

## Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

25

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

### General Supervision System:

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

#### Overview

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

The DSE/EIS organizational structure is based upon principles of collaboration and shared responsibility. The Division is organized by five branches: Policy and Accountability; Programmatic Support and Technical Assistance; Family Support and Dispute Resolution; Interagency Collaboration; and Resource Management. The Division matrix organizational design integrates knowledge and skills for improvement of compliance and results, and ensures consistent communication within the DSE/EIS, throughout the Department, and with external stakeholders and partners. The core functions of the DSE/EIS are leadership, accountability for results, technical assistance and program support, and fiscal and resource management. **Please see Attachment A which provides a graphic description of the Division's cross matrix leadership.**

Through the implementation of cross matrix leadership, the Division is committed to the following essential principles in order to improve results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities and their families:

- **Transparency:** Maintaining an open door to stakeholders and to regularly keep our stakeholders informed through formal and informal feedback loops, including quarterly birth through twenty-one special education and early intervention leadership meetings, the Annual Leadership Conference/Professional Learning Institute, meetings of the Assistant State Superintendent's Advisory Council, and regularly scheduled convening of advisory groups, including the State Interagency Coordinating Council, Special Education State Advisory Committee, and the Early Childhood Advocacy Coalition.
- **Collaboration:** Continually engaging stakeholders through participatory processes that promote innovation, the sharing of best practices, and dissemination of research and evidence-based models. We are also committed to strengthening partnerships and planning with other MSDE Divisions and external stakeholder groups.
- **Equity, Excellence, Efficiency:** Serving stakeholders in a timely and effective manner, ensuring the availability of 'real-time' data for effective decision-making, and accelerating dissemination of models of best practices quickly and effectively throughout the State.
- **Accountability:** Improving results for all children and youth with disabilities served in LSSs/PAs. The DSE/EIS has developed a tiered system of analysis, monitoring, and support to identify LSSs/PAs in need of differentiated support and technical assistance. An LSS/PA is assigned to a tier based upon performance on SPP/APR compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and findings identified through monitoring. These principles are used to provide differentiated technical assistance that focuses on building capacity to improve results and directs State resources to those LSSs/LITPs/PAs that are the lowest performing. At the same time, LSSs/PAs that are achieving success are recognized and provided with the support needed to publish and disseminate successful best practices.

#### Differentiated Framework

With the emphasis on results driven accountability, the DSE/EIS has increased its focus on the requirements related to results indicators. Each LSS/PA serving children and youth with disabilities is unique, and their needs for general supervision and engagement from the DSE/EIS vary greatly depending upon numerous factors. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) allows the

DSE/EIS staff to monitor and provide technical assistance and support to programs in a more effective, efficient, and systematic manner.

The MSDE, DSE/EIS comprehensive system of general supervision, Blrth - 21, encompassed in the *Differentiated Framework*. **Please see Attachment B for a graphic representation of the *Differentiated Framework*.** The *Differentiated Framework* includes two parallel multi-tier systems of support (MTSS). The MTSS on the left represents four tiers of general supervision: "Universal," "Targeted," "Focused," and "Intensive." The inverted MTSS to the right represents the corresponding tiers of engagement. The processes embedded in the *Differentiated Framework* include: Data collection; Data verification; Identification of LSS/PA performance status; LSS/PA improvement; Reporting; and Enforcements. Within these processes are the essential components of Maryland's comprehensive system of general supervision:

- 1) Effective policies and procedures;
- 2) State Performance Plan (SPP) goals and targets;
- 3) Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR);
- 4) Fiscal management;
- 5) Dispute resolution; and
- 6) Targeted technical assistance and support.

The DSE/EIS has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for program support and technical assistance to provide a MTSS for monitoring and technical assistance to address the needs of each LSS/PA. The *Differentiated Framework* illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. The Division is committed to maintaining compliance and providing supports to improve the quality of special education services. An LSS/PA is assigned to a tier of general supervision and oversight based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The corresponding support an LSS/PA can expect to receive is differentiated and based on that agency's assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of the public agency's needs.

*The Differentiated Framework* involves directing the Division's attention to local school systems in need of more comprehensive engagement, technical assistance, and support in order to enable those local school systems to meet indicator targets, improve results, narrow the achievement gap, correct identified noncompliance, and maintain compliance. This represents the foundation of a comprehensive Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) to integrate a continuum of resources, strategies, structures and practices.

A majority of the LSSs/PAs are currently in the **Universal Tier of General Supervision**. This represents LSSs/PAs that have met identified performance and compliance criteria, resulting in a determination status of "Meets Requirements" or is in the first year of "Needs Assistance." The LSSs/PAs assigned to the Universal Tier of General Supervision have no findings of noncompliance or have corrected all findings of noncompliance within one year and have maintained compliance.

Each LSS/PA is monitored annually through a desk audit and cross-divisional data analysis of SPP Indicators, local priorities, and fiscal data. Additionally, a cyclical general supervision monitoring of select LSS/PAs includes, at a minimum, student record reviews for IDEA requirements, a review of policy, procedures, and practices, and sub-recipient fiscal monitoring. Each LSS/PA develops and self-monitors an internal work plan including Local Priority Flexibility to address locally identified needs.

In the **Universal Tier of Engagement**, the focus is on professional development/learning and support to address statewide needs based on overall State trend data, (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide technical assistance include State and regional professional development, online tools, resources through Maryland Learning Links, and Technical Assistance Bulletins.

An LSS/PA receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for two or more consecutive years or "Needs Intervention" is assigned to the **Targeted Tier of General Supervision**. An LSS/PA in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for identified noncompliance, and/or although noncompliance may be corrected within one year, compliance is not sustained.

Targeted monitoring occurs semi-annually and includes customized data analysis with real-time local and State data. Activities may include, but are not limited to: student record reviews using selected sections of the student record review document, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LSS/PAs system of general supervision, interview

questions, and/or case studies. State and local joint cross-departmental and cross-divisional teams are formed to address identified needs. The LSS/PA develops a local Improvement Plan which is submitted to and approved by the DSE/EIS.

The corresponding **Targeted Tier of Engagement** focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, and technical assistance) to address the needs of the LSS/PA on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LSS/PA from needing substantial support. The LSS/PA leadership is required to engage with the Division to review State and local data and information in order to implement an Improvement Plan that is approved by the DSE/EIS to build capacity to effectively address the identified needs. Evaluation and periodic feedback are critical elements of Targeted Engagement. A Targeted Assistance and Support Committee (TASC) team, consisting of jointly identified local and state cross-Divisional members, provides performance-based and responsive support.

Continuing up the Differentiated Tiers, an LSS/PA with a determination status of "Needs Substantial Intervention" is assigned to the **Focused Tier of General Supervision**. In this tier, an LSS/PA continues to have findings of noncompliance, have active CAPs for two or more years, and demonstrate little progress despite general and targeted technical assistance. Focused general supervision is comprised of enhanced and differentiated monitoring and in-depth data analysis. This tier of general supervision oversight also requires the participation of the State Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent for Learning, and the DSE/EIS Assistant State Superintendent work closely with the local School Superintendent to develop a cross-departmental, cross-divisional State and local implementation team. The MSDE provides increased oversight activities to assess progress and may direct federal funds, impose special conditions, and/or require more frequent submission of data. The PA leadership is required to participate in a quarterly joint State and local Focused Intervention and Accountability Team (FIAT) to review progress. Maryland's focused monitoring as seen in the *Differentiated Framework* occurs quarterly and may include, but is not limited to: student record reviews using selected sections of the student record review document, a review of the LSS's/PAs real time data, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LSS's system of general supervision, interview questions, classroom observations, and case studies.

At this level, the goal of the **Focused Tier of Engagement** is to direct substantial support to address the continuous lack of improvement of the LSS/PA through significant systems change. As described above, a joint multi-faceted State and local FIAT meet quarterly to develop, implement, and review progress in affecting systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. Principles of effective systems change, implementation, evaluation, and sustainability are foundational elements of the technical assistance. Frequent feedback and general supervision is maintained throughout the extent of the technical assistance.

At the highest tier, the **Intensive Tier of General Supervision**, an LSS/PA fails to progress and correct previously identified noncompliance despite receiving technical assistance and support. The failure to comply has affected the core requirements, such as the delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight. The LSS/PA enters into a formal agreement with the MSDE to guide improvement and may have additional sanctions. The LSS/PA informs the MSDE of its unwillingness to comply with core requirements.

The **Intensive Tier of Engagement** focuses on providing support based on a Formal Agreement that is developed to guide improvement and correction with onsite supervision. The MSDE may direct, recover or withhold State or federal funds.

#### **Data Collection**

The first step is the collection and review of quantitative and qualitative data used for making data-informed decisions about program management and improvement. Data is derived from a variety of sources and the data collection process is continuous. First, the MSDE Data System incorporates information from a variety of other MSDE offices. The DSE/EIS collaborates with staff members from the Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability (DCAA) and the Division of Student, Family and School Support (DSFSS) 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 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the IDEA are accurate, valid, and reliable. 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. Relational links using the Unique Student ID numbers allows cross-referencing between all data sets.

#### **Special Services Information System (SSIS) 618 Data Collection**

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

The following processes and procedures are in place to ensure 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 daily.

- Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using the Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk.
- Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed.
- The SSIS Manual provides detailed information for LSSs/PAs to build mechanisms within their systems for data accuracy.

The DSE/EIS runs edit reports of the files for the local school systems and public agencies to correct and resubmit their files to the DSE/EIS. To ensure validity, the DSE/EIS Special Services Information System manual provides data standardization for definitions and provides system edits similar to those suggested system edits provided by the IDEA Data Center (IDC). Validity of the data and consistency with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data instructions is ensured throughout the data collection process by a number of practices and safeguards including edits built into the data collection system, such as data definition edits (what values are put in what fields), out-of-range edits, cross-field or relationship edits, and checks to ensure that all local school systems and public agencies submit data.

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

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

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

- Data submitted as one large file and then corrected and resubmitted; or
- Data submitted as a large file and error records are held in a suspense file until the local school system/public agency corrects the errors online. Once corrected records are accepted LSS/PA can extract the corrected file and repopulate the LSS/PA system with the corrected records.

#### **IDEA Requirements**

The DSE/EIS conducts a comprehensive student file review to ensure LSSs/PAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and COMAR. The LSSs/PAs are selected for review on a cyclical basis using a representative sample based on student enrollment that includes large, medium and small districts. Every Maryland LSS/PA will be reviewed at least once during the six year cycle.

#### **Effective Policies, Procedures, and Practices**

Maryland has policies and procedures aligned with the IDEA, 34 CFR §300. Maryland State law and Maryland's Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) supports State implementation of the IDEA. Each LSS and PA is responsible for developing policies, procedures and practices for effective implementation in accordance with federal and State requirements to ensure the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The DSE/EIS has embedded the review of LSS/PA policies, procedures, and practices within existing components of general supervision.

#### **Significant Disproportionality**

States must collect and examine data to determine whether significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is occurring in the State and districts with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities, including specific disability categories; the placement of children in particular educational settings; and the incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including student suspensions and expulsions.

Significant disproportionality is based on an analysis of numerical information. It is defined in Maryland as a weighted risk ratio greater than 2.0 for the same race or ethnicity with regard to a disability category, type of disciplinary action, or particular educational setting. Maryland uses 618 data collected for SPP Indicators 4B, 5, 9, and 10 to determine significant

disproportionality. An LSS identified as having significant disproportionality must reserve 15% of its IDEA Part B Section 611 and Section 619 passthrough funds to provide Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS); review and, if appropriate, revise district PPPs; and publicly report on the revisions of district policies, procedures and practices. Additionally, districts identified as having significant disproportionality are restricted from reducing Maintenance of Effort (MOE) by using the 50% reduction rule.

### **State Performance Plan**

The State Performance Plan (SPP) is the State's plan to improve the 17 results and compliance indicators established by the OSEP. This plan contains a description of the State's efforts to implement the requirements of Part B of the IDEA, including how it will improve performance on indicators. As part of the SPP, each indicator has a target set by OSEP or the State. All targets set by the State are approved by the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). The State Performance Plan is located on the MSDE website at [marylandpublicschools.org](http://marylandpublicschools.org) on the "Also of Interest" page.

