



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE  
SERVICES

June 30, 2015

Honorable Lillian M. Lowery  
State Superintendent of Schools  
Maryland State Department of Education  
200 West Baltimore Street, 7th Floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2595

Dear Superintendent Lowery:

I am writing to advise you of the U. S. Department of Education's (Department) 2015 determination under section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Maryland meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of the State's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Your State's 2015 determination is based on the data reflected in the State's "2015 Results Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and consists of: (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors and a Compliance Score; and (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements, a Results Score, an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score, and the State's Determination. The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2015: Part B" (HTDMD).

OSEP is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2015, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD and reflected in the RDA Matrix for your State.) In making Part B determinations in 2015, OSEP continued to use results data related to the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments and the participation and performance of CWD on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). In addition, OSEP used exiting data on CWD who dropped out and CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma, as reported by States under section 618 of the IDEA. One of the purposes of the IDEA, as set out in section 601(d)(1)(A), is to ensure that all children with disabilities have a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living. Because it is critical that States focus on decreasing the number of CWD that drop out and increasing the number of CWD that graduate with a regular high school diploma, OSEP has added these data as results elements in making determinations in 2015.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of your State's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the SPP/APR module using your State-specific log-on information at [osep.grads360.org](http://osep.grads360.org). When you access your State's SPP/APR on the site, you will find in Indicators 1 through 16, the OSEP Response to the indicator, and any actions that the State is

required to take. The actions that the State is required to take are in two places: (1) any actions related to the correction of findings of noncompliance are in the “OSEP Response” section of the indicator; and (2) any other actions that the State is required to take are in the “Required Actions” section of the indicator. It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include an OSEP response and/or Required Actions.

You will also find all of the following important documents saved as attachments to the Progress Page: (1) the State’s RDA Matrix; (2) the HTDMD document; (3) a spreadsheet entitled “2015 Data Rubric Part B,” which shows how OSEP calculated the State’s “Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data” score in the Compliance Matrix; (4) a document entitled “Dispute Resolution 2013-14,” which includes the IDEA section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State’s “Timely State Complaint Decisions” and “Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions” scores in the Compliance Matrix; and (5) a Data Display, which presents certain State-reported data in a transparent, user-friendly manner and is helpful for the public in getting a broader picture of State performance in key areas.

As noted above, the State’s 2015 determination is Meets Requirements. A State’s 2015 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State’s last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2012, 2013, and 2014), and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2015 determination.

In 2015, States were required to submit a new SPP/APR, which included baseline data and measurable and rigorous targets for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 for each indicator in the SPP/APR. In addition, under Indicator 17, States were required to submit a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that included activities the State would implement to improve results for children with disabilities. OSEP has reviewed your State’s SPP/APR, including Phase I of the SSIP, and determined that it meets the requirements of IDEA section 616(b) to include measurable and rigorous targets, including targets for FFY 2018 that reflect improvement over the State’s baseline data. OSEP appreciates the State’s work on Phase I of its SSIP. This represents a significant effort to improve results for students with disabilities. We have carefully reviewed your submission and provided feedback during a recent conference call with the State. OSEP will continue to work with your State as it develops Phase II of the SSIP, due April 1, 2016.

As a reminder, your State must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency’s (SEA’s) Web Site, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the State’s submission of its FFY 2013 SPP/APR. In addition, your State must: (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State’s SPP/APR; (2) determine if each LEA “meets the requirements” of Part B, or “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention” in implementing Part B of the IDEA; (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, your State must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA’s Web Site. Within the next several days, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile for your State that: (1) will be accessible to the public; (2) includes links to a PDF of the State’s SPP/APR, including all of the State’s and OSEP’s attachments; and (3) the State may use to make its

SPP/APR accessible to the public. We will provide you with the link to that profile when it is live.

OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with your State over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance, please contact Ken Kienas, your OSEP State Lead, at 202-245-7621.

Sincerely,

/s/ Melody Musgrove

Melody Musgrove, Ed.D.  
Director  
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Director of Special Education

## **How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2015: Part B**

### **Introduction**

In 2015, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) is using both results and compliance data in making our determination for each State under section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). We considered the totality of the information we have about a State, including information related to the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments; the participation and performance of CWD on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); exiting data on CWD who dropped out and CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma<sup>1</sup>; the State's Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013 State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR); information from monitoring and other public information, such as Special Conditions on the State's grant award under Part B; and other issues related to State compliance with the IDEA. Below is a detailed description of how the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) evaluated States' data using the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix. The RDA Matrix consists of: (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors and a Compliance Score; and (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements, a Results Score, the Compliance Score<sup>2</sup>, an RDA Percentage and Determination.

