring activities for LRE and the provision of related services will be conducted by MSDE in 10 additional local school systems during the period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 (for a total of 17 of 24 local school systems). Corrective Action Plans (CAP) will be assigned to those local school systems with systemic findings of noncompliance.	July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams
On-site verification of the results of Corrective Action Plans will be conducted by MSDE within six months of the close of the CAP as per revised monitoring procedures.	July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams
24 of 24 local school systems will have self-monitoring systems in place to ensure compliance with all requirements associated with FAPE in the LRE and the delivery of related services.	November 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams
Upon completion of the Self-assessment Desk Audit and On-Site Review, the LSS and PA will be required to submit Local Performance Plans	September 2005 - June 2006	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams

SPP Template – Part B (3)

(LPP). MCIR and Focused Monitoring procedures will define required actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement to be applied to those LSS and PA with sustained noncompliance.		
The State will complete its focused monitoring for LRE and the provision of related services and select additional monitoring priority areas for focused monitoring.	January 2006 – June 2007	SESAC IDEA Partnership Team
The revised MCIR manual will be distributed to all LSS and PA.	January 2006 – March 2006	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams

MSDE has expanded its system of general supervision to address identified noncompliance. MSDE recognizes that the target of 100% has not been met and proposes the following improvement activities to make progress on reaching the standard. The selection of each activity is based on the findings and data in this report and is designed to promote and improve the State's general supervisory system.

Improvement Activities	Timeline	Resources
When a CAP has been completed and PA submitted data to show correction has been made, the State will conduct verification activities as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the identification of noncompliance.	September 2006 – June 2007 and ongoing	QAM CIDP Staff
Develop data collection methods that continue to ensure data are valid and reliable across the DSE/EIS.	February 2007 – June 30, 2007 and ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff
Identify TA and monitoring activities that serve as alternatives to on-site activities.	February 2007 – June 30, 2007	QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD
Coordinate the findings from the Self-Assessment instrument with grants in the	March 2007	PASD Staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Local Application for Federal Funds (LAFF).		
Based on an analysis of the data, implement TA activities that addresses targeted areas in PAs.	February 2007 – December 2007 and ongoing	QAM MITP/PS PASD
Conduct DSE/EIS general supervisory coordination meetings for the purpose of coordinating practices, data collection and improving the rate of correction of noncompliance through TA and other strategies of enforcement.	February 1, 2007 – June 30, 2007 and ongoing	QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD
Clarify and expand enforcement activities.	May 2007 – June 2007	QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD
Work with PAs to ensure adequate systems are in place that are designed to self-identify, monitor, and correct noncompliance.	February 2007 – December 2007 and ongoing	QAM PASD
Update the monitoring manual, as necessary. Clarify how PAs are selected for monitoring and how determinations are made.	May 2007 – September 2007 and ongoing	QAM CIDP MITP/PS
Align indicators with the State's monitoring areas for reporting.	March 2007 – June 30, 2007	QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

MSDE has adopted written procedures for investigating IDEA complaints. The MSDE Special Education Complaint Resolution Procedures for Part B complaints have been widely disseminated may be found on the MSDE web site. Once the regulations implementing IDEA 2004 are finalized, MSDE will review and revise these procedures to ensure they are consistent with federal requirements.

Pursuant to the MSDE procedures, the complaint must be in writing and signed and meet the criteria identified in 34 CFR §300.153 in order to constitute an IDEA complaint filed with the Department for investigation. In completing IDEA complaint investigations, MSDE utilizes a collaborative approach, consulting with appropriate Department staff and the Office of the Attorney General, as necessary, to ensure consistency in the interpretation of federal and State regulation and policies.

The MSDE has procedures to ensure that alleged violations of IDEA and State special education law are investigated in a thorough manner to identify noncompliance. Complaints are generally resolved within 60 days of the date that the written complaint is received unless exceptional circumstances exist with respect to a particular complaint. The need for an extension of the timeline is documented in the complaint file and a written explanation is provided in the Letter of Findings.

The MSDE procedures address the correction of noncompliance identified through complaint investigations. Pursuant to those procedures, all noncompliance identified through the investigation must be remediated and corrected. The Letter of Findings explicitly states the timeframe in which the corrective actions must be taken to redress the violations for the individual student(s) as well as any school-based and/or systemic corrective action. The timeline for remediating the denial of appropriate services to the individual student is generally 30-60 days, depending on the circumstances and nature of the violation determined.