### **Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR)**

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has revised its monitoring priorities to ensure a balance between compliance and results by placing a greater emphasis on accountability and technical assistance (TA) activities that focus on improving the MSDE capacity to develop, strengthen, and support improvement at local levels. In response to OSEP's shift in monitoring priorities, the MSDE, DSE/EIS has revised its monitoring procedures and now places greater emphasis on requirements related to improving educational results for children and youth with disabilities. In addition, the MSDE, DSE/EIS uses the *Differentiated Framework*, thus enabling the MSDE, DSE/EIS to work collaboratively with LSSs/PAs to focus on areas in need of improvement.

This is accomplished through the Maryland's Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) process. General supervision is accountable for enforcing the requirements and for ensuring continuous improvement. The primary focus of the MCIR process is to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities and their families and ensuring that the MSDE meets the program requirements within IDEA.

The MCIR process verifies data, documents compliance with both the IDEA and the COMAR regulatory requirements, and provides technical assistance for the timely correction of identified findings of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance concerning the records of individual students with disabilities always result in verification of correction using a two prong process. First (Prong 1), the records in which the noncompliance was first identified are reviewed to determine if correction has occurred, or, the requirement was completed (for timeline violations), unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or the parent has withdrawn consent. Then (Prong 2), a subsequent review of a sample of records of other similarly situated students is conducted by the DSE/EIS to verify correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. If both reviews result in 100% compliance, then correction has been achieved and the corrective action is closed.

Comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every 6 years in each LSS/PA. The purpose of comprehensive monitoring is to ensure the LSSs/PAs:

- Are compliant with State and federal regulations;
- Have a system of general supervision in place to monitor student progress and make data informed decisions; and
- Are focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

While some monitoring activities are universal for all, other monitoring activities are customized to examine areas of need. These areas are identified through a variety of sources such as but not limited to:

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

While compliance continues to be important, the OSEP has shifted to an RDA focus with respect to results monitoring for children, and youth with disabilities. In response, the DSE/EIS has developed monitoring activities geared towards these efforts to ensure improved results. Monitoring may be conducted either off-site as a desk audit or on-site depending on the nature of the monitoring activities. The method selected is dependent upon the activity and the information that is or is not accessible online and the practicality involved in acquiring the necessary documents needed for the review.

### **Desk Audit**



A desk audit refers to a review of data, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by DSE/EIS staff at the MSDE. It may be the single method used to complete a review or may be used in combination with an on-site visit. After the completion of the desk audit, the DSE/EIS staff may request further documentation or data to clarify potential findings of noncompliance or verify correction of noncompliance.

### **On-Site Monitoring**

On-site monitoring refers to a review of data, IEPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by DSE/EIS staff within the LSS/PA. On-site monitoring is specifically used to carry out those activities that are not practical to complete through a desk audit by the DSE/EIS staff. Examples of on-site monitoring may include but is not limited to a review of student records for Medicaid monitoring, provision of related services, disciplinary removal, etc.

### **Case Study Reviews**

The MSDE staff conducts case study reviews of an individual child's/student's total educational record. This allows the reviewer to gauge/conclude whether the child/student is being provided educational programming aligned with their IEP, which is evidenced by continued growth and progress towards goals and outcomes.

### **Classroom Visits**

In conducting visits to local schools and classrooms, the MSDE staff is able to determine if students' IEPs are being implemented in a manner that allows the child to benefit from being educated in the LRE. It is also an opportunity to assess whether specialized instruction is being executed with fidelity.

### **Interviews**

Interviews are conducted with general and special education teachers, and school administrators. This measures consistency and understanding of practices across the school system. Additionally, MSDE staff is able to ascertain the knowledge of school based staff pertaining to the content and implementation of student IEPs and the responsibilities of staff.

### **Directed Onsite Visits**

The MSDE, DSE/EIS reserves the right to conduct a directed onsite visit at any time based on multiple sources of data indicating potential concerns, evidence of repeated concerns, or a pattern of concerns over time. These concerns may come from examining data reported to the MSDE as part of the accountability system and other sources of information, such as interactions and conversations with parents, advocates, and/or district personnel. The purpose of the directed onsite visit is to monitor compliance and identify areas of need. The scope of each directed onsite visit is based on presenting concerns including relevant regulatory requirements. This is determined on a case-by-case basis and may include a targeted review of any of the following: SPP/APR Indicators; SSIS 618 data; fiscal management; IDEA requirements; or implementation of any other State and federal regulatory requirements. Based on identified needs, ongoing technical assistance is provided to support improvement efforts.

### **Fiscal Management**

It is the primary responsibility of the Resource Management and Monitoring Branch to ensure effective procurement, use, and oversight of Division resources. This branch also provides for the effective, fiscal subrecipient monitoring of all recipients of the IDEA grant funds throughout Maryland, including the LSSs, PAs, and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE). Through grants management staff, the Branch also ensures fiscal accountability in accordance with federal and State regulations for federal and State funds administered by the Maryland State Department of Education for the benefit of children with disabilities, ages birth through 21. The Branch assists LSSs, PAs, and other subrecipients through the application, reporting, and fiscal management of those funds. Technical assistance relative to fiscal matters, is also provided to all LSS, PAs, and grant subrecipient agencies, as well as monitors subrecipient compliance with State and federal grant regulations, including the IDEA, Code of Federal Regulations, Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), Office of Management and Budget Circulars, Maryland Education Articles, and the COMAR. The Branch additionally provides data and information to the Division leadership in support of programmatic interventions and to facilitate funding determinations and resource allocations. The Branch is additionally responsible to manage major Special Education State Aid grants and to act as the Fiscal Agent for the Children's Cabinet Interagency Fund.

### **Dispute Resolution**

The IDEA provides parents certain rights and procedural safeguards. These safeguards include formal dispute resolution requirements, such as mediation, formal complaints, resolution sessions, and due process hearings. The Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch collects and analyzes data on an ongoing basis using the parent contact and dispute resolution database to ensure effective implementation of the dispute resolution system.

### **Improvement and Correction**

Through the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) within the SPP, along with data from the examination of the LSS/PA performance; ongoing state activities are used for program improvement and

progress measurement. The DSE/EIS also aligns improvement activities with existing Department initiatives, such as the Department's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver, Maryland's Race to the Top grant, Maryland's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant, LSS Master Plan, and school improvement activities with SPP improvement activities, and correction of any identified noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

### Enforcement

There is a direct relationship between determination status and enforcement. After assigning each LSS/PA a determination status, the DSE/EIS applies appropriate enforcement actions. The DSE/EIS mandates activities and actions that are designed to ensure that LSSs/PAs meet the requirements of IDEA.

Each LSS/PA is assigned to one of four tiers of general supervision, "Universal," "Targeted," "Focused," or "Intensive" based upon performance on the IDEA SPP/APR compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. This comprehensive information is used to provide differentiated engagement that focuses on building capacity to improve results and direct State resources to those LSS/PAs that are the lowest performing. At the same time, LSS/PAs that are achieving success are recognized and provided with the support needed to publish and disseminate their successful best practices.

### Technical Assistance System:

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

Technical assistance activities, designed to address the needs of each individual LSS/PA, are based on data that are collected. Evidence that the data on the processes and results component is part of a State's or an LEA's system of general supervision and includes the following:

- Data are collected as required under the IDEA and by the U.S. Secretary of Education.
- Data are routinely collected throughout the year.
- The LEAs submit data in a timely and accurate manner.
- Data are available from multiple sources and used to examine performance of the LSSs/PAs.

Through the Division's strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, the DSE/EIS focuses on building the capacity of local school systems, public agencies, and institutions of higher education, to narrow the performance gap and enable all students with disabilities to exit education career and college ready. The Division works collaboratively with other Divisions within the MSDE to improve performance on statewide accountability measures and achievement of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards. Differentiated program support and technical assistance is provided based on State and local needs related to implementing a high quality, seamless, evidence-based early childhood intervention and special education system of services, birth through 21. The Division facilitates data informed systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation of evidenced-based professional development to enhance the quality of instructional practices including assessment, instruction, interventions, accommodations, modifications, and family engagement. **Please refer to Attachment B, *Differentiated Framework, Tiers of Engagement*.**

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

The TAP-IT process is the universal delivery system for improved results through the DSE/EIS *Differentiated Framework: Tiers of Engagement*. TAP IT ensures purposeful resource allocation and collaborative effort in support of research-based actions that narrow the achievement gap for students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The TAP-IT process follows the annual cycle for Local Priority Flexibility (LPF) Grants while looking beyond the grant parameters to ensure a more comprehensive effort in narrowing the achievement gap. Through TAP-IT the DSE/EIS will partner with LSSs around five levers for change (based on State Education Agency (SEA) Levers for Change in Local Education Agencies and Schools, Redding, 2013):

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

The TAP IT process begins with the formation of an implementation team comprised of LSS and DSE/EIS representatives

who operate in a clearly defined partnership. The team collects all current, relevant data sources (*for example: LSS data warehouse, State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Review (SPP/APR), Maryland Report Card, Maryland Online Individual Education Plan (MOIEP), and Title I Focus Schools Identification*) that are used to determine specialized educational services. The data for targeted areas for school improvement—mobility, attendance, discipline/suspension, and academics (*qualitative and quantitative*) is then organized and together the data are used to support thoughtful study and research based actions which are identified, monitored, and evaluated through the SEA/LSS TAP-IT Process. **Please refer to Attachment C for a graphic representation of TAP-IT.**

**Team:** The LSS leadership selects team members who are decision makers (programmatic, fiscal, organizational, human capital, and general educator(s) as appropriate) and will represent the LSS in partnership with the SEA, DSE/EIS team (data, fiscal and programmatic SEA liaisons, and general educator(s) as appropriate). Collaborative team sessions are scheduled face-to-face and/or through technology applications to establish team function, roles and operating norms. There is attention to building the capacity of the team in implementation science. A partnership is jointly formed by the LSS/DSE/EIS team to guide the work that includes the outcomes, design, and assessment.

**Analyze:** The team studies the processes currently in place to analyze data at the SEA, LSS and school level. The team reviews the available data that include formative, summative, longitudinal summary reports and early warning alert systems that may be in place. The purpose of each data source is reviewed and the strength and limitations are identified. The team describes/defines the sources and processes to analyze data at SEA, LSS, and school levels and identifies opportunities for programmatic support and/or technical assistance. The team analyzes the data using an agreed upon protocol (*a suggestion for data informed discussions is posted on Maryland Learning Links: [http://marylandlearninglinks.org/data/ck/sites/121/files/REL\\_2013001.pdf](http://marylandlearninglinks.org/data/ck/sites/121/files/REL_2013001.pdf)*) and reports their finding.

**Plan:** The team reviews the effectiveness of existing processes and interventions to narrow the gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The team shares current research and research based practices for narrowing the achievement gap. Allocation of resources is reviewed to determine their effectiveness in narrowing the gap. Using evidence based questioning strategies such as Teams Intervening Early to Reach all Students (TIERS): Asking the Right Questions at <http://www.hdc.lsuhsd.edu/tiers/modules/Module/TIERS%20Data%20Use%20Steps%201-8%20output/story.html>, and implementation science tools that include the Hexagon Tool where information is gathered and organized providing the team with a complete picture of the targeted interventions and their use in the LSS. <http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/hexagon-tool-exploring-context> Plans are created and resources are aligned to narrow the achievement gap based on the data analysis. Plans use SMART goals that are *Strategic, Measurable, Attainable, Results based and Time bound* - and includes ideas for sharing success and replication. <http://www.hr.virginia.edu/uploads/documents/media/Writing SMART Goals.pdf>

**Implement:** The plan is implemented with the supports and resources identified from the LSS and DSE/EIS partners. Monitoring of progress, identification and removal of barriers to change, and diagnostic site reviews are conducted.

**Track:** Team members meet quarterly face-to-face and/or through technology applications. They receive updates from those assigned to monitor each data set, financial reports are discussed and the team modifies the work as needed (e.g., based on fidelity of intervention implementation, student performance, etc.). An annual review and report of the work is completed by the team through the SMART Process. Success is shared, and the work is scaled up as appropriate.