### **The 2015 Part B Compliance Matrix**

In making each State's 2015 determination, the Department used a Compliance Matrix, reflecting the following data:

1. The State's FFY 2013 data for Part B Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, (including whether the State reported valid and reliable data for each indicator); and, if the FFY 2013 data the State reported under Indicators 11, 12, and 13 reflected compliance between 90% and 95% (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, were between 5% and 10%), whether the State demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance it had identified in FFY 2012 under such indicators;
2. The timeliness and accuracy of data reported by the State under sections 616 and 618 of the IDEA;
3. The State's FFY 2013 data, reported under section 618 of the IDEA, for the timeliness of State complaint and due process hearing decisions;

---

<sup>1</sup> When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students who exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR §300.102(a)(3)(iv), "the term *regular high school diploma* does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the State's academic standards, such as a certificate or GED."

<sup>2</sup> In 2015, the Department is using the terminology "Compliance Score" and "Results Score", rather than the terminology it used in 2014 ("Compliance Performance Percentage" and "Results Performance Percentage"), in order to be consistent with the terminology used in the Part C RDA Matrix. However, the methodology for calculating a State's Compliance Score and Results Score has not changed from the methodology used to calculate the Compliance Performance Percentage and Results Performance Percentage in 2014.

4. Whether the Department imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2014 IDEA Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2015 determination, and the number of years for which the State's Part B grant award has been subject to Special Conditions; and
5. Whether there are any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 or earlier by either the Department or the State that the State has not yet corrected.

### **Scoring of the Compliance Matrix**

The Compliance Matrix indicates a score of 0, 1, or 2, for each of the compliance indicators in item one above and for each of the additional factors listed in items two through five above. Using the cumulative possible number of points as the denominator, and using as the numerator the actual points the State received in its scoring under these factors, the Compliance Matrix reflects a Compliance Score, which is combined with the Results Score to calculate the State's RDA Percentage and Determination.

### **Scoring of the Matrix for Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13**

In the attached State-specific 2015 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for each of Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13<sup>3</sup>:

- Two points, if either:
  - The State's FFY 2013 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95%<sup>4</sup> compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 5% compliance)<sup>5</sup>; or
  - The State's FFY 2013 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 90% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 10% compliance); and the State identified one or more findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012 for the indicator, and has demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for the indicator. Such full correction is indicated in the matrix with a "Y" (for "yes") in the "Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012" column.<sup>6</sup>
- One point, if the State's FFY 2013 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no

---

<sup>3</sup> A notation of "N/A" (for "not applicable") in the "Performance" column for an indicator denotes that the indicator is not applicable to that particular State. The points for that indicator are not included in the denominator for the matrix, and the indicator does not impact the State's Compliance Score, RDA Percentage, or RDA Determination.

<sup>4</sup> In determining whether a State has met this 95% compliance criterion, the Department will round up from 94.5% (but no lower) to 95%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 90% compliance criterion discussed below, the Department will round up from 89.5% (but no lower) to 90%. In addition, in determining whether a State has met the 75% compliance criterion discussed below, the Department will round up from 74.5% (but no lower) to 75%.

<sup>5</sup> For Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, a very high level of compliance is generally at or below 5%.

<sup>6</sup> An "N" (for "no") in that column denotes that the State has one or more remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction. An "N/A" (for "not applicable") in that column denotes that the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012 for the indicator.

greater than 25% compliance), and the State did not meet either of the criteria above for two points.

- Zero points, under any of the following circumstances:
  - The State’s FFY 2013 data for the indicator reflect less than 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect greater than 25% compliance); or
  - The State’s FFY 2013 data for the indicator were not valid and reliable;<sup>7</sup> or
  - The State did not report FFY 2013 data for the indicator.<sup>8</sup>

### **Scoring of the Matrix for Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data**

In the attached State-specific 2015 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data**<sup>9</sup>:

- Two points, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects less than 75% compliance.

### **Scoring of the Matrix for Timely State Complaint Decisions and Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions**

In the attached State-specific 2015 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for timely State complaint decisions and for timely due process hearings, as reported by the State under section 618 of the IDEA:

- Two points, if the State’s FFY 2013 data were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the State’s FFY 2013 data reflect at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the State’s FFY 2013 data reflect less than 75% compliance.

---

<sup>7</sup> If a State’s FFY 2013 data for any compliance indicator are not valid and reliable, the matrix so indicates in the “Performance” column, with a corresponding score of 0. The explanation of why the State’s data are not valid and reliable is contained in the OSEP Response to the State’s FFY 2013 SPP/APR in GRADS360.

<sup>8</sup> If a State reported no FFY 2013 data for any compliance indicator (unless the indicator is not applicable to the State), the matrix so indicates in the “Performance” column, with a corresponding score of 0.