The Letter of Findings states that technical assistance is available to the parties regarding implementation of the required actions and identifies the name of the MSDE staff person responsible for following up to ensure that required actions are satisfactorily completed in a timely manner. The Letter of Findings states that the public agency is required to provide documentation to MSDE to demonstrate satisfactory completion of the corrective actions. MSDE has designated one full-time staff person who is responsible for ensuring completion of the required actions. This individual conducts on-site visits with public agencies and provides technical assistance to public agency staff and complainants to ensure timely and effective implementation of complaint decisions. As part of this process, the individual reviews data concerning violations identified through complaint investigations and due process hearings with public agency staff, to determine if there is pattern that suggests systemic noncompliance.

Systemic findings of noncompliance determined through complaint investigations are shared and reviewed through the State's monitoring process. Data and analysis concerning follow up to complaint findings of noncompliance is provided in Indicator #15 of this report.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See Attachment 1. During this reporting period, MSDE received 162 written complaints. Nineteen (19) of these were withdrawn or dismissed. As of the closing date (August 29, 2005), two (2) investigations were pending. Of the 141 Letters of Findings for complaints received between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005, 138 were issued within required timelines (98%).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Between July 1, 2004 and November 15, 2004, MSDE had five (5) full-time complaint investigators. From November 15, 2004 through the end of the reporting period for complaint investigations (August 29, 2005), MSDE had four (4) full-time complaint investigators. The fifth complaint investigator position has been abolished due to State budgetary constraints. Because the complaint investigation staff is highly skilled with extensive experience and a deep commitment to ensuring timelines are met, MSDE was able to achieve a marked improvement in completing IDEA complaint investigations within required timelines. Unfortunately, one of our most experienced investigators resigned effective September 26, 2005, bringing the number of full-time complaint investigators to three (3). MSDE staff has taken immediate steps under the State's hiring procedures to fill the vacant position.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Review and revise, as appropriate complaint resolution procedures to ensure consistency with IDEA 2004 and its implementing regulations.	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS staff OSEP Contact MSRRC Contact AG Office
Recruit and retain qualified personnel needed to ensure complaint investigations are conducted within proper timelines.	July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS staff HR Staff
Provide professional development to DSE/EIS staff to ensure staff members are properly trained and knowledgeable of the requirements of IDEA 2004 and State special education law.	Annually	DSE/EIS Staff MSRRC Contact AG Office
Project utilizing facilitators to assist parents and school systems at IEP meetings.	September 2005 and ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff LSS staff Consultants

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) is responsible under State Law to conduct all special education due process hearings. OAH works closely with MSDE in developing policies and procedures in administration of the hearing procedures and in determining agenda for the training of the administrative law judges (ALJ) in various special education topics. MSDE collects, maintains, and reports all data required under the IDEA and other relevant data determined necessary to meet the State's general supervisory responsibility.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See Attachment 1. During the FFY 2004 reporting period (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005) of the 79 hearing requests that were fully adjudicated, 9 decisions were not issued within the required timelines. The measurement was $70 / 79 = 88.61\%$.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

It is noted that in FFY 03 the closing date for the data collection was August 14, 2004 which was 45 days after the close of the fiscal year and when we designated the end of the reporting period. For the SPP in Attachment 1, we are required to end the reporting period on June 30, 2005 and therefore we lose approximately 45 days of data from the report.

MSDE is able to report that during the 1st quarter of FFY 05 (July 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005), there were 81 requests for due process hearing. As of November 29, 2005, MSDE is in receipt of 9 due process hearing requests that resulted in fully adjudicated decisions being issued. Of the 9 due process hearing requests, 8 were issued within timelines or within timelines extended.

MSDE continues to closely monitor the timeliness of hearing decisions. Activities include analyzing and disseminating monthly timeline reports, and conducting meetings with the OAH staff on a quarterly basis, or more frequently if the need arises. Additionally, due to changes within IDEA 2004 due process complaint forms required revisions and in order to continue to strive toward 100% of hearings rendered within timelines, some revisions will still need to be made.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Meet regularly with OAH	Ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff AG Office Staff
Provide OAH with monthly timeliness reports for all hearing decisions rendered	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Evaluate each ALJ on the timeliness of their decisions.	Ongoing	OAH staff
Provide professional development to ALJs and OAH staff on legal updates and revisions to federal and state policies and procedures, as appropriate	Annually	ALJs, OAH staff DSE/EIS staff AG Office staff Consultant
Receive copies of all requests for due process hearing and review requests to determine if an expedited hearing is warranted. If upon receipt of a request that	May 2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

may need an expedited hearing, MSDE contacts OAH so appropriate action can be taken without delay.		
--	--	--