#### Professional Development System:

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

The Maryland State Department of Education's "Stages of Professional Development for All Teachers Teaching Students with Disabilities" is a roadmap that teachers can use throughout their careers, ideally beginning in the final year of a teacher-preparation program and moving all the way through to retirement. There are other matrices available to guide teacher professional development, but "Stages" is unique. It's specifically geared to help teachers improve the performance of their students with disabilities in both the general and special education environments.

While "Stages" can be a great self-assessment tool, it's especially useful during the mentoring process. It helps mentors and mentees identify the mentee's particular areas of strength and areas of need. In addition, it provides clear stepping stones to guide the mentee's professional development on an ongoing, career-long basis. The online version of "Stages", accessible through the [Professional Development Online Tracker \(PDot\)](#), includes links to professional development courses, videos, curricula, webinars, books and other materials that can be invaluable during (and after) mentoring. **See Attachment D for a graphic representation of the professional development cycle** that is at the heart of "Stages" and at the heart of every teacher's professional growth.

#### Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.



The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State

Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The DSE/EIS has developed the State's Birth through 21 SPP/APR website in collaboration with our strategic partners at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE). A complete copy of Maryland's SPP is available on the Maryland's Birth through 21 SPP/APR website. This website may be accessed from the home page of the MSDE website at <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org>. The public may also access Maryland's Birth through 21 SPP/APR website at <http://mdideareport.org>. The website includes State and local performance and compliance data on all applicable indicators. It also includes tools for comparing local performance in relationship to other LSS/PA and the State targets. The public may see progress and slippage through a combination of tables and graphs populated on the website. This site also includes the OSEP's annual State determination, and the DSE/EIS's annual local school system determinations. The DSE/EIS will make FFY 2013 local determinations in March 2015.

The DSE/EIS reports to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the SPP measurable and rigorous targets, and the performance of each LSS/PA on the targets in the SPP on the MSDE website within 120 days of the submission to the OSEP. At that time the MSDE will also disseminate this information to each LSS/PA in the State, to members of the SESAC, to each local school system's Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECACs), and make it available to various media, consistent with the MSDE policy for dissemination of other written material. Upon receipt of the State's FFY 2013 federal Part B determination status, the DSE/EIS will send a copy of the FFY 2013 APR to local superintendents of schools, local directors of special education in each LSS/PA, the SESAC members, and the Parents' Place of Maryland, Inc.

**OSEP Response**

**Indicator 1: Graduation****Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		83.24%	80.00%	85.50%	85.50%	85.50%	90.00%	81.50%
Data	76.80% <del>76.77%</del>	75.61%	72.85%	67.23% <del>70.05%</del>	70.05%	73.33% <del>72.33%</del>	56.57%	57.41% <del>71.51%</del>

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**Explanation of Changes**

Data for FFY 2005, 2008, 2010, and 2012 were revised to align with the data reported on the Maryland Report Card for the students with disabilities subgroup and as reported in the respective APRs submitted to the OSEP.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	59.19%	61.43%	63.67%	65.91%	68.14%	70.38%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation -The graduation targets are the Maryland Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate targets established for students with disabilities, page 81;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

### **OSEP Response**

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2005 data to the FFY 2011 data). OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.




**Indicator 1: Graduation****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,847	3847
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	6,408	6,408
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	60.03%	Calculate 

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

N/A

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
3,847	6,408	57.41%	59.19%	60.03%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions Field**

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The same data was reported to the U. S. Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The State used the four year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA. Using the required 2012-2013 Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Rate, 3,847 youth with IEPs out of a possible 6,408 graduated with a regular diploma. This is a 4 year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 60.03%. This compares to a 4 year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 87.64% for regular education students. This data reflects a 27.61 percentage point gap between the graduation rate of nondisabled peers and youth with disabilities who received services in accordance with an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

The four year adjusted cohort rate is the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. From the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade, students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently "adjusted" by adding any student who transfers into the cohort later during the 9<sup>th</sup> grade year and the next three years and subtracting out any students who transfer out, emigrate to another county, or die during that same period. This definition is defined in federal regulation 34 C.F.R.

§200.19(b)(1)(i)-(iv). The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate also strictly adheres to section 111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which defines graduation rate as the “percentage of students who graduate from secondary school with a regular diploma in the standard number of years.

The data provided is from the Maryland Report Card, Maryland’s official ESEA data reporting source for the Maryland State Department of Education that aligns with Maryland’s Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). The Maryland Report Card may be accessed at <http://mdreportcard.org/>. The graduation rate targets are the same as the annual graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA.

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

Subject Area	Specific Credit Requirement
English	4 credits
Math	3 credits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 in Algebra/Data Analysis</li> <li>• 1 in Geometry</li> <li>• 1 additional Mathematics credit</li> </ul>
Science	3 credits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 in Biology</li> <li>• 2 that must include laboratory experience in any or all of the following areas: earth science, life science, physical science</li> </ul>
Social Studies	3 credits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US History</li> <li>• World History</li> <li>• Local, State, and National Government</li> </ul>
Fine Arts	1 credit
Physical Education	½ credit
Health	½ credit
Technology Education	1 credit
Other	2 credits of foreign language <b>or</b> 2 credits of American Sign Language <b>or</b> 2 credits of advanced technology education <b>and</b> 3 credits in electives <b>OR</b> 4 credits by successfully completing a State-approved career & technology program <b>and</b> 1 credit in an elective
Students must also meet attendance, 75 hours of service-learning, and any local school system requirements	

In addition, all students, including youth with IEPs, must complete the following High School Assessments requirements:

**Algebra/Data Analysis, English 10, and Biology**

Students who entered grade 9 in the fall of 2005 and later (COMAR 13A.03.02.09) must obtain either a passing score on Algebra/Data Analysis, English 10, and Biology or obtain an overall combined score of 1208 or 1602 (see below).

Students who meet specific criteria may use the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation to meet the passing requirement.

For more information about the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation, please see questions 20 and 21 (pages 10-11) in the High School Graduation Requirements Questions and Answers at [http://hsaexam.org/img/HS\\_Grad\\_Q\\_A.pdf](http://hsaexam.org/img/HS_Grad_Q_A.pdf).

**Government**

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

- 1602 for English, Algebra/Data Analysis, Biology, **and** Government; or
- 1208 for English, Algebra/Data Analysis, and Biology.

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



**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2005 data to the FFY 2011 data). OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2005 data to the FFY 2011 data). OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		3.81%	3.54%	3.54% <del>5.78%</del>	3.54%	3.27% <del>3.54%</del>	3.27%	3.27% <del>5.87%</del>
Data	5.65%	4.98%	5.78%	3.11%	4.41%	4.46%	5.41%	5.87% <del>3.27%</del>

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### Explanation of Changes

The prepopulated data for FFY 2008, 2010, and 2012 did not coincide with the targets reported to the OSEP in the respective Federal Fiscal Years. The prepopulated data for FFY 2012 was corrected to reflect the approved amended APR submitted to the OSEP on April 28, 2014.

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.95%	4.47%	3.99%	3.51%	3.03%	2.55%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress, and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26,

2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout - new targets were established using Option 2 to report using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the instructions;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### FFY 2013 Data

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

## Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,576	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	950	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	87	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,512	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e )	39	

## FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
1,540	31,113	5.87%	4.95%	4.95%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

☒ Use a different calculation methodology

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Maryland is using Option 2. The data and measurement for Option 2 is the same data source and measurement that Maryland used to report in its FFY 2010 APR, submitted February 1, 2012. The instructions for Option 2 state that Maryland is to, "use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data." This data is from SY 2012-2013 as the data for this indicator are "lagged" data.

The annual event school dropout rate is the percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students who leave school for any reason, except death, before graduation or completion of a Maryland approved educational program and who are not known to enroll in another school or state-approved program during the current school year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer 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 - 12 served by the school. Note: Students who re-enter school during the same year in which they dropped out of school are not counted as dropouts.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)



**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		33.00%	38.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	21.00%	37.50%	38.00%	20.00%	24.00%	8.00%	48.00%	8.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### Explanation of Changes

Prepopulated data was not available on 12/30/14. Data from the OSEP approved APR submissions for FFY 2005 through 2012.

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	8.00%	16.00%	16.00%	32.00%	48.00%	56.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment - 3A -No LSS met the reading or mathematics AMOs; 3B - Maryland continues to have a very high participation rate on Sttewide assessments at all grade levels; 3C - State established raes of proficiency were not met for any grade level assessment for rading or mathematics. Overall, the 2013-2014 school year was a year of continued transition for Maryland, as it was for many states. Maryland teachers began implementing the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MDCCRS, based on the Common Core Standards) in the 2012-2013 school year with full implementation taking place in the 2013-2014 school year. While the new standards are being implemented, the new assessment, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC), which are aligned to the MDCCRS, will not be administered until FFY 2014, the 2014-2015 school year. This misalignment between what is being taught and what is being assessed had a significant impact on Maryland's reading and mathematics MSA and HSA scores in FFY 2013 at all grade levels. In some situations, a topic that is covered on the MSA or HSA assessment for a particular grade is not addressed at all in the MDCCRS for that grade. This has impacted the proficiency rares for nondisabled peers, along with that of students with disabilities as a result of administering the Maryland School Assessment that is not aligned with MDCCRS.
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Inidicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

## OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



## Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/15/2014	Number of districts in the State	25	

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? ☒ Yes ☐ NoAre you reporting AYP or AMO? ☒ AYP ☐ AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
25	25	0	8.00%	8.00%	0%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

### Explanation of Slippage

For FFY 2013, 0% (0/25) of the State's local school systems met the State's AMO targets in both mathematics and reading for the students with disabilities subgroup. For mathematics, 0/25 or 0% of the local school systems met the State's AMO target for the disability subgroup and 1/25 or 4% of the local school systems met the State's AMO reading target for the disability subgroup. Maryland did not meet the target and there was slippage. The 2013-2014 school year was a year of continued transition for Maryland, as it was for many states. Maryland teachers began implementing the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MDCCRS, based on the Common Core Standards) in the 2012-2013 school year with full implementation taking place in the 2013-2014 school year. While the new standards are being implemented, the new assessment, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC), which are aligned to the MDCCRS, will not be administered until FFY 2014, the 2014-2015 school year. This misalignment between what is being taught and what is being assessed had a significant impact on Maryland's reading and mathematics MSA and HSA scores in FFY 2013 at all grade levels. In some situations, a topic that is covered on the MSA or HSA assessment for a particular grade is not addressed at all in the MDCCRS for that grade.

### ☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Upon discussion with OSEP during the clarification period it was determined no action was required relative to this indicator.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2013 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		95.00% 0.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00% 0.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	100%	98.90%	98.70%	99.18%	99.23%	99.10%	99.17%	99.10%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		95.00% 0.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00% 0.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	100%	98.80%	98.70%	99.03%	99.17%	99.10%	99.05%	98.86%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### Explanation of Changes

The FFY 2006 and 2009 targets for Reading and Math participation were not included. Data provided was from the OSEP approved APR submissions from FFY 2006 and FFY 2009.