<sup>9</sup> OSEP used the Part B Timely and Accurate Data Rubric to award points to States based on the timeliness and accuracy of their sections 616 and 618 data. A copy of the rubric is contained in the OSEP Response to the State’s FFY 2013 SPP/APR in GRADS360. On the first page of the rubric, entitled “Part B Timely and Accurate Data-SPP/APR Data,” States are given one point for each indicator with valid and reliable data and five points for SPP/APRs that were submitted timely. The total points for valid and reliable SPP/APR data and timely submission are added together to form the APR Grand Total. On page two of the rubric, the State’s section 618 data is scored based on information provided to OSEP on 618 data timeliness, completeness, edit checks, and data notes from EDFacts. The percentage of Timely and Accurately Reported Data is calculated by adding the 618 Data Grand Total to the APR Grand Total and dividing this sum by the total number of points available for the entire rubric. This percentage is inserted into the Compliance Matrix

- Not Applicable (N/A), if the State’s data reflect less than 100% compliance, and there were fewer than ten State complaint decisions or ten due process hearing decisions.

**Scoring of the Matrix for Long-Standing Noncompliance (Includes Both Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance and Special Conditions)**

In the attached State-specific 2015 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Long-Standing Noncompliance component:

- Two points, if the State has:
  - No remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2011 or earlier; and
  - No Special Conditions on its FFY 2014 grant award that are in effect at the time of the 2015 determination.
- One point, if either or both of the following occurred:
  - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2011, FFY 2010, and/or FFY 2009, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the OSEP Response to the State’s FFY 2013 SPP/APR in GRADS360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
  - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State’s FFY 2014 Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2015 determination.
- Zero points, if either or both of the following occurred:
  - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2008 or earlier, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the OSEP Response to the State’s FFY 2013 SPP/APR in GRADS360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
  - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State’s last three (FFYs 2012, 2013, and 2014) IDEA Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2015 determination.

**The 2015 Part B Results Matrix**

In making each State’s 2015 determination, the Department used a Results Matrix reflecting the following data:

1. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD participating in regular Statewide assessments;
2. The percentage of eight-grade CWD participating in regular Statewide assessments;
3. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD scoring at basic<sup>10</sup> or above on the NAEP;

---

<sup>10</sup> While the goal is to ensure that all CWD demonstrate proficient or advanced mastery of challenging subject matter, we recognize that States may need to take intermediate steps to reach this benchmark. Therefore, this year

4. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD included in NAEP testing;
5. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD scoring at basic or above on the NAEP;
6. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD included in NAEP testing;
7. The percentage of CWD exiting school by dropping out; and
8. The percentage of CWD exiting school by graduating with a regular high school diploma.

The Results Elements for participation in regular Statewide assessments and participation and performance on the NAEP are scored separately for reading and math. When combined with the exiting data, there are a total of fourteen Results Elements. The Results Elements are defined as follows:

Percentage of CWD Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments – This is the percentage of CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who took regular Statewide assessments in school year (SY) 2013-14 with and without accommodations. The numerator for this calculation is the number of CWD participating with and without accommodations on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2013-14, and the denominator is the number of all CWD participants and non-participants on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2013-14, excluding medical emergencies. The calculation is done separately by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading). (Data source: ED*Facts* SY 2013-14; data extracted 4/17/15.)

Percentage of CWD Scoring Basic or Above on the NAEP – This is the percentage of CWD, not including students with a Section 504 plan, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who scored at or above basic on the NAEP in SY 2012-13. (Data Source: Main NAEP Data Explorer; data extracted 4/16/14.)

Percentage of CWD Included in NAEP Testing – This is the reported percentage of identified CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who were included in the NAEP testing in SY 2012-13. (Data Source:

Inclusion rate for 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading: See page 6:

[http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading\\_math\\_2013/files/Tech\\_Appendix\\_Reading.pdf](http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2013/files/Tech_Appendix_Reading.pdf)

Inclusion rate for 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math: See page 6:

[http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading\\_math\\_2013/files/Tech\\_Appendix\\_Math.pdf](http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2013/files/Tech_Appendix_Math.pdf))

Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Dropping Out - This is a calculation of the percentage of CWD, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by dropping out. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the exit reason category *dropped out* by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories

---

we assessed the performance of CWD using the Basic achievement level on the NAEP, which also provided OSEP with the broader range of data needed to identify variations in student performance across States. Generally, the Basic achievement level on the NAEP means that students have demonstrated partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.



(*graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*), then multiplying the result by 100. (Data source: EDFacts SY 2012-13; data extracted 6/5/14.)

Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma - This is a calculation of the percentage of CWD, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by graduating with a regular high school diploma. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the exit reason category *graduated with a regular high school diploma* by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (*graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*), then multiplying the result by 100. (Data source: EDFacts SY 2012-13; data extracted 6/5/14.)