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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))

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In preparation for the implementation of the new procedure for impartial due process hearings required under Section 615 regarding Resolution Sessions, MSDE provided training in June 2005 to public agencies, advocacy organizations, attorneys who represent parents, and administrators of nonpublic schools that serve students with disabilities. MSDE has also revised the Procedural Safeguards/Parental Rights document and the State's Guidelines for Special Education Mediations and Due Process Hearings. Both of these documents are available on the MSDE website. MSDE is accomplishing the collection of Resolution Session data by requiring public agencies to complete a form, entitled "Notice of Outcome of Resolution Session", and is currently monitoring this new process to ensure smooth implementation, and analyzing the data to ensure compliance with 20 U.S.C. §1415.

MSDE has also revised its database to include capturing the relevant information on Resolution Sessions, taking into consideration the information included in Table 7, provided for this reporting period. MSDE is prepared to provide the data as indicated Table 7, and the data will be included in the next reporting period.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

64% of resolution meetings held resulted in agreements during the 2005-2006 school year. Please refer to attached Table 7.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

DSE/EIS will continue to promote early resolution processes, such as resolution meetings, mediations, or other means to help parents and Public Agencies "get on the road to agreement" and resolve all complaints at the LEA level so as not to require SEA involvement.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>Baseline data was collected during FFY 2005.</i>
2006 (2006-2007)	64 – 75% of all resolution meetings conducted will result in a settlement agreement
2007 (2007-2008)	64 – 75% of all resolution meetings conducted will result in a settlement agreement
2008 (2008-2009)	64 – 75% of all resolution meetings conducted will result in a settlement agreement
2009 (2009-2010)	64 – 75% of all resolution meetings conducted will result in a settlement agreement
2010 (2010-2011)	64 – 75% of all resolution meetings conducted will result in a settlement agreement

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Review and analyze resolution meeting data to ensure public agencies are implementing the requirement in accordance with 300.510.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff
Provide professional development to public agency, and upon request, parent advocates about the use of resolution meetings and other less formal means of dispute resolution.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff Consultants

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Under State law, OAH is designated to conduct all mediations filed under the IDEA and State special education requirements. All mediation sessions must be held in a manner that does not deny or delay a parent’s right to a due process hearing. Although MSDE and OAH continue to strive to reach a mediation agreement for each mediation session conducted, the primary goal continues to be that mediation sessions are conducted in a timely manner so as to ensure no delay or denial of a due process hearing occurs, and that parents are aware of the opportunity to resolve disagreements through mediation and may seek mediation at any time. We continue to work toward increasing resolutions through mediation and dispute resolution sessions which should decrease those disputes that must be resolved at due process hearings. MSDE will continue to work closely with public agencies and parent groups to encourage the use of mediation and the advantage of resolving disputes as early as possible.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See Attachment 1

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.
(120 + 118) divided by 299 x 100 = 80%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The closing date for data collection was changed from 8/14/2005 to 6/30/2005. Therefore, any mediation that was conducted and settled between 6/30/2005 and 8/14/2005 is not captured in this report. Our data is collected and maintained through the data system that was developed during the 2003–2004 school year (FFY 2003). Based on national data on mediation provided by CADRE (MD APR 2002-2003) Maryland had the 5th highest number of mediations held; and the 4th highest number of mediated agreements in the nation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

2006 (2006-2007)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2007 (2007-2008)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2008 (2008-2009)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2009 (2009-2010)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2010 (2010-2011)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Meetings with Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) staff	Quarterly	DSE/EIS staff
Encourage public agency's attendance at conferences which encourage and discuss the use of mediation and other less formal means of dispute resolution.	Prior to conferences such as CADRE's Bi-annual conference.	DSE/EIS staff
Review and analyze mediation data to ensure public agencies are offering mediation to resolve disputes.	Quarterly	DSE/EIS staff
Train mediators through attendance at conferences and workshops.	Bi-Annually in accordance with Court Rules	DSE/EIS staff Consultants

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The data system incorporates a variety of information from other MSDE offices. MSDE procedures for data collection are clearly delineated in MSDE data collection manuals to address the specific data collection and reporting requirements of the Department. The DSE/EIS collaborates with staff members from the Division of Accountability and Assessment (DAA), the Division of Instruction (DI), and the Division of Student, Family, and School Services (DSFSSS) to collect, disaggregate, analyze, report, and/or develop new data collections, as determined appropriate, to ensure data on students with disabilities required in accordance with IDEA are accurate, valid, and reliable.