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed

regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment - 3A -No LSS met the reading or mathematics AMOs; 3B - Maryland continues to have a very high participation rate on Sttewide assessments at all grade levels; 3C - State established raes of proficiency were not met for any grade level assessment for rading or mathematics. Overall, the 2013-2014 school year was a year of continued transition for Maryland, as it was for many states. Maryland teachers began implementing the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MDCCRS, based on the Common Core Standards) in the 2012-2013 school year with full implementation taking place in the 2013-2014 school year. While the new standards are being implemented, the new assessment, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC), which are aligned to the MDCCRS, will not be administered until FFY 2014, the 2014-2015 school year. This misalignment between what is being taught and what is being assessed had a significant impact on Maryland's reading and mathematics MSA and HSA scores in FFY 2013 at all grade levels. In some situations, a topic that is covered on the MSA or HSA assessment for a particular grade is not addressed at all in the MDCCRS for that grade. This has impacted the proficiency rares for nondisabled peers, along with that of students with disabilities as a result of administering the Maryland School Assessment that is not aligned with MDCCRS.
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2013 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	6639	7242	7939	7286	7204	7349	0	0	0	0	6779
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1246	1275	1098	847	754	759					1830
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4738	5315	6208	5617	5652	5749					1947
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											2151
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	593	605	588	698	649	712					770

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	6821	7210	7938	7363	7089	7338	0	0	0	0	7018
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1292	1232	1078	833	740	706					2025
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4866	5311	6212	5696	5518	5767					1801
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											2338
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	593	605	588	698	649	712					770

## OSEP Response



The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	50,438	49,801	99.10%	95.00%	98.74%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	50,777	50,030	98.86%	95.00%	98.53%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Public Reporting Information

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

The Maryland Report Card at <http://mdreportcard.org> reports performance data by State, county, and school. The Maryland School Improvement website at [www.mdk12.org](http://www.mdk12.org) also reports performance data by county and school. The MSDE implements necessary limits on the data reported on both websites in accordance with FERPA guidelines. The changes to the websites were designed to maximize the information provided to the public while also protecting the privacy of small identifiable groups of students.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2013 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Grade 3	x											
B	Grade 4		x										
C	Grade 5			x									
D	Grade 6				x								
E	Grade 7					x							
F	Grade 8						x						
G	HS											x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		61.82% 0.00%	62.27%	72.73% 0.00%	73.73% 0.00%	78.18% 0.00%	83.64% 0.00%	94.55% 0.00%
			Data	57.50% 0.00%	62.50%	63.33%	68.65% 0.00%	66.72% 0.00%	67.95% 0.00%	69.34% 0.00%	61.60% 0.00%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥		72.05% 0.00%	76.90%	80.75% 0.00%	80.75% 0.00%	84.60% 0.00%	88.45% 0.00%	96.15% 0.00%
			Data	58.50% 0.00%	67.30%	72.23%	69.39% 0.00%	68.12% 0.00%	71.51% 0.00%	71.47% 0.00%	66.90% 0.00%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		66.59% 0.00%	71.36%	76.14% 0.00%	76.14% 0.00%	80.91% 0.00%	85.68% 0.00%	95.23% 0.00%
			Data	48.90% 0.00%	52.97%	67.51%	73.29% 0.00%	71.12% 0.00%	70.30% 0.00%	72.27% 0.00%	65.40% 0.00%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥		68.50% 0.00%	73.00%	77.50% 0.00%	77.50% 0.00%	82.00% 0.00%	86.50% 0.00%	95.50% 0.00%
			Data	36.90% 0.00%	47.15%	51.24%	57.10% 0.00%	61.41% 0.00%	59.39% 0.00%	57.82% 0.00%	51.80% 0.00%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥		66.75% 0.00%	71.50%	76.25% 0.00%	76.25% 0.00%	81.00% 0.00%	85.75% 0.00%	95.25% 0.00%
			Data	36.30% 0.00%	36.88%	49.48%	52.72% 0.00%	52.84% 0.00%	57.28% 0.00%	51.96% 0.00%	54.00% 0.00%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		63.73% 0.00%	68.91%	74.09% 0.00%	74.09% 0.00%	79.27% 0.00%	84.45% 0.00%	94.82% 0.00%
			Data	30.80% 0.00%	35.22%	38.81%	50.35% 0.00%	53.90% 0.00%	55.13% 0.00%	52.24% 0.00%	44.60% 0.00%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥		52.17% 0.00%	59.00%	65.83% 0.00%	65.83% 0.00%	72.67% 0.00%	79.50% 0.00%	93.17% 0.00%
			Data	21.10% 0.00%	36.45%	45.91%	48.16% 0.00%	46.69% 0.00%	49.77% 0.00%	51.56% 0.00%	49.40% 0.00%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		66.53% 0.00%	71.31%	76.09% 0.00%	76.09% 0.00%	80.87% 0.00%	85.65% 0.00%	95.22% 0.00%
			Data	53.00% 0.00%	54.97%	60.27%	58.13% 0.00%	63.44% 0.00%	62.70% 0.00%	63.37% 0.00%	52.13% 0.00%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥		66.33% 0.00%	71.14%	75.95% 0.00%	75.95% 0.00%	80.76% 0.00%	85.57% 0.00%	95.19% 0.00%
			Data	54.90% 0.00%	62.63%	66.85%	66.90% 0.00%	68.63% 0.00%	67.00% 0.00%	66.09% 0.00%	60.99% 0.00%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		58.89% 0.00%	64.76%	70.64% 0.00%	70.64% 0.00%	76.51% 0.00%	82.38% 0.00%	94.13% 0.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
			Data	41.90% 0.00%	51.59%	52.52%	53.35%	57.95%	57.60%	61.01%	48.05%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥		51.84% 0.00%	58.72%	65.60%	65.60%	72.48%	79.36%	93.12%
			Data	30.90% 0.00%	40.46%	44.51%	46.39%	50.78%	54.10%	54.13%	42.96%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥		49.81% 0.00%	56.98%	64.15%	64.15%	71.32%	78.49%	92.83%
			Data	26.60% 0.00%	30.58%	35.23%	43.12%	45.59%	48.70%	49.68%	38.48%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		48.45% 0.00%	55.82%	63.18%	63.18%	70.55%	77.91%	92.64%
			Data	23.30% 0.00%	27.22%	29.51%	35.13%	34.89%	34.90%	37.96%	29.22%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥		38.60% 0.00%	38.60%	56.11%	56.12%	64.89%	73.67%	91.22%
			Data	31.00% 0.00%	37.33%	49.95%	47.46%	45.69%	48.60%	48.33%	48.16%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

The empty cells were populated with targets and data from the FFY 2005 through FFY 2012 approved OSEP APR submissions.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	72.80%	75.80%	78.80%	81.90%	84.90%	87.90%
	B ≥ Grade 4	72.80%	75.80%	78.80%	81.90%	84.90%	87.90%
	C ≥ Grade 5	72.80%	75.80%	78.80%	81.90%	84.90%	87.90%
	D ≥ Grade 6	72.80%	75.80%	78.80%	81.90%	84.90%	87.90%
	E ≥ Grade 7	72.80%	75.80%	78.80%	81.90%	84.90%	87.90%
	F ≥ Grade 8	72.80%	75.80%	78.80%	81.90%	84.90%	87.90%
	G ≥ HS	72.80%	75.80%	78.80%	81.90%	84.90%	87.90%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	67.40%	71.00%	74.70%	78.30%	81.90%	85.50%
	B ≥ Grade 4	67.40%	71.00%	74.70%	78.30%	81.90%	85.50%
	C ≥ Grade 5	67.40%	71.00%	74.70%	78.30%	81.90%	85.50%
	D ≥ Grade 6	67.40%	71.00%	74.70%	78.30%	81.90%	85.50%
	E ≥ Grade 7	67.40%	71.00%	74.70%	78.30%	81.90%	85.50%
	F ≥ Grade 8	67.40%	71.00%	74.70%	78.30%	81.90%	85.50%

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
	G ≥ HS	67.40%	71.00%	74.70%	78.30%	81.90%	85.50%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment - 3A -No LSS met the reading or mathematics AMOs; 3B - Maryland continues to have a very high participation rate on Sttewide assessments at all grade levels; 3C - State established raes of proficiency were not met for any grade level assessment for rading or mathematics. Overall, the 2013-2014 school year was a year of continued transition for Maryland, as it was for many states. Maryland teachers began implementing the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards



(MDCCRS, based on the Common Core Standards) in the 2012-2013 school year with full implementation taking place in the 2013-2014 school year. While the new standards are being implemented, the new assessment, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC), which are aligned to the MDCCRS, will not be administered until FFY 2014, the 2014-2015 school year. This misalignment between what is being taught and what is being assessed had a significant impact on Maryland's reading and mathematics MSA and HSA scores in FFY 2013 at all grade levels. In some situations, a topic that is covered on the MSA or HSA assessment for a particular grade is not addressed at all in the MDCCRS for that grade. This has impacted the proficiency rates for nondisabled peers, along with that of students with disabilities as a result of administering the Maryland School Assessment that is not aligned with MDCCRS.

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2013 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	6577	7195	7894	7162	7055	7220	0	0	0	0	6698
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	792	969	844	534	394	334					1085
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2348	2907	3778	2440	2035	1825					763
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											634
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	532	533	521	605	570	622	0	0	0	0	625

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	6751	7148	7878	7227	6907	7185	0	0	0	0	6934
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	816	860	579	330	255	184					1210
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1643	2125	1844	1422	1144	921					807
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade											

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											591
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	519	516	477	586	563	585	0	0	0	0	599

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3	6,577	3,672	61.60%	72.80%	55.83%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B Grade 4	7,195	4,409	66.90%	72.80%	61.28%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C Grade 5	7,894	5,143	65.40%	72.80%	65.15%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D Grade 6	7,162	3,579	51.80%	72.80%	49.97%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
E Grade 7	7,055	2,999	54.00%	72.80%	42.51%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
F Grade 8	7,220	2,781	44.60%	72.80%	38.52%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
G HS	6,698	3,107	49.40%	72.80%	46.39%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Group A Slippage

The 2013-2014 school year was a year of continued transition for Maryland, as it was for many states. Maryland teachers began implementing the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MDCCRS, based on the Common Core Standards) in the 2012-2013 school year with full implementation taking place in the 2013-2014 school year. While the new standards are being implemented, the new assessment, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC), which are aligned to the MDCCRS, will not be administered until FFY 2014, the 2014-2015 school year. This misalignment between what is being taught and what is being assessed had a significant impact on Maryland's reading and mathematics MSA and HSA scores in FFY 2013 at all grade levels for both nondisabled students and students with disabilities. In some situations, a topic that is covered on the MSA or HSA assessment for a particular grade is not addressed at all in the MDCCRS for that grade.

#### Explanation of Group B Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group D Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group E Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group F Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group G Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3	6,751	2,978	52.13%	67.40%	44.11%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B Grade 4	7,148	3,501	60.99%	67.40%	48.98%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C Grade 5	7,878	2,900	48.05%	67.40%	36.81%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
D Grade 6	7,227	2,338	42.96%	67.40%	32.35%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
E Grade 7	6,907	1,962	38.48%	67.40%	28.41%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
F Grade 8	7,185	1,690	29.22%	67.40%	23.52%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
G HS	6,934	3,207	48.16%	67.40%	46.25%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Group A Slippage

The 2013-2014 school year was a year of continued transition for Maryland, as it was for many states. Maryland teachers began implementing the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MDCCRS, based on the Common Core Standards) in the 2012-2013 school year with full implementation taking place in the 2013-2014 school year. While the new standards are being implemented, the new assessment, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC), which are aligned to the MDCCRS, will not be administered until FFY 2014, the 2014-2015 school year. This misalignment between what is being taught and what is being assessed had a significant impact on Maryland's reading and mathematics MSA and HSA scores in FFY 2013 at all grade levels for both nondisabled students and students with disabilities. In some situations, a topic that is covered on the MSA or HSA assessment for a particular grade is not addressed at all in the MDCCRS for that grade.

#### Explanation of Group B Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group C Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group D Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group E Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### Explanation of Group F Slippage

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### **Explanation of Group G Slippage**

Please refer to Explanation of Slippage for Group A.

#### **Public Reporting Information**

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

The Maryland Report Card at <http://mdreportcard.org> reports performance data by State, county, and school. The Maryland School Improvement website at [www.mdk12.org](http://www.mdk12.org) also reports performance data by county and school. The MSDE implements necessary limits on the data reported on both websites in accordance with FERPA guidelines. The changes to the websites were designed to maximize the information provided to the public while also protecting the privacy of small identifiable groups of students.