### **Scoring of the Results Matrix**

In the attached State-specific 2015 Part B Results Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Results Elements:

- A State's participation rates on regular Statewide assessments were assigned scores of '2', '1' or '0' based on an analysis of the participation rates across all States and whether a State administered an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards (AA-MAAS).<sup>11</sup> For a State that did not administer an AA-MAAS, a score of '2' was assigned if at least 90% of their CWD participated in the regular Statewide assessment; a score of '1' if the participation rate for CWD was 81% to 89%; and a score of '0' if the participation rate for CWD was 80% or less. For a State that administered an AA-MAAS, a score of '2' was assigned if the participation rate of CWD was 70% or greater; a score of '1' if the participation rate of CWD was 61% to 69%; and a score of '0' if the participation rate of CWD was 60% or less.
- A State's NAEP scores (Basic and above) were rank-ordered; and the top third of States received a '2', the middle third of States received a '1', and the bottom third of States received a '0'.
- A State's NAEP inclusion rate was assigned a score of either '0' or '1' based on whether the State's NAEP inclusion rate for CWD was "higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board [NAGB]

---

<sup>11</sup> In FFY 2013, in assessing the academic progress of students with disabilities under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), some States were permitted to develop and administer AA-MAAS for eligible students with disabilities, and to include Proficient and Advanced scores of students who took those assessments in ESEA accountability determinations, provided the number of those scores at the district and state levels, separately, did not exceed 2.0 percent of all students in the tested grades. States were also permitted to develop and administer alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, and to include Proficient and Advanced scores of students who took those assessments in ESEA accountability determinations, provided the number of those scores at the district and state levels, separately, did not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in the tested grades.

goal of 85 percent.” “Standard error estimates” were reported with the inclusion rates of CWD and taken into account in determining if a State’s inclusion rate was higher than or not significantly different from the NAGB goal of 85 percent.

- A State’s data on the percentage of CWD who exited school by dropping out were rank-ordered; and the top third of States (i.e., those with the lowest percentage) received a score of ‘2’, the middle third of States received a ‘1’, and the bottom third of States (i.e., those with the highest percentage) received a ‘0’.
- A State’s data on the percentage of CWD who exited school by graduating with a regular high school diploma were rank-ordered; and the top third of States (i.e., those with the highest percentage) received a score of ‘2’, the middle third of States received a ‘1’, and the bottom third of States (i.e., those with the lowest percentage) received a ‘0’.

The following table identifies how each of the Results Elements was scored:

Results Elements	RDA Scores		
	0	1	2
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessments (reading and math, separately)	<=80	81-89	>=90
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessments for States with AA-MAAS (reading and math, separately)	<=60	61-69	>=70
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<=23	24-29	>=30
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<=29	30-37	>=38
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<=51	52-57	>=58
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<=26	27-33	>=34
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma	<=58	59-76	>=77
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Dropping Out	>=23	22-17	<=16

Percentage of 4th and 8th Grade CWD included in NAEP testing (reading or math):

1 point if greater than or equal to the NAGB goal of 85%.

0 points if less than 85%.

Using the cumulative possible number of points as the denominator, and using as the numerator the actual points the State received in its scoring under the Results Elements, the Results Matrix reflects a Results Score, which is combined with the Compliance Score to calculate the State’s RDA Percentage and Determination.

## **The RDA Percentage and Determination**

The State's RDA Percentage was calculated by adding 50% of the State's Results Score and 50% of the State's Compliance Score. The State's RDA Determination is defined as follows:

1. Meets Requirements – a State's 2015 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%,<sup>12</sup> unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2012, 2013, and 2014) IDEA Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2015 determination.
2. Needs Assistance – a State's 2015 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2012, 2013, and 2014) IDEA Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2015 determination.
3. Needs Intervention – a State's 2015 RDA Determination is Needs Intervention if the RDA Percentage is less than 60%.
4. Needs Substantial Intervention – The Department did not make a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention for any State in 2015.

---

<sup>12</sup> In determining whether a State has met this 80% matrix criterion for a Meets Requirements determination, the Department will round up from 79.5% (but no lower) to 80%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 60% matrix criterion for a Needs Intervention determination discussed below, the Department will round up from 59.5% (but no lower) to 60%.

## Maryland

### Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix: 2015

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	92.00%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89.00%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	51.00%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	26.00%	0
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	51.00%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	29.00%	0
Math Assessment Elements	Performance	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	91.00%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89.00%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	46.00%	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	93.00%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	29.00%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89.00%	1
Exiting Data Elements	Performance	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	21.0%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma <sup>1</sup>	64.0%	1
RESULTS AND COMPLIANCE OVERALL SCORING		
Total Results Points Available	Results Points Earned	Results Score
24	15	62.50
Total Compliance Points Available <sup>2</sup>	Compliance Points Earned	Compliance Score
20	20	100.00
Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination <sup>3</sup>		
81.25%	<b>MEETS REQUIREMENTS (green)</b>	

1. Graduated with a regular high school diploma as defined under the IDEA Section 618 State-reported data: These students exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR 300.102(a)(3)(iv), "the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the state's academic standards, such as a certificate or GED."