These collaborations include the following:

- MSDE continues to develop the Part B Report Writer System. The Report Writer will permit end users to compare and contrast data from other offices within MSDE using a unique student identifier. The system is designed to support public agencies in performing online data analysis.
- Public agencies complete cross reference documentation between special education data collection and other required state data submissions, including attendance, enrollment, suspension & discipline, and post-graduation data. Refer to Indicator 4.
- Maryland measures academic progress from state assessments. Public agencies have the capacity to disaggregate MSA, HSA and Alt-MSA data for students with disabilities at the level of student data. The capability of online data analysis allows a user to view special education data side by side with general education data on the public MSDE State Report Card on the MSDE website. Each agency's data are linked at the State, school system, and school level. The Mdk12 website is available to assist schools and other interested parties to analyze state assessment data and guide them in making data-based instructional decisions that support improved performance for all students. Refer to Indicator 3.

Data on students with disabilities is 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. Presently three relational links are being developed for:

- Maryland School Assessment (MSA) data relative to content areas, grade, and type of assessment in relationship to least restrictive environment (LRE) data on students with disabilities. At present MSDE is testing the ability to match the DSE/EIS Special Services Information System (SSIS) data collection on students with disabilities which generates LRE data with the MSA data collection system. The links are presently based on several algorithms and direct matches and student identifiers. Please refer to Indicators 3 and 5 for more information.
- Comparison of Section 618 data on students with disabilities exiting special education to general education data collections as compared to the number of students with disabilities exiting as high school graduates and dropouts. At present these relational links are being instituted in many local school systems (LSS), however, MSDE is not presently able to complete this transaction electronically but manual comparisons are occurring. This process will be used as check the validity of data reported in Indicator 2.
- Linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) data collection on children, birth to three years old, to SSIS for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old. MSDE has added the necessary fields to the SSIS which will be used to track the transition of children served under Part C into services for children under Part B at age 3. Please refer to Indicator 12 for further information.
- Report of student participation and performance in Statewide assessments under NCLB. Please refer to Indicator 3.

Most LSS and PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students. However, Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), Adult Correction Education (ACE), and Maryland State Department of Education Juvenile Correctional Education Program (MSDE/JCEP) provide reports on data entry forms and have no electronic web-based management of special education records.

The SSIS presently functions as a centralized data submission for 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 public agencies, including LSS, Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), Adult Corrections Education (ACE), Maryland School for the Blind (MSB), and Maryland School for the Deaf (MSD) who monitor and verify their data collection systems on a local level. Most PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students.

The SSIS presently functions as the centralized data submission system for Section 618 data. LSS and PA utilize electronic file transfers twice a year to an MSDE secure server for web-based data submission of the annual child count, census data, and exit data. Personnel data are collected annually in Excel spreadsheets.

The accuracy of the data is dependent upon the accuracy of the school level data. Questions and discrepancies in the data are always verified by MSDE staff with the LSS/PA. The LSS/PA SSIS Database Manager corrects errors and resubmits the entire data file to MSDE to ensure that corrections are made in both the database and the error file.

Data on students with disabilities is submitted electronically from public agencies. Each LSS and PA is responsible for submitting data for each student using an electronic file transfer over a secure server website. Each of the data elements contained on the SSIS records are required and must be accurately maintained. The database consists of two types of records: the SSIS Student Record that contains student demographic information; and the SSIS Service Record that contains information about the services provided to the student. Twice a year public agencies are required to submit an

electronic file of SSIS data. These data submissions are for the last Friday of October Census Data, including the annual child count, and the June 30 Exit data. Local directors of special education are responsible for supervising the accurate and timely entry of data. The data manager within each LSS and PA is responsible for accurate and timely data submissions of records through an electronic file transfer into the MSDE secure server.