**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion****Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		20.83%	16.67%	16.67%	12.50%	8.30%	8.30%	4.10%
Data	33.00%	20.83%	12.50%	12.50%	16.70%	16.70%	16.70%	16.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	16.00%	12.00%	12.00%	8.00%	8.00%	4.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress, and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26,

2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion - process for review of policies, procedures, and students record review and review of disciplinary removal data. Also, eight (8) 32% of the LSSs are excluded from the calculation because they each had an "N size" of less than 30 students disciplinarily removed in excess of 10 days.
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability - There is a continued concern regarding the discrepant disciplinary removal of African American students with disabilities. If an LSS is identified with significant disproportionality in the discipline of students with disabilities, the LSS is required to use 15% of its Part B 611 and Part B 619 funds for Comprehensive Early Intervening Services. Additionally, the MSDE State Board of Education adopted new disciplinary regulations in the 2013-2014 school year to reduce the disciplinary removal of all students, including students with disabilities. We will review this data as it comes available;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

## **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/15/2014	Number of districts in the State	25	25

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Please indicate the type of denominator provided



Number of districts in the State



Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
4	25	16.00%	16.00%	16.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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



Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State



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

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Significant discrepancy is defined as having a Comparative Discrepancy Ratio of 2.0 or greater when comparing the rate of suspension of students with disabilities for greater than ten days to the rate of suspension of nondisabled students for greater than ten days. Calculation for the Comparative Discrepancy Ratio is the local school system suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities divided by the local school system suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. The Comparative Discrepancy Ratio is modeled after a Risk Ratio which is the ratio between two rates of outcomes. If the ratio is greater than 2.0, the local school system is considered to be significantly discrepant. In addition to meeting the Comparative Discrepancy Ratio of 2.0 or above, a local school system must meet the criteria for the minimum "n" size. The minimum "n" size for all local school systems is 30 students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 school days in a school year.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response


The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.


**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion****FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE***Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

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

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))****Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)*Description of review*

The DSE/EIS required the four (4) local school systems to submit their written policies and procedures relating to the discipline of students with disabilities, development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to the DSE/EIS for review to ensure that the policies and procedures comply with the IDEA. In addition, the DSE/EIS reviews four (4) LSSs practices thorough a review of student records and disciplinary removal data to ensure the regulatory requiremntns were implemented correctly . Through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, noncompliance was not identified. In addition, staff members from the Division's Policy and Accountability Branch, Monitoring and Accountability Section conducted a subsequent review of a random selection of student records from another data period to ensure policies and procedures were being followed (Prong 2). The student records reviewed were compliant with requirements. Results of the DSE/EIS's review indicate that each of the four (4) LSSs have compliant policies, procedures, and practices related to suspensions and expulsions, development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and the application of procedural safeguards to ensure that comply with requirements. Therefore, no changes to policies, procedures, and practices were required.

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

 The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE***Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE***Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

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

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

**Historical Data***Baseline Data: 2009*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					4.10%	4.10%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/15/2014	Number of districts in the State	25	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Please indicate the type of denominator provided



Number of districts in the State



Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
4	0	25	0%	0%	0%

**Status****Slippage**

Met Target

No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**All races and ethnicities were included in the review****State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

The Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) utilized a *Rate Ratio* to compare the district-level suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities from each racial/ethnic group to the suspension/expulsion rate for all children without disabilities in that same district. The Rate Ratio is an acceptable method for determining significant discrepancy and is explained in detail on pages 70-71 of the Data Accountability Center document entitled *Measuring Significant Discrepancy: an Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide*, dated March 16, 2012. If the *Rate Ratio* is greater than 2.0, the local school system is considered to be significantly discrepant. Calculation for the Rate Ratio is the local school system suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities divided by the local school system suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities.

In addition to meeting the *Rate Ratio* of 2.0 or above, the local school systems must meet the criteria for the minimum "n" size. The minimum "n" size for all local school systems is 30 students with disabilities in a particular race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than 10 school days in a school year. Significant discrepancy calculations were made for local school systems that had at least 30 children with disabilities in a particular race/ethnic group suspended for greater than ten days.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.


**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion****FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE***Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**


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

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)*Description of review*

Each of the local school systems with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension made their policies, procedures related to the discipline of students with disabilities, development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards available to the MSDE. Staff from the MSDE reviewed the policies, procedures using our discipline review document to ensure compliance with federal and State regulations. Additionally, to review practices, the DSE/EIS reviewed individual student records and disciplinary data to ensure practices implement regulatory requirements correctly. Staff members from the Division's Policy and Accountability Branch, Monitoring and Accountability Section also conduct a subsequent review a random selection of student records from another data period to ensure policies and procedures, and practices to ensure regulatory requirements are met.

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

 The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		60.11%	60.61%	61.11%	61.61%	62.11%	62.61%	63.11%
		Data	59.90%	61.64%	62.35%	63.00%	64.80%	66.14%	67.12%	67.97%
B	2005	Target ≤		16.61%	16.36%	16.11%	15.86%	15.61%	15.36%	15.11%
		Data	16.86%	16.21%	15.82%	15.10%	14.55%	14.04%	13.66%	13.34%
C	2005	Target ≤		7.24%	6.20%	6.92%	6.67%	6.42%	6.32%	6.22%
		Data	7.89%	7.90%	7.80%	7.59%	7.33%	7.12%	7.01%	6.94%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	68.40%	68.90%	69.40%	69.90%	70.40%	70.90%
Target B ≤	13.26%	12.76%	12.26%	11.76%	11.26%	10.76%
Target C ≤	6.69%	6.44%	6.19%	5.94%	5.69%	5.44%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic

Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) - 5A Services in the regular education setting > 80% of the school day continues to increase. Twenty of 25 LSSs exceeded the State target. 5B- Twenty of 25 LSSs were below the State target. 5C- Twenty-one of 25 LSSs were below the State Target. Only 4 of 25 LSSs exceeded the State target.
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

## **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



**Indicator 5: Education Environments****(children 6-21)****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	90,652	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62,006	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12,020	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	5,949	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	123	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	246	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62,006	90,652	67.97%	68.40%	68.40%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12,020	90,652	13.34%	13.26%	13.26%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	6,318	90,652	6.94%	6.69%	6.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

## Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

## Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								64.10%
		Data							63.60%	56.20%
B	2011	Target ≤								19.10%
		Data							19.60%	20.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

## FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.10%	64.30%	64.50%	64.70%	64.90%	65.10%
Target B ≤	18.90%	18.70%	18.50%	18.30%	18.10%	17.90%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26,

2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE - 6A-Sixteen of 26 LSSs/PAs met or exceed the target; 6B- Seventeen of 26 LSSs/PAs met or exceeded the target. Work continues with LSS/PA personnel to explore less restrictive natural environment options with nondisabled peers.
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE - 6A-Sixteen of 26 LSSs/PAs met or exceed the target; 6B- Seventeen of 26 LSSs/PAs met or exceeded the target. Work continues with LSS/PA personnel to explore less restrictive natural environment options with nondisabled peers.
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

## **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 6: Preschool Environments****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	13,136	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,440	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,271	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	276	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	5	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,440	13,136	56.20%	64.10%	56.64%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,552	13,136	20.00%	18.90%	19.43%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

## Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

## Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					65.30%	66.30%	66.80%	68.30%
		Data				64.30%	64.40%	68.90%	69.20%	67.30%
A2	2008	Target ≥					70.50%	71.50%	72.00%	73.50%
		Data				68.50%	64.90%	67.50%	69.53%	66.40%
B1	2008	Target ≥					65.60%	66.60%	67.10%	68.60%
		Data				64.60%	65.30%	69.50%	70.40%	66.00%
B2	2008	Target ≥					56.30%	57.30%	58.20%	59.30%
		Data				55.30%	52.70%	55.20%	60.38%	55.70%
C1	2008	Target ≥					59.70%	61.70%	62.20%	63.70%
		Data				58.70%	60.60%	63.90%	65.52%	61.50%
C2	2008	Target ≥					63.20%	64.20%	64.70%	66.20%
		Data				66.20%	62.10%	63.60%	67.00%	64.10%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

## Explanation of Changes

The data prepopulated for FFY 2012 did not match the data submitted in the amended FFY 2012 APR, submitted to OSEP on April XX, 2014.

## FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	67.30%	68.70%	68.90%	68.90%	68.90%	68.90%
Target A2 ≥	66.40%	67.80%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.60%
Target B1 ≥	66.00%	67.40%	67.60%	67.60%	67.60%	67.60%
Target B2 ≥	55.70%	57.10%	57.20%	57.20%	57.20%	57.20%
Target C1 ≥	61.50%	62.90%	63.10%	63.10%	63.10%	63.10%
Target C2 ≥	64.10%	65.50%	65.70%	65.70%	65.70%	66.30%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator.

Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes - The ability of the current methodology, the Work Sampling System (WSS), to reflect incremental progress for children with multiple and complex needs, as well as for children whose development is atypical in one or more areas contributed to the State's decision to move forward with implementing a new methodology, the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, beginning July 1, 2015. For FFY 2013 and 2014, the existing methodology is based on the use of a single assessment instrument, the Work Sampling System (WSS). This system has provided data of limited programmatic value as well as being inconsistent with national data, specifically at Progress Level A.
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE -
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes-The ability of the current methodology, the Work Sampling System (WSS), to reflect incremental progress for children with multiple and complex needs, as well as for children whose development is atypical in one or more areas contributed to the State's decision to move forward with implementing a new methodology, the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, beginning July 1, 2015. For FFY 2013 and 2014, the existing methodology is based on the use of a single assessment instrument, the Work Sampling System (WSS). This system has provided data of limited programmatic value as well as being inconsistent with national data, specifically at Progress Level A.
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and

- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the targets for A1, B1, B2, and C1, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A2, and C2, because the State's end targetS for A2 and C2 for FFY 2018 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 targetS for A2 and C2 to reflect improvement.

**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE***Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:**

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4,019
------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	653
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	348
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	390
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,488
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,140

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1,878	2,879	67.30%	67.30%	65.23%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,628	4,019	66.40%	66.40%	65.39%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of A1 Slippage**

State target was not met. Slippage is the result of the persistently high percentage (12%-17%) of children in Progress Level A (no progress) since the State began collecting outcomes data. The current methodology, the Work Sampling System (WSS), has not been able to capture incremental progress for children with multiple and complex needs, as well as for children whose development is atypical in one or more areas. Additionally, the implementation of a new statewide measure for kindergarten readiness and a revision to the State's Early Learning Standards resulted in some confusion on the part of kindergarten teachers over the standards by which all children's progress should be measured; these individuals collect a great portion of the Exit data for preschool children with disabilities.

**Explanation of A2 Slippage**

State target was not met. The high percentage of children falling into Progress Level A that impacted the results for Indicator A1 had a similar impact on Indicator A2. The ability of the current methodology, the Work Sampling System (WSS), to reflect incremental progress for children with multiple and complex needs, as well as for children whose development is atypical in one or more areas has become an ongoing concern and contributed to the State's decision to move forward with implementing a new methodology, the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, beginning July 1, 2015. Additionally, these data are inconsistent with data reported by other States and exceed a percentage-range estimated by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center as representative of data that are valid and reliable.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	634
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	605
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	590
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,581
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	609

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,171	3,410	66.00%	66.00%	63.67%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,190	4,019	55.70%	55.70%	54.49%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of B1 Slippage**

State target was not met. The percentage of children falling into the “no progress” level (just under 16%) is of great concern and was a major contributing factor for the State target not being met. The ability of the current methodology, the Work Sampling System (WSS), to reflect incremental progress for children with multiple and complex needs, as well as for children whose development is atypical in one or more areas contributed to the State's decision to move forward with implementing a new methodology, the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, beginning July 1, 2015.

**Explanation of B2 Slippage**

State target was not met. Performance on this Indicator in terms of narrowing the performance gap with typically developing children is greatly impacted by a lack of demonstrated progress over time as measured by Indicator B1. As with Indicators A1 and A2, a high percentage of children have consistently fallen into Progress Level A over the period of time that the State has been collecting data. The State anticipates that with a new methodology, the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, scheduled for implementation beginning July 1, 2015, data collected for all Indicators, should be more representative of actual performance at all progress levels.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	647
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	483
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	340
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,417
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,132

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited	1,757	2,887	61.50%	61.50%	60.86%	Did Not Meet	No Slippage

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)						Target	
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2,549	4,019	64.10%	64.10%	63.42%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)?** No

**Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Methodology/Age-Anchoring

The Work Sampling System (WSS) is an age-anchored early childhood assessment that provides a picture of a child's development in relation to typically developing peers. For the Early Childhood Accountability System (ECAS) established as Maryland's data collection system for the 3 broad child outcomes, individual WSS indicators in all domains at each age level (3,4,5) were linked electronically through the web-based system with one or more of the child outcomes.