2. Review the Part B Compliance Matrix for a breakdown of compliance points earned.

3. For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2015: Part B."

### Maryland Part B Compliance Matrix: 2015

Part B Compliance Indicator <sup>1</sup>	Performance	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012	Score
<b>Indicator 4B:</b> Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 9:</b> Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 10:</b> Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 11:</b> Timely initial evaluation	98.46%	Y	2
<b>Indicator 12:</b> IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.47%	Y	2
<b>Indicator 13:</b> Secondary transition	99.96%	Y	2
<b>Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data</b>	100.00%		2
<b>Timely State Complaint Decisions</b>	98.70%		2
<b>Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions</b>	100.00%		2
<b>Longstanding Noncompliance</b>			2
<b>Special Conditions</b>	NONE		
<b>Uncorrected identified noncompliance</b>	NONE		
	<b>Total Compliance Points</b>		<b>20</b>

Total Compliance Points Available	Compliance Points Earned	Compliance Score
20	20	100.00

1. The complete language for each indicator is located at the following website: <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/4603>

Part B Data Display: **MARYLAND**  
 Publication Year 2015

**Identification of Children with Disabilities**

**STUDENT ENROLLMENT, AGES 6 THROUGH 21**

Student Category	State Students (#)	State Students (%)	Nation Students (#)	Nation Students (%)
All students	763,071		45,091,525	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	90,652	11.9	5,847,624	13.0

Explanatory Note: The number of total students enrolled in public schools in the state and nation as of October 1, 2012 (or the closest day to October 1) for all grade levels from grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded. The number and percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2013). Children with disabilities (IDEA) are served by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Data reported for IDEA 2013 Child Count and Educational Environments and the SY 2012-13 Common Core of Data (CCD). National IDEA Child Count and Educational Environments data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and the national CCD data represent the US and Outlying Areas.

**PERCENT OF POPULATION WHO ARE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA), AGES 3 THROUGH 21**

Age	State (%) SY 2011-12	State (%) SY 2012-13	State (%) SY 2013-14	Nation (%) SY 2013-14
3 through 5	5.9	5.9	5.9	6.2
6 through 21	7.3	7.4	7.4	8.7

Explanatory Note: The percentage of the population who are children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state designated special education child count date, for the age ranges of 3 through 5 and 6 through 21. Data reported for IDEA Child Count and Educational Environments and Census. National IDEA Child Count and Educational Environments data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and national Census data represent the 50 states and DC (including BIE).

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	Percent of Overall Student Enrollment State (%)	Percent of Overall Student Enrollment Nation (%)
Autism	1.22	1.06
Deaf-blindness	0.00	0.00
Emotional disturbance	0.87	0.78
Hearing impairment	0.12	0.15
Intellectual disability	0.68	0.93
Multiple disabilities	0.55	0.28
Orthopedic impairment	0.03	0.11
Other health impairment	2.19	1.80
Specific learning disabilities	4.05	5.13
Speech or language impairment	1.81	2.32
Traumatic brain injury	0.03	0.06
Visual impairment	0.04	0.06

Explanatory Note: The percentage of enrollees who are children with disabilities (IDEA), by disability category, in the state and nation for the age range of 6 through 21 (excluding children reported in the category of developmental delays). For this calculation, the numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) in a specific disability category as of the state-designated special education child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2013) for ages 6 through 21 (excluding children reported in the category of developmental delays) and the denominator is the total number of students enrolled in public schools as of October 1, 2012 (or the closest school day to October 1) for all grade levels from grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded. Data reported for IDEA 2013 Child Count and Educational Environments and SY 2012-13 CCD. National IDEA Child Count data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and national CCD data represent US and Outlying Areas.

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 3 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5 State (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5 Nation (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 6-21 State (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 6-21 Nation (%)
All disabilities	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Autism	7.0	8.4	10.5	8.4
Deaf-blindness	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Developmental delay*	52.6	37.1		
Emotional disturbance	0.1	0.4	7.5	6.2
Hearing impairment	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.2
Intellectual disability	0.5	1.9	5.9	7.3
Multiple disabilities	1.3	1.1	4.7	2.2
Orthopedic impairment	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.9
Other health impairment	2.0	3.0	18.9	14.2
Specific learning disabilities	0.0	1.2	34.9	40.4
Speech or language impairment	34.7	44.2	15.6	18.3
Traumatic brain injury	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
Visual impairment	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4

\*Developmental delay is only allowable through age 9, so a 6-21 percentage cannot be calculated.

Explanatory Note: The percentage represents a distribution of children with disabilities (IDEA) by disability category for age ranges 3 through 5 and 6 through 21 (excluding children reported in the category of developmental delays). For this calculation, the denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA) for the specified age range, excluding developmental delays for ages 6 through 21. Data reported for IDEA 2013 Child Count and Educational Environments. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

**Graduation**

FOUR-YEAR REGULATORY ADJUSTED COHORT GRADUATION RATE

	CWDs (IDEA) (%)	All Students (%)
SY 2012-13	60%	85%

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students from the original cohort who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma. Data reported for CSPR purposes.