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

- The SSIS secure server is available 24 hours a day for file submissions. The secure server is backed up nightly and replicated off-site. Files posted are reviewed and edited in a timely manner.
- Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk.
- Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed.
- The SSIS Manual Appendix provides detailed information for public agencies to build mechanisms within their systems for data accuracy.
- MSDE runs edit reports of the files for the public agencies to correct and resubmit their files to MSDE.
 - Upon receipt of the SSIS data, each SSIS record is edited to be certain that the record is complete and valid codes have been used.
 - MSDE generates a report of the total count of active or exited students (October and June collections respectively) for each PA.
 - Each PA data manager receives a copy of the report for review and verification.

In the event that discrepancies are found, the PA makes corrections and resubmits the entire file. MSDE will produce an updated summary report and return this to the PA for review and signature. During the annual child count collection, MSDE produces two additional reports for the Superintendent's signature. One report lists the number of students whose Individual Education Programs (IEPs) were developed more than 13 months prior to the last Friday of October. The second report lists the number of students who have not had a re-evaluation for more than three years.

To ensure validity, the MSDE SSIS manual provides data standardization for definitions and provides system edits similar to those suggested system edits provided by WESTAT. Validity of the data and consistency with OSEP data instructions is ensured throughout the data collection process by a number of practices and safeguards.

- MSDE produces the Census Publication and Related Tables from the data system which contains multiple tables and is posted on the MSDE web site. Additional internal reports produced are the 5% Analysis Report which highlights any LSS or PA with 5% or more population increases.
- MSDE uses the WESTAT Verification Reports to flag large changes in the data. Data is disaggregated to determine which PA are involved. When disaggregated data is suspect MSDE contacts the local director of special education. Directors of special education and MSDE staff work together to validate the data. The LSS or PA provides MSDE the reasons for large changes in data and that information is analyzed at MSDE and provided to WESTAT.
- MSDE conducted a routine audit that compared Special Services Information System (SSIS) to Exit Data from each LSS/PA. The students were matched by using the student's social security number (SSN) as the link between two data collections. The MSDE required LSS/PA explain/revise data following an analysis of the students who were described as exited in the SSIS Exit Count, yet also reported as receiving services in the next SSIS Child Count Data. LSS/PA are required to provide to MSDE a summary analysis of findings for each category. All student records referenced in the detailed report provided to the LSS/PA may be included in a random audit of these records.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

- MSDE periodically reviews records to support 618 data collections. MSDE annually monitors student records for IEPs that were more than 13 months prior to the last Friday of October and for students who have not had a re-evaluation for more than three years. Sampling is not used for the child count. However sampling may be used for monitoring purposes. PA data systems are student level systems and sampling may be required for audits and record reviews.
- MSDE Division of Budget and Management routinely audits LSS to determine whether: (1) students included on the State Aid for Special Education report are eligible; (2) applicable laws and regulations are complied with governing State Financial Assistance under Special Education Grant; and (3) accurate data is reported in claiming State funds.

Revised Baseline Data Table for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Name of Report	Date Due	Date Submitted	Follow-up Questions from WESTAT or OSEP	Response to Follow-up	Flags
Table 5 Discipline	11/1/04	10/31/04	Data Error	Resubmitted 11/8/04	No
Table 4 Exit	11/1/04	10/31/04			
Table 2 Personnel	11/1/04	10/31/04			Yes***
Table 1 Child Count	2/1/05	2/1/05			Yes*
Table 3 LRE	2/1/05	1/31/05	LRE Data Error	Resubmitted 2/11/05	Yes**
FFY 03 (7/1/03-6/30/04 APR)	3/31/05	3/31/05	Requested additional information 9/22/05	Required response on 12/2/05	

Data Error = Error in the spreadsheet sent to WESTAT. Data won't be loaded into their database.

Flag = Year to year significant change. Data is loaded into database. If necessary, WESTAT asks the state to revise the data or send "Data Notes" explaining the change.

* OSEP notified 4/14/05 FFY 04 child count and exit data being revised as a result of MSDE review of LSS/PA student records.

** Data corrected, no additional response

Revised Indicator 20 Baseline Data (as per March 20, 2006) OSEP letter.

On March 20, 2006, OSEP notified MSDE of its review of the Part B SPP. Attached to that letter was Table A that identified issues to be addressed by MSDE by providing additional information as part of the State's APR. Specific to Indicator 20, OSEP stated, "The State should reconsider the baseline data provided for Indicator 20 of the SPP and provide accurate information, including improvement activities in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information in this indicator may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of IDEA."