MSDE Part C and Part B Preschool staff worked jointly with consultants from JHU/CTE to establish a framework for reporting child progress. Using the Intervention Efficacy Index (Bagnato and Neisworth) and the Proportional Change Index (Wolery), sample child Entry and Exit data were tested and analyzed to determine how each approach affected reporting on the OSEP levels of progress. MSDE and the JHU/CTE consultants reached agreement that with the use of one statewide assessment, the WSS, an approach based on a modified Proportional Change Index would yield child outcomes progress data that was both reasonable and accurate for the preschool population.

MSDE staff and consultants developed formulas\* for each reporting category using the sum of WSS indicator values divided by the number of indicators for an outcome at Entry and Exit. In addition, for OSEP reporting categories “b” and “c”, the percentage of change from Entry to Exit proved to be essential for distinguishing between these two levels of progress.

**Considerations and Overarching Formulas**

- **WSS indicators are assigned numerical values: Proficient = 3, In Process = 2, Needs Development = 1**
- **2.5 was determined as the “cut-off” score for reporting a child's performance as comparable to typically developing peers**

**WSSav = sum of indicator values for an outcome /number of indicators**

**% change = (Exit WSSav – Entry WSSav)/Entry WSSav**

Formulas for each reporting category are as follows:

**a) % of children who did not improve functioning**

In this category, MSDE is reporting children whose average WSS score for Exit is equal to or less than the average WSS score for Entry and who were not captured in categories “d” or “e”:

**NOT** captured by categories D or E **AND** Exit WSSav  $\leq$  Entry WSSav Exit

**b) % of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers**

This category includes children whose average WSS score for Exit is greater than the average score at Entry, and where the percent of change is less than 30%:

**NOT** captured by categories D or E **AND** Exit WSSav > Entry WSSav **AND** % change < 30%

**c) % of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it**

This category is reporting children whose average WSS score for Exit is greater than the average score for Entry, and the percent of change is equal to or greater than 30%:

**NOT** captured by categories D or E **AND** Exit WSSav > Entry WSSav **AND** % change < 30%

**d) % of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers**

This category includes children whose average WSS score for Exit is equal to or greater than 2.5, and whose average score for Entry is less than 2.5:

Exit WSSav  $\geq$  2.5 **AND** Entry WSSav < 2.5

**e) % of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers**

This category includes children whose average WSS score is equal to or greater than 2.5, and whose average score for Entry is equal to or greater than 2.5:

Exit WSSav  $\geq$  2.5 **AND** Entry WSSav  $\geq$  2.5

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Change in methodology: The MSDE made the informed decision to revise the State methodology for measuring child outcomes for preschool children served through IEPs, as a result of extensive stakeholder feedback generated through periodic leadership meetings with local Directors of Special Education, Local Preschool Special Education Coordinators, Local Infants and Toddlers Directors, as well as members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (Birth-5), local service providers and families, and following consultation with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Beginning July 1, 2015, the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process will be implemented for preschool children served through an IEP, and the revised ages for data collection will include 3 and 4 year-olds, and 5 year-olds-not in kindergarten.

For FFY 2013 and 2014, the existing methodology is based on the use of a single assessment instrument, the Work Sampling System (WSS). This system has provided data of limited programmatic value as well as being inconsistent with national data, specifically at Progress Level A. The COS is the methodology used for infants and toddlers served under an IFSP or Extended IFSP. The use of the COS for Part B 619, beginning in FFY 2015, as well as for Part C will further promote and strengthen Maryland's statewide birth-5 system of services. Additionally, this change coincides with the State's implementation of a

new Statewide early childhood assessment system that also previously used the WSS for the annual measure of school readiness for all entering kindergarten students, including students with disabilities.

The new assessment system known as the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System (EC-ECAS)/Ready for Kindergarten (R4K) includes a new Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) component and the Early Learning Assessment (ELA) formative component, the focus of which is on gathering functional and developmental/academic information on children, ages three to six years-of-age, in order to inform differentiated instructional planning and ongoing progress monitoring. Unlike the WSS, the COS process will allow for the use of multiple sources of data to inform child outcomes ratings, and as an integrated part of the IEP team process, will further support the participation of parents as active partners in decision-making for their child.

Initial implementation of the COS process will begin on July 1, 2015, with full implementation as of July 1, 2017. July 1, 2015-July 1, 2017 represents a transition period during which children with their initial IEPs will participate in the COS process, and Exit measures on children who had existing. Entry measures using the WSS will receive Exit measures also using the WSS. As of July 1, 2016, however, no new Entry measures using the WSS will be collected, only Exit measures for children with existing WSS Entry measures. The final Exit measures using the WSS will be collected by June 30, 2017. It is anticipated that new baseline data utilizing the COS methodology will be established with the 2015-2016 data collection year, with the potential for revised baseline data reflecting a larger population of children measured through the COS process during the 2016-2017 data collection year.

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the targets for A1, B1, B2, and C1, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A2, and C2, because the State's end targetS for A2 and C2 for FFY 2018 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 targetS for A2 and C2 to reflect improvement.



## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Progress data and actual target data are included in the "Historical Data and Targets" Section for this Indicator and in the "FFY 2013 Data" Section for this Indicator.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the targets for A1, B1, B2, and C1, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A2, and C2, because the State's end targetS for A2 and C2 for FFY 2018 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 targetS for A2 and C2 to reflect improvement.

**Indicator 8: Parent involvement****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? **Yes**Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? **Yes****Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Preschool</b>	2005	Target ≥		27.00%	29.00%	35.00%	37.00%	38.00%	36.00%	40.00%
		Data	32.00% 9.00%	45.00%	68.00%	69.00%	43.00%	49.00%	42.00%	47.00%
<b>School Age</b>	2005	Target ≥		32.00%	34.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	39.00%	38.00%
		Data	27.00% 0.00%	43.70% 58.00%	56.00%	57.00%	37.00%	40.00%	42.00% 49.00%	40.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**Explanation of Changes**

The prepopulated data did not match the data submitted to the OSEP and publically reported in the FFY 2005, 2006, and 2011 APRs.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Preschool Target ≥	47.00%	47.00%	48.00%	48.00%	49.00%	49.00%
School-age Target ≥	39.00%	39.00%	40.00%	40.00%	41.00%	41.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the

Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement For the third year in a row the number of parents completing the surveys have declined. The Parent Involvement Workgroup, that includes members of the SESAC are piloting additional ways to increase parent response rate; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE -
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement - For the third year in a row the number of parents completing the surveys have declined. The Parent Involvement Workgroup, that includes members of the SESAC are piloting additional ways to increase parent response rate.
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

## OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 8: Parent involvement****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	778	1,655	47.00%	47.00%	47.01%	Met Target	No Slippage
School-age	3,190	8,179	40.00%	39.00%	39.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.**

As in prior years, the 2013-14 survey consists of items obtained from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) item bank. Both surveys include 25 core questions, followed by several demographic questions and an open-ended comment section. The value of Indicator 8 is calculated through a Rasch analysis using Winsteps software and the anchors suggested by NCSEAM.

The Rasch analysis condenses all of a respondent's responses to the 25 core survey items into a single measure. This measure represents the extent to which a respondent agrees with the survey items overall; a person with a high number is expressing more agreement with items on the scale than an individual with a lower number.

After assigning this single number to each respondent, the analysis uses a cut score to determine whether or not each respondent believes that his/her child's school is facilitating parent involvement. With the help of an expert panel, NCSEAM determined that the appropriate cut score is 600. Therefore, if a respondent's Rasch measure is equal to or above 600, he/she is considered to believe that their school is facilitating parent involvement.

The value reported for Indicator 8 is the percentage of respondents that meet this criterion. The value of Indicator 8 is reported with a 95% confidence interval; one can be 95% sure that the true value of the indicator lies within this given confidence interval.

Overall, the number (102,702) and percentage (11.85%) of students with disabilities, ages three (3) through 21 years of age receiving special education, by race and ethnicity reported in the October 25, 2013 child count identified their race and ethnicity as 39,837 (38.8%) White (a 0.7 percentage point decrease from FFY 2012) , 43,233 (42.1%) Black/African American (a 0.1 percentage point decrease), and 12,806 (12.5%) Hispanic (a 0.7 percentage point increase). Respondents to the two surveys represented a total of 9,834 respondents. A total of 4,820 (49%) were identified as White, 2,618 (26%) as Black/African American, 926 (9%) as Hispanic, and 703 (7%) as Multiracial. There was a decrease in the number of Black/African American respondents to the survey over FFY 2012 response rate (28% in FFY 2012 vs. 26% in FFY 2013). The respondents were substantially representative of the population. The overall response rate was 9.57%, which represents 9,834 responses/102,702. **Please refer to Attachment F Respondents By Race/Ethnicity.**

**Was sampling used?** No

Was a collection tool used? ☒ Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? ☐ No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/15/2014	Number of districts in the State	25	

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided



Number of districts in the State



Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	25	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.



All races and ethnicities were included in the review

#### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation is defined as having students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i. e., American Indian or Alaskan native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic, or Two or More Races) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the local school system or in the State. Maryland identifies disproportionate representation using a weighted risk ratio calculated according to the instructions provided in the IDEA publication, “Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide.” A weighted risk ratio of 2.0 or greater is considered disproportionate. In addition to meeting the 2.0 or greater weighted risk ratio, the local school system must meet the criteria for the minimum “n” size. The MSDE utilizes a minimum “n” size of 30 students with disabilities in a racial or ethnic category for all local school systems.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

None required.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Historical Data and Targets

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/15/2014	Number of districts in the State	25	

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided



Number of districts in the State



Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
13	0	25	0%	0%	0%

Status  
Met Target

Slippage  
No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.



All races and ethnicities were included in the review

#### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation is defined as having students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i. e., American Indian or Alaskan native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic, or Two or More Races) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the local school system or in the State. Maryland identifies disproportionate representation using a weighted risk ratio calculated according to the instructions provided in the IDEA publication, “Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide.” A weighted risk ratio of 2.0 or greater is considered disproportionate. In addition to meeting the 2.0 or greater weighted risk ratio, the local school system must meet the criteria for the minimum “n” size. The MSDE utilizes a minimum “n” size of 30 students with disabilities in a racial or ethnic category for all local school systems.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

None required.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 11: Child Find****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

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

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

**Historical Data***Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	77.00%	83.00%	89.02%	92.00%	95.46%	97.71%	97.79%	97.37%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 11: Child Find

## FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

## FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
19,302	19,005	97.37%	100%	98.46%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	297
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

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

Local school systems and public agencies reported a total of **297 students** as having "**unacceptable reasons for delay**," which were broken down as follows:

- **75 students** - paperwork error;
- **15 students** - inconclusive testing results;
- **15 students** - child not available (not parent failure)/child refusal);
- **57 students** - staffing issues; and
- **135 students** - other reason(s).

In order to more closely analyze the root causes for delay, the Division collects data on the number of days beyond 60 days in which there were unacceptable reasons for delay (297). The range of days for all reasons are as follows:

- **177 (59.66%) - 1 day to 15 days**
- **92 (30.78%) - 16 to 45 days**
- **28 (9.56%) - beyond 45 days**

This information is used by the MSDE monitoring staff to assist public agencies in analyzing data and providing technical assistance. The MSDE data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported in FFY 2013.

## Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- ☒ The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- ☒ The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations?



Maryland regulations require adherence to the 60-day timeframe unless the student's parents and the IEP team extend the timeframe by mutual written agreement, consistent with COMAR 13A.05.01.04A(4).