EXITING SPECIAL EDUCATION AND SCHOOL, AGES 14 THROUGH 21

Method of Exiting:	Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma (%)	Received a Certificate (%)	Dropped Out (%)	Reached Maximum Age
SY 2012-13	63.9	13.3	21.1	1.2

Explanatory Note: The percentages were calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA, Part B, reported in the exit reason category (i.e., *graduated with a regular high school diploma*, received a certificate, *dropped out*, or *reached maximum age*) for the year by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA, Part B, reported in the five categories that represent exiting from special education and school (i.e., *graduated with a regular high school diploma*, *received a certificate*, *dropped out*, *reached maximum age* for services, and *died*) for that year, then multiplying the result by 100. The U.S. Department of Education collects data on seven categories of exiters from special education (i.e., the Part B program in which the student was enrolled at the start of the reporting period). The categories include five categories of exiters from both special education and school (i.e., *graduated with a regular high school diploma*, *received a certificate*, *dropped out*, *reached maximum age* for services, and *died*) and two categories of exiters from special education, but not school (i.e., *transferred to regular education and moved*, *known to be continuing in education*). The seven categories are mutually exclusive. Students with disabilities reported in the Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma category represent students who exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR 300.102(a)(3)(iv), “the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the state’s academic standards, such as a certificate or GED.” The percentages of students who exited special education and school by graduating or dropping out as required under IDEA and included in this report are not comparable to the graduation and dropout rates required under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA)*. The data used to calculate percentages of students who exited special education and school by graduating or dropping out are different from those used to calculate graduation and dropout rates. In particular, states often use data such as the number of students who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma and the number of students who entered high school four years earlier to determine their graduation and dropout rates under ESEA. These exiting data are from the reporting period between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013. Data reported for IDEA 2012-13 Exiting.

**Educational Environment**

**EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS, AGES 3 THROUGH 5**

Disability Category	CWDs Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program State (%)	CWDs Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program Nation (%)	CWDs Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility State (%)	CWDs Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility Nation (%)
All disabilities	56.6	43.5	19.4	25.9
Autism	35.5	33.1	43.6	48.2
Deaf-blindness	50.0	24.4	0.0	51.2
Developmental delay	61.4	43.5	24.1	35.4
Emotional disturbance	50.0	47.6	20.0	22.3
Hearing impairment	20.3	37.8	63.4	41.2
Intellectual disability	45.5	32.1	25.8	44.0
Multiple disabilities	25.3	25.8	55.9	49.8
Orthopedic impairment	60.5	45.4	15.8	33.4
Other health impairment	36.8	46.1	47.6	28.2
Specific learning disabilities	50.0	52.0	0.0	12.7
Speech or language impairment	57.4	46.1	2.9	11.9
Traumatic brain injury	27.3	40.1	63.6	35.3
Visual impairment	75.9	47.6	6.9	32.2

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation by disability category attending a regular early childhood program, or a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility. Note that this table does not include all reported preschool educational environment categories. The denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 5, in the specified disability category. Data reported for IDEA 2013 Child Count and Educational Environments. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

**EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS, AGES 6 THROUGH 21**  
 Percent of Time Spent Inside the Regular Classroom

Disability Category	≥ 80% of Day State (%)	≥ 80% of Day Nation (%)	40 to 79% of Day State (%)	40 to 79% of Day Nation (%)	< 40% of Day State (%)	< 40% of Day Nation (%)	Separate School or Residential Facility State (%)	Separate School or Residential Facility Nation (%)
All disabilities	68.3	62.0	10.0	19.2	13.2	13.6	6.8	3.3
Autism	41.9	39.7	13.3	18.2	28.2	33.3	15.9	7.8
Deaf-blindness	12.5	23.6	12.5	12.0	18.8	34.9	56.3	26.3
Emotional disturbance	41.7	45.2	12.2	17.7	18.8	19.7	24.5	14.5
Hearing impairment	44.3	59.4	8.1	16.0	10.3	12.2	35.0	10.8
Intellectual disability	13.4	16.7	20.4	26.6	57.1	49.1	8.5	6.6
Multiple disabilities	31.2	13.4	9.9	16.3	22.3	46.2	34.2	20.3
Orthopedic impairment	64.8	55.2	13.3	16.0	14.8	21.4	5.1	4.5
Other health impairment	77.8	64.7	9.7	21.8	8.7	9.5	2.4	1.9
Specific learning disabilities	81.5	68.2	10.4	24.1	6.5	6.0	0.7	0.5
Speech or language impairment	91.7	87.1	2.5	5.5	1.6	4.3	0.2	0.3
Traumatic brain injury	51.5	49.6	13.4	22.1	19.5	20.1	13.4	5.6
Visual impairment	76.4	65.2	6.3	12.9	1.8	10.7	12.3	9.4