The baseline for FY 2004 (2004-2005) was revised to reflect:

- 100% of the 618 data and annual performance reports were submitted on or before due dates; and
- 19 out of 20 Indicators reported accurate data.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MSDE developed the following measurement to address OSEP's concerns:

$$(a + b) \div (c + d) \times 100 = \text{Percent}$$

The elements are defined as follows:

a = Number of 618 data submissions on or before due date.

b = Number of SPP/APR Indicators with accurate data

c = Total number of required 618 data and SPP/APR data submissions

d = Total number of SPP/APR Indicators

In the reconsideration of the FFY 2004 (2004-2005) SPP baseline data, considering the incomplete/inaccurate data submitted for Indicator 12 MSDE has determined the for the FFY 2004 (2004-2005) SPR the results indicate the following:

a = Number of 618 and SPP/APR data submissions on or before due date = (6)

b = Number of SPP/APR Indicators with accurate data = (19)

c = Total number of required 618 and SPP/APR data submissions = (6)

d = Total number of SPP/APR Indicators = (20)

$$(a + b) \div (c + d) \times 100 = \text{Percent}$$

$$(6 + 19) \div (6 + 20) \times 100 = (25) \div (26) \times 100 = 96.4\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The alignment between Department policy and the use of data is evident. MSDE has a history of providing accurate student level data on public school students, including students with disabilities. MSDE has provided accurate and timely data to OSEP and WESTAT and has responded within timelines to WESTAT'S data validation process comparing significant year-to-year changes in data collections.

Each LSS and PA reported all required special education data for FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005). The submission dates were within the OSEP timeline requirements. MSDE will continue to provide technical assistance to LSS/PA to facilitate timely accurate data submission. The validity and reliability of student level data are high. MSDE uses validation rules to ensure that SSIS child count data records are error free. Validations include: Element level (e.g., dates within ranges), cross element level (e.g., grade X age relationship be consistent with acceptable age range for each grade), and agency level (e.g., duplications between or among agencies, types of internal validation routines).

MSDE has developed an internet based dynamic data reporting system through a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG). This system permits management reports, monitoring data, and general analysis of data from many different sources. The dynamic data reporting system was developed in the 2003. However, the development of predefined reports and an end-user maintenance function to permit data imports by dialogue boxes has been delayed due to vendor delays. MSDE still requires manual programming by the vendor to import data sets and to normalize data.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

In the 2004-2005 school year, the pilot of a web-based standardized Individualized Education Program (IEP) was initiated and data collection submissions were tested during the October 28, 2005 child count data submission. The validation comparisons of the LSS web-based standardized IEP system parallel running of the SSIS will be completed during the 2005-2006 school year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Conduct professional development activities with LSS and PA data managers and LSS and PA directors of special education	Annually	DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data managers
Integrate the SSIS Data Warehouse into MSDE existing it infrastructure.	<u>Revised Timeline</u> June 2006 - June 2008	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Conduct MSDE internal parallel test of Enhanced SSIS System using LSS Child Count data	December 2005	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers

SPP Template – Part B (3)

		SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Conduct pilot testing of Enhanced SSIS System using LSS data	January - February 2006	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Conduct professional development for LSS/PA staff on Enhanced SSIS System and predefined reports created with the SSIS warehouse System	March – April 2006	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Develop MSDE production usage of enhanced SSIS System for administrative section of online SSIS system	October 2006	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Validate LSS/PA data submissions	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Participate in QAM monitoring of LSS/PA data collection and reporting, as appropriate	Annually	DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA data mangers
Technical assistance to LSS/PA on data submissions prior to submissions to OSEP/WESTAT	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

<p><u>New Activity</u> Linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) data collection on children, birth to three years old, to SSIS for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old</p>	<p>June 2007 - June 30, 2008</p>	<p>Data Collection staff/Data Managers SSIS Data Managers Directors of Special Education MITPPS Preschool Staff DSE/EIS Staff Center for Technology in Education DataLab USA</p>
<p><u>New Activity</u> It is anticipated that MSDE will continue to use Excel forms to collect data on children served under Part C transitioning into Part B through FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p>	<p>July 2006 - June 2008</p>	<p>Data Collection staff/Data Managers SSIS Data Managers Directors of Special Education MITPPS Preschool Staff DSE/EIS staff</p>
<p>Review LSS/PA policies, procedures, practices to ensure valid, reliable, accurate, and timely data reporting.</p>	<p>February 2007 and ongoing</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA staff</p>