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



**State monitoring**



**State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

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



**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 11: Child Find****Required Actions from FFY 2012***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

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

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

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

The data indicated that not all evaluations were completed within the 60 day timeline. In each LSS/PA where the data are 100%, the MSDE conducts a review of a random sample of student records to verify the accuracy of the data. In local school systems and public agencies where the data are less than 100%, the MSDE verifies correction of noncompliance or completion of the evaluation process in the records of the students where the noncompliance was first identified (Prong 1). This activity is completed as either a desk audit or an onsite review. An updated random sample of student records from a subsequent data set, are then reviewed to determine if those records are compliant (Prong 2). If the results yield 100%, correction of noncompliance is verified. Through this review process the MSDE verified that each LSS identified as noncompliant in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a State data system, and that each LSS has corrected each individual case on noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 11: Child Find****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	20	1	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected***Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In FFY 2012, Maryland identified 21 findings of noncompliance. Twenty were corrected within one year. One finding was subsequently corrected. To verify the correction of FFY 2012 noncompliance, the MSDE reviews each individual case of noncompliance and ensures that the evaluation was conducted although beyond the 60 day timeline. This activity is completed as either a desk audit or an onsite review. An updated random sample of student records, from a subsequent data set are then reviewed to determine if those records are compliant. Through this review process the MSDE verified that each LSS identified as noncompliant in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a State data system and that each LSS has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

The MSDE reviewed the records of the individual students for which evaluations were not completed within timelines to ensure they were completed. An updated random sample of student records, from a subsequent data set are then reviewed to determine if those records are compliant. Through this review process the MSDE verified that each individual case of identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the State's SSIS data system and that each LSS has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Historical Data***Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	83.40%	95.00%	95.42%	97.28%	99.73% <del>99.70%</del>	99.17%	99.89%	99.31%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

Prepopulated cell changed to reflect actual percentage for FFY 2009 as reported in the OSEP approved FFY 2009 APR.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided conflicting information regarding the number of findings identified in FFY 2012 and the number of those findings that were corrected. Under the section "Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table" the State reported that it identified 11 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012 and that it verified the correction of all of those findings. However, in the section entitled "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012," the State reported that it identified zero findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,866
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	317
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,505
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	36
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	1,505	1,513	99.31%	100%	99.47%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	8
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

Local school systems and public agencies reported a total of 8 out of 1,836, students, or 0.44%, whose eligibility determination or IEP development did not occur by the third birthday as a result of unacceptable reasons for delay included: "Inconclusive Testing Results" (1); "Inclement Weather" (4); and "Other unspecified reason" (3).

The range of days beyond the third birthday for eligibility determination or development and implementation of the IEP for all reasons cluster around the following range:

- 16 to 35 days – 8 or 0.19%

**Attached PDF table (optional)** No PDF table was attached

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

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Indicator 12 data was collected through the Special Services Information System (SSIS) data reporting system or an Excel data collection form. Five (5) local school systems who use a vendor-based IEP submit an Excel data collection form

quarterly during the FFY 2013 reporting period (July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014). Nineteen local school systems and two (2) public agencies report child level data for FFY 2013 reporting period (July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014) through the SSIS data system. The State verified the use of the new methodology by conducting a parallel data comparison between the Excel data collection forms and the SSIS reports for each quarter of the FFY 2013 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014).



**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided conflicting information regarding the number of findings identified in FFY 2012 and the number of those findings that were corrected. Under the section "Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table" the State reported that it identified 11 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012 and that it verified the correction of all of those findings. However, in the section entitled "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012," the State reported that it identified zero findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition****Required Actions from FFY 2012***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

Because Maryland reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, Maryland must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for Indicator 12. The transition from Part C to Part B for 11 children with disabilities did not occur within prescribed timelines. The 11 student specific findings of noncompliance have been corrected consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Staff members within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services verified that each Local School System (LSS) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LSS/PA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

When the MSDE issues a written finding of noncompliance to an LSS/PA, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required. The CAP is required to include actions and strategies designed by the LSS/PA to timely correct the area(s) of noncompliance. The first step in the corrective action plan is a review policies and procedures to ensure compliance with requirements. Then, during the duration of the corrective action and prior to its completion, the MSDE will require the LSS/PA to collect data and conduct a random review of records to determine if correction of noncompliance has been achieved. During the period of correction the State monitors the progress of the LSS/PA. MSDE consultants visit the LSS/PA to determine if technical assistance is required, if policies and procedures are being revised (if necessary), and participate in the review of records with the LSS/PA to determine progress.

The DSE/EIS uses a two prong approach to verify correction. First (Prong 1), in each local school system or public agency where findings of noncompliance are made, the DSE/EIS verifies that the records of the students where the noncompliance was first identified were corrected, unless the child is no longer within the local school system or public agency, or the parent has withdrawn consent. Then (Prong 2), using updated data from a specified period of time, a random selection of records are reviewed to determine if the specific regulatory requirement(s) is correctly implemented in those records. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, verification procedures must demonstrate the local school system or public agency is properly implementing the regulatory requirement(s) at 100% during Prong 1 and 2 activities to close the corrective action and to have achieved correction.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided conflicting information regarding the number of findings identified in FFY 2012 and the number of those findings that were corrected. Under the section "Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table" the State reported that it identified 11 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012 and that it verified the correction of all of those findings. However, in the section entitled "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012," the State reported that it identified zero findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In FFY 2012, Maryland identified 11 findings of noncompliance. The 11 findings were corrected within one year. To verify the correction of FFY 2012 noncompliance, the MSDE reviews each individual case of noncompliance and ensures that the evaluation was conducted although beyond the 60 day timeline. This activity is completed as either a desk audit or an onsite review. An updated random sample of student records, from a subsequent data set are then reviewed to determine if those records are compliant. Through this review process the MSDE verified that each LSS identified as noncompliant in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a State data system and that each LSS has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

The DSE/EIS uses a two prong approach to verify correction. First (Prong 1), in each local school system or public agency where findings of noncompliance are made, the DSE/EIS verifies that the records of the students where the noncompliance was first identified were corrected, unless the child is no longer within the local school system or public agency, or the parent has withdrawn consent. Then (Prong 2), using updated data from a specified a period of time, a random selection of records are reviewed to determine if the specific regulatory requirement(s) is correctly implemented in those records. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, verification procedures must demonstrate the local school system or public agency is properly implementing the regulatory requirement(s) at 100% during Prong 1 and 2 activities to close the corrective action and to have achieved correction.

When the MSDE issues a written finding of noncompliance to an LSS/PA, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required. The CAP is required to include actions and strategies designed by the LSS/PA to timely correct the area(s) of noncompliance. The first step in the corrective action plan is a review policies and procedures to ensure compliance with requirements. Then, during the duration of the corrective action and prior to its completion, the MSDE will require the LSS/PA to collect data and conduct a random review of records to determine if correction of noncompliance has been achieved. During the period of correction the State monitors the progress of the LSS/PA. The MSDE consultants visit the LSS/PA to determine if technical assistance is required, if policies and procedures are being revised (if necessary), and participate in the review of records with the LSS/PA to determine progress.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



The State provided conflicting information regarding the number of findings identified in FFY 2012 and the number of those findings that were corrected. Under the section "Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table" the State reported that it identified 11 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012 and that it verified the correction of all of those findings. However, in the section entitled "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012," the State reported that it identified zero findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Historical Data***Baseline Data: 2009*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		93.90%	95.20%		86.10%	95.27%	97.50%	98.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

Prepopulated cells did not include data previously provided in OSEP approved APR submissions.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition****FFY 2013 Data**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
19,316	19,324	98.70%	100%	99.96%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☒ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The local school systems and public agencies submit Indicator data on a quarterly and annual basis on an Excel spreadsheet to the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services. The MSDE implemented Quarterly Data Collection for all local school systems and public agencies as of November 1, 2009. For local school systems that utilize the Maryland Online IEP (MOIEP) System most of the required quarterly data uploads nightly to SSIS from the MOIEP. Those local school systems only have to report quarterly the Indicator data that is currently being collected on Excel spreadsheets: Indicators 11, 12, and/or 13. Local school systems that utilize vendor-based IEP systems report quarterly data via file submission and Excel spreadsheets. The quarterly data are uploaded to the Maryland Scorecard where local school systems and the DSE/EIS staff can track the progress of Indicator data. The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) Indicator 13 checklist was used as the framework in the development of the data reporting form.

☐ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition****Required Actions from FFY 2012**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

Because Maryland reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, Maryland must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for Indicator 13. In FFY 2012 there were a total of 165 findings of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance were corrected, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. All findings were corrected within one year.

Staff members within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services verified that each Local School System (LSS) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LSS/PA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

When the MSDE issues a written finding of noncompliance to a LSS/PA, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required. The CAP is required to include actions and strategies designed by the LSS/PA to timely correct the area(s) of noncompliance. The first step in the corrective action plan is always to review policies and procedures to ensure compliance with requirements. Then, during the duration of the corrective action and prior to its completion, the MSDE will require the LSS/PA to collect data and conduct a random review of records to determine if correction of noncompliance has been achieved. During the period of correction the State monitors the progress of the LSS/PA. MSDE consultants visit the LSS/PA to determine if technical assistance is required, if policies and procedures are being revised (if necessary), and participate in the review of records with the LSS/PA to determine progress.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
165	165	0	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected***Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

When the MSDE issues a written finding of noncompliance to a LSS/PA, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required. The CAP is required to include actions and strategies designed by the LSS/PA to timely correct the area(s) of noncompliance. The first step in the corrective action plan is always to review policies and procedures to ensure compliance with requirements. Then, during the duration of the corrective action and prior to its completion, the MSDE will require the LSS/PA to collect data and conduct a random review of records to determine if correction of noncompliance has been achieved. During the period of correction the State monitors the progress of the LSS/PA. MSDE consultants visit the LSS/PA to determine if technical assistance is required, if policies and procedures are being revised (if necessary), and participate in the review of records with the LSS/PA to determine progress.

The DSE/EIS uses a two prong approach to verify correction. First (Prong 1), in each local school system or public agency where findings of noncompliance are made, the DSE/EIS verifies that the records of the students where the noncompliance was first identified were corrected, unless the child is no longer within the local school system or public agency, or the parent has withdrawn consent. Then (Prong 2), using updated data from a specified a period of time, a random selection of records are reviewed to determine if the specific regulatory requirement(s) is correctly implemented in those records. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, verification procedures must demonstrate the local school system or public agency is properly implementing the regulatory requirement(s) at 100% during Prong 1 and 2 activities to close the corrective action and achieve compliance.

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

The DSE/EIS staff reviewed the student IEPs containing the 165 findings of noncompliance, and verified that all identified noncompliance were corrected and are compliant. To meet the requirements of Prong 2, an additional random selection of updated data from a specified period of time are reviewed to demonstrate the local school system or public agency is properly implementing the regulatory requirement(s) at 100% during Prong 1 and 2 activities in order to close the corrective action and achieve compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition***Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:**

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2013 <del>2009</del>	Target ≥						50.00%	50.00%	50.00% 0.00%
		Data					49.40%	29.36%	24.94%	23.10% 0.00%
B	2013 <del>2009</del>	Target ≥						73.00%	73.00%	73.00%
		Data					72.61%	50.17%	57.79%	56.73%
C	2013 <del>2009</del>	Target ≥						82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
		Data					81.42%	62.73%	85.99%	85.36%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**Explanation of Changes**

Prepopulated data revised to reflect FFY 2012 target and data for Indicator 14A. Maryland stakeholders set FFY 2013 data as the new baseline upon review of data and the methodology used. The use of a data exchange with the National Student Clearing House (NSCH) provides data on Maryland youth who have been enrolled in higher education anywhere within the United States for at least one term as beginning most accurate and reliable than the previous baseline.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%
Target B ≥	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%
Target C ≥	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	83.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and

- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE -
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes- Stakeholders discussed the overly ambitious targets previously established and considered revising targets. After discussion the stakeholders reset targets for FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 to be ambitious but more realistic targets for continued post-school outcomes.
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

## OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the targets for B, and C, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A because the State's end target for A for FFY 2018 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 target for A to reflect improvement.





**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,139
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,906
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,335
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	0
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	1,655

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,906	7,139	23.10%	35.00%	26.70%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,241	7,139	56.73%	68.00%	59.41%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	5,896	7,139	85.36%	82.00%	82.59%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Was sampling used?** No**☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

An administrative record exchange was used for data collection. The administrative record exchange provides data on the number of youth with disabilities no longer in secondary school and had an IEPs in effect at the time they left school (leavers) and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. The MSDE, DSE/EIS, Division of Career and College Readiness (DCCR), the Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability (DCAA), the University of Baltimore, the State Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulations (DLLR), the Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA), and the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) collaborated to gather the data for this report.

The data includes:

1. The number of student enrolled in higher education (1,906) is a data exchange with the National Student Clearing

House (NSCH) that provides data on youth who have been enrolled in higher education anywhere within the United States for at least one term.

2. The number of youth who competitively employed (2335) within one year of leaving high school is a data exchange with the State Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulations (DLLR).
3. The number of youth (0) enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school. In past years there was a multi-state Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the exchange of data relative to this youth population who may be enrolled in some other educational trade program. The MOU was not been renewed and Maryland is seeking another avenue for collecting data on this population of youth.
4. The number of youth (1655) who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. This data is from the Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) (370) and Division of Rehabilitation Services (DORS) (1285).

The response rate does not include youth who may be employed outside of the geographic region described above. It also does not include youth who are taking non-credit college courses or auditing college courses.

#### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the targets for B, and C, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A because the State's end target for A for FFY 2018 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 target for A to reflect improvement.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the targets for B, and C, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A because the State's end target for A for FFY 2018 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 target for A to reflect improvement.

**Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions****Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%
Data	64.00%	72.00%	65.00%	79.00%	70.20%	64.29%	70.48%	64.37%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**Explanation of Changes**

The cells with updated data reflect the range reported in the FFY 2006 through FFY 2012 OSEP approved APRs.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE -
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session- Stakeholders discussed retention or revision of current target range. Stakeholders believe the trend data supports maintaining the current target ranges as realistic.
- Indicator 16 Mediation.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	43	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	74	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
43	74	64.37%	64.00% - 75.00%	58.11%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of Slippage**

The MSDE attributes this slippage to the changing perceptions regarding Due Process in Maryland. For the last two years, Maryland's parent advocacy community has organized and lobbied for a change in the burden of proof requirements in the State. While this effort has not yet been successful during the last two legislative sessions in the Maryland General Assembly, the Department anticipates that legislation will be again be proposed in the 2015 legislative session.

As the result of this continuing focus on this aspect of Due Process, we believe that there may be a lack of understanding regarding the purpose and role of resolution sessions and what parents can expect from their local school systems in this process. This, in turn, leads to the possibility of higher expectations from the resolution process and the possibility of more difficult communications between the parties.

The MSDE is responding to this issue by continuing to focus upon parent support and parent education. We have focused our attention on high quality parent support through the use of MSDE Family Support Specialists, who respond to parent requests for assistance through telephone calls, email, and written correspondence. The Family Support Specialists serve as both educators and school system liaisons in order to ensure that parents have both the information and access to school system based resources for support.

The MSDE also continues to strengthen the training and support provided to its Statewide Family Support Providers. This includes the continuing discussions regarding how to facilitate meaningful communication between families and school system personnel as well as issue specific training. Recently, the MSDE provided a State-wide training for these partners which included a presentation of a Maryland Administrative Law Judge on the issues that arise when parents represent themselves in Due Process and how parents can be most effective when participating in this process. The MSDE believes that these efforts will positively impact the successful outcome of resolution sessions for families and the local school systems.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.



## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 16: Mediation****Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%
Data	73.00%	68.00%	73.00%	77.00%	74.30%	77.70%	76.65%	76.10%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**Explanation of Changes**

The prepopulated data were incorrect. Maryland has used a target range of 75% - 85% for mediation agreements from FFY 2006 through FFY 2012.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MSDE identified staff from across the five branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to form internal Division teams that corresponded to the Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across the cluster areas identified by the OSEP. The DSE/EIS obtained broad stakeholder input on revisions to the SPP and development of the APR, including information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Stakeholder input was sought and received regarding draft information and data relative to revising the SPP targets from the following stakeholder groups:

- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC);
- State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC);
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs; and
- Local Preschool Coordinators.

On October 16, 2014 at an open meeting of the SESAC, information and preliminary data was provided and discussed regarding the new SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2013 - 2018), the GRADS360 online reporting, the status of the SSIP work groups, OSEP'S FFY 2012 Part B State determination, and the DSE/EIS's local school system determinations process for March 2015.

On November 13, 2014, local directors of special education, local preschool coordinators, other strategic partners, such as the Parents' Place of Maryland, local assistant superintendent's of instruction received an overview of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that aligns the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B SPP indicator targets to four (4) Action Imperatives: Early Childhood, Professional Learning, Access, Equity and Progress , and Secondary Transition.

On November 18, 2014, at an open meeting of the SESAC, information was shared with the members of the SESAC regarding the alignment of the graduation data with the graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA. The graduation targets are derived from page 81 of the Maryland State Department of Education ESEA Flexibility Waiver, revised March 26, 2014. At that same meeting the SESAC also provided input on the following Indicators:

- Indicator 1 Graduation;
- Indicator 2 Dropout;
- Indicator 4A Suspension and Expulsion;
- Indicator 4B Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity and Disability;
- Indicator 5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
- Indicator 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity);
- Indicator 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity/Disability Category);
- Indicator 11 Initial Evaluation; and
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition.

On January 8, 2015, at an open public meeting of the SICC, broad stakeholder input was gathered relative to the following preschool indicators:

- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool Parent Involvement; and
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool.

On January 20, 2015, at an open meeting of the SESAC, the SESAC provided input relative to the following indicators:

- Indicator 3 Assessment;
- Indicator 6 Preschool LRE -
- Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes;
- Indicator 8 Preschool and School-Age Parent Involvement;
- Indicator 12 Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool;
- Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes;
- Indicator 15 Resolution Session; and
- Indicator 16 Mediation - Stakeholders discussed the current data and current target range. Stakeholders supported maintaining the current target range as realistic, based on trend data.

During a teleconference on January 28, 2015, with Maryland's Birth through 21 leaders, including local directors of Infants and Toddlers Programs, local preschool coordinators, and local directors of special education, the MSDE, Assistant State Superintendent for the DSE/EIS provided preliminary results for the IDEA Part C and Part B FFY 2013 APR.

## OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 16: Mediation****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	36	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	58	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	134	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
36	58	134	76.10%	75.00% - 85.00%	70.15%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of Slippage**

The MSDE is responding to this issue by continuing to focus upon parent support and parent education. We have focused our attention on high quality parent support through the use of MSDE Family Support Specialists, who respond to parent requests for assistance through telephone calls, email, and written correspondence. The Family Support Specialists serve as both educators and school system liaisons in order to ensure that parents have both the information and access to school system based resources for support. The MSDE also continues to strengthen the training and support provided to its Statewide Family Support Providers. This includes the continuing discussions regarding how to facilitate meaningful communication between families and school system personnel as well as issue specific training.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**
**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Baseline and Targets

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

#### Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	35.00%

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	35.00%	35.00%	38.00%	41.00%	44.00%

#### Description of Measure

The MSDE will support efforts to increase the number of children with disabilities scoring Proficient or above and target an average increase of three percentage points from the baseline average score percentage after the first two years of implementation. The chart below illustrates this rate of improvement to be ambitious and achievable. This target will raise the average percentage of children with disabilities scoring Proficient or above on Maryland's Statewide assessment of mathematics by nine (9) percentage points in five years. Baseline data for FFY 2013 (2013-2014 school year) is student performance as measured using scores on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA). Please note that beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, students will take the applicable Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment, based on Maryland's College and Career-Ready Standards aligned with the Common Core. This new assessment will require future standard setting and establishment of targets and at least two years of assessment data before the MSDE is able to predict trends. The baseline and targets established in the SSIP will require future revision.

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Overview of Stakeholder Involvement

In the Spring of 2014 MSDE leadership met with LSS special education directors and their teams from all 24 jurisdictions to review identification and placement patterns for students with disabilities and disproportionate gaps in student performance. These were followed by a series of meetings in the Fall of 2014 and Winter of 2015 with Maryland stakeholders, representing a broad range of organizations instrumental in advocating for children with disabilities, providing professional learning opportunities and technical assistance to families and educators, and delivering special education services. In addition to LSS Directors, representatives included other state organizations such as Maryland's Protection and Advocacy agency (Maryland Disability Law Center), and the Parent Training and Information agency (Parents' Place of Maryland) as well as other state agencies (e.g., MD Department of Disabilities), Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), and State educational organizations for general and specialized teachers. Special attention was given to ensure that representatives of Maryland family groups were involved. In addition to external stakeholders, key staff from various MSDE Divisions reviewed data summaries and engaged in infrastructure analysis. These 26 external stakeholders had areas of expertise that included district and school administration, parent partnerships, delivery of multi-tiered instruction and interventions, data analysis, policy planning, early intervention, early childhood services, behavior interventions, mathematics instruction, teacher preparation, and inclusive practices for students who need the most comprehensive supports. Stakeholders were involved in Phase I through face-to-face meetings, reviews of data, summaries of input in meetings, and email. See

Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2F for a list of the representatives engaged in all parts of the Phase I SSIP Development.

Over a series of meetings as described in Data Analysis, Sections 1(F), Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2(F), and SIMR, Section 3(D), internal and external stakeholders examined and asked questions of data and of the State infrastructure capacity to identify the SIMR. As noted earlier, an iterative approach was used with stakeholder meetings, even as in this document's elements and activities are described in a linear manner. This approach allowed stakeholders to examine data as well as learn about State-level initiatives and priorities, such as those in the Special Education Strategic Plan, in the same meeting to build shared knowledge. In subsequent meetings new elements would be added while reviewing data and information from previous meetings. For example, in the November meeting a description based on the previous data analyses was given in the area of SIMR focus (math) before conducting the infrastructure SWOT analysis. In order to leverage the systemic work being conducted in the LSSs participating in the SPDG and SWIFT Center partnership – both of which are also prioritizing math performance – stakeholders agreed that LSSs, participating in the SPDG and SWIFT Center partnership, and located across all 6 regions of the state, should be targeted.

#### Internal Stakeholders

Stakeholder	1/12/15	1/15/15
Chief of Staff	X	X
Special Assistant to the State Superintendent (STEM)	X	X
Executive Director, Governmental Relations	X	X
Director, Departmental Coordination & National Legislative Liaison	X	X
Race to the Top Coordinator & Teacher/Principal Evaluations	X	X
Chief Operating Officer	X	X
Division of Business Services	X	X
Office of Human Resources	X	X
Office of Information Technology	X	X
Division of Rehabilitation Services	X	X
Office of School Effectiveness	X	X
Division of Academic Policy and Innovation	X	X
Division of Educator Effectiveness	X	X
Division of Student, Family, and School Support	X	X
Director, Program Improvement and Family Support Branch (Title I)	X	X
Office of Teaching and Learning	X	X
Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X

Division of Early Childhood Development	X	X
Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability	X	X
Division of Career and College Readiness	X	X
Division of Library Development and Services	X	X
Branch Chief, Policy & Accountability, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Educational Program Specialist, Math, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Educational Program Specialist, SPDG, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Research Consultant, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Consultant	X	X

**Stakeholder Meeting #7 (1/12/2015)** The Assistant State Superintendent, DSE/EIS provided an overview of the SSIP process to the State Superintendent's Executive Leadership Team. She enlisted their engagement and support in the SSIP process of infrastructure analysis to address the SIMR and to develop coordinated and collaborative strategies for improvement of results for children and youth with disabilities in Maryland. Specifically, the Assistant State Superintendent, DSE/EIS asked for a representative from each of the Leadership Team areas to meet as an internal stakeholder group and that the Executive Leadership Team would continue to engage in dialogue throughout the phases of the SSIP.

#### External Stakeholders

Stakeholders	1/15//15
Parents	X
Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)	X
Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECAC)	X
Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD)	X
Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)	X
Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)	X
Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)	X



Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	X
Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)	X
Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	X
Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)	X
Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)	X
Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)	X
Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X
State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)	X
Ready At Five Partnership	X
Maryland State Family Child Care Association (MSFCCA)	X
Maryland Association of Teacher Educators (MATE)	X
Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family	X
University of Maryland – Department of Education Policy Studies	X
Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)	X
Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE)	X
Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health	X
Maryland Department of Disabilities (MDOD)	X
Maryland Department of Human Resources	X
Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X
Local Directors