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation by disability category (excluding children with developmental delays) attending regular classrooms, or separate schools and residential facilities. Note that this table does not include all reported educational environment categories. The denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21 (excluding children with developmental delays), in a specified disability category. Data reported for IDEA 2013 Child Count and Educational Environments. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

Participation and Performance on Assessments

PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) IN STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	General Assessment (%)	Field Test General Assessment (%)	Alternate Assessment (%)	Field Test Alternate Assessment (%)	Non-participant (%)
4th grade reading/language arts	85	6	8	-	1
8th grade reading/language arts	88	0	10	-	2
High school reading/language arts	56	0	43	-	1
4th grade mathematics	85	7	8	-	1
8th grade mathematics	88	0	10	-	2
High school mathematics	55	0	44	-	1

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in statewide assessments and field tests for reading and mathematics for 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school. The denominator is the sum of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated and children with disabilities (IDEA) who did not participate in statewide assessments and field tests (excluding those with a significant medical emergency who did not take the assessment). In states that received the Secretary’s approval of a double-testing flexibility waiver, students approved to be assessed on the field test in lieu of the current state assessment are reported in the appropriate “field test” reporting categories. The performance of students reported in the “field test” reporting categories should not be reported in the academic achievement data. Due to differences in the calculations used for the “children with disabilities (IDEA)” subgroup, these percentages may differ from those reported for the CSPR. Data reported for 2013-14 Assessment, accessed from EDFacts on April 16, 2015.

ED urges caution when using and interpreting the SY 2013-14 assessment participation and performance data for the states who implemented field testing of PARCC/ Smarter Balanced during SY 2013-14.

Participation data submitted by the following states/ entities were flagged due to questionable data quality in one or more subject areas, grades, and assessment types: AL, ID, MS, NY, CNMI, OK, TN, UT, WA, and WV.

PERFORMANCE ON STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	Proficient (%) General Assessment (CWD)	Proficient (%) Alternate Assessment (CWD)	Proficient (%) General Assessment (All Students)
4th grade reading/language arts	59	88	86
8th grade reading/language arts	33	87	77
High school reading/language arts	49	43	85
4th grade mathematics	46	85	81
8th grade mathematics	17	82	59
High school mathematics	53	38	87

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students in the state who scored at or above proficient (as determined by each state) on the general assessment for all students and children with disabilities (IDEA) in 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school, and the percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state who scored at or above proficient (as determined by each state) on the alternate assessment. In states that received the Secretary’s approval of a double-testing flexibility waiver, students approved to be assessed on the field test in lieu of the current state assessment are not reported in the academic achievement data. States where all students participated in the field test in lieu of the current state assessment will have no academic achievement data. Due to differences in the calculations used for the “all students” and “children with disabilities (IDEA)” subgroup, these percentages may differ from those reported for the CSPR. Data reported for 2013-14 Assessment, accessed from ED Facts on April 16, 2015.

ED urges caution when using and interpreting the SY 2013-14 assessment participation and performance data for the states that implemented field testing of PARCC/Smarter Balanced during SY 2013-14.

Achievement data submitted by the following states/ entities were flagged due to questionable data quality in one or more subject areas, grades, and assessment types: IL, MA, TN and WA.

PERFORMANCE ON 2013 NAEP ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	At or Above (%) Basic (CWD)	At or Above (%) Basic (Non-CWD)	At or Above (%) Proficient (CWD)	At or Above (%) Proficient (Non-CWD)
4th grade reading/language arts	51	78	22	46
8th grade reading/language arts	51	83	9	43
High school reading/language arts				
4th grade mathematics	46	87	15	50
8th grade mathematics	29	79	6	41
High school mathematics				

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students in the state who scored at or above the Basic level and at or above the Proficient level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), for children with disabilities (IDEA) and children without disabilities. Since the NAEP is administered every other year, the percentages reported in this table remained consistent for a two-year period of time. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires states that receive Title I funding to participate in the state NAEP in reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8 every two years. State NAEP does not provide individual scores for the students or schools assessed. Instead, NAEP provides results about subject-matter achievement, instructional experiences, and school environment, and reports these results for populations of students (e.g., fourth-graders) and subgroups of those populations (e.g., children with disabilities (IDEA)).

INCLUSION RATES FOR 2013 NAEP ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	Inclusion Rate State (%)	Inclusion Rate Nation (%)
4th grade reading/language arts	26	83
8th grade reading/language arts	29	84
High school reading/language arts		
4th grade mathematics	93	90
8th grade mathematics	89	89
High school mathematics		

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students identified as having a disability who were included in the NAEP assessment. A state's inclusion rate of students identified as having a disability is the weighted percentage of students identified as having a disability in the state sampled by NAEP who participate in NAEP. In other words, the weighted number of students identified as having a disability in a state who are selected for participation in NAEP is in the denominator, the weighted number of those students who participate in NAEP is in the numerator, and the fraction is multiplied by 100 to turn it into a percentage. Since NAEP results are generated from a sample of the total student population, inclusion rates are reported by state with a standard error. The Office of Special Education Programs takes the standard error into consideration when making annual state determinations. National inclusion rates were based on figures available under "National (public)." Since the NAEP is administered every other year, the percentages reported in this table remained consistent for a two-year period of time.

Race/Ethnicity

PERCENT OF STATE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	Hispanic/ Latino (%)	Black or African American (%)	White (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (%)	All Race/ Ethnicities (%)
All students	12.3	35.0	42.5	6.0	0.3	0.1	3.8	100.0
All disabilities	12.1	43.2	38.5	2.7	0.3	0.1	3.2	100.0
Autism	9.0	35.5	45.7	5.9	0.3	0.1	3.5	100.0
Deaf-blindness	18.8	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	100.0
Emotional disturbance	4.6	58.3	32.4	0.9	0.4	0.1	3.3	100.0
Hearing impairment	14.1	28.0	47.5	7.4	0.3	0.1	2.5	100.0
Intellectual disability	10.0	55.7	29.2	2.9	0.2	0.1	1.9	100.0
Multiple disabilities	8.8	34.3	49.8	3.2	0.4	0.1	3.6	100.0
Orthopedic impairment	12.5	40.2	39.8	5.5	0.4	0.0	1.6	100.0
Other health impairment	8.5	46.2	39.7	1.5	0.4	0.1	3.5	100.0
Specific learning disabilities	16.0	45.3	34.0	1.5	0.3	0.1	2.8	100.0
Speech or language impairment	13.2	32.7	46.0	4.2	0.3	0.1	3.6	100.0
Traumatic brain injury	9.1	44.6	38.5	3.5	0.9	0.0	3.5	100.0
Visual impairment	10.6	37.0	38.4	9.9	0.7	0.0	3.5	100.0

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category and particular race/ethnicity category in the state. The numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category and race/ethnicity category as of the state designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2013) and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category. The "All Student" row is calculated using the total number of students enrolled in public schools in grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded, in the state as of October 1, 2012 (or the closest day to October 1). Data reported for IDEA 2013 Child Count and 2012-13 CCD.

**PERCENT OF STATE CWDS (IDEA) BY EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21**

Educational Environment	Hispanic/Latino (%)	Black or African American (%)	White (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (%)	All Race/Ethnicities (%)
≥ 80% of day spent inside regular classroom	70.2	62.1	74.7	64.1	71.1	74.4	74.3	100.0
40 to 79% of day spent inside regular classroom	11.1	11.3	8.2	9.4	10.0	3.8	8.8	100.0
< 40% of day spent inside regular classroom	13.9	17.9	7.9	16.8	10.6	9.0	10.3	100.0
Separate school; Residential facility	4.0	7.5	6.6	8.0	6.8	9.0	5.6	100.0

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category and particular educational environment in the state. The numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category and particular educational environment as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2013) and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category. Data reported for IDEA 2013 Child Count and Educational Environments.

**TOTAL DISCIPLINARY REMOVALS OF CWD (IDEA) IN STATE BY RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 3 THROUGH 21**

Student Group	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	White	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Two or more races	All Race/Ethnicities
Number of Disciplinary Removals per Child with a Disability	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2

Explanatory Note: The number of disciplinary removals per child with a disability (IDEA), ages 3 through 21, by race/ethnicity category. The numerator is the total number of disciplinary removals in a particular race/ethnicity category and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2012). Data reported for IDEA 2012-13 Discipline and 2012 Child Count and Educational Environments.



**Parental Involvement**

**INDICATOR 8: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (FFY 2013 APR, 2015)**

	State (%)
Percent of parent 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.	39.0
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of parents from whom a response is requested is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

**Preschool Outcomes**

**INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES (FFY 2013 APR, 2015)**

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each of the following outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program in the outcome of:	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	65.2
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	63.7
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	60.9
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each of the following outcomes by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	65.4
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	54.5
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	63.4
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

**Post School Outcomes**

**INDICATOR 14: POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES (FFY 2013 APR, 2015)**

Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were:	State (%)
Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	26.7
Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	59.4
Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school	82.6
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

x Data have been suppressed to protect personally identifiable information due to small cell counts.

<=3 Data in the cell are less than or equal to three.

- Data not available.

\* Data flagged due to questionable data quality. These data violated data quality edit checks. Additional information explaining the discrepancies in the data may be available in the data notes documents.

Note: Sum of percentages may not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

References: Additional information clarifying states' data submissions are available in the data notes documents on <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html#datanotes>. Additional state-level data on children with disabilities (IDEA) can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/state-level-data-files/index.html>, <http://www.data.gov>, <http://www.eddataexpress.ed.gov>, <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/>, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>, and <http://factfinder2.census.gov>. Information on U.S. Department of Education Special Education funding can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/osep/2013apps.html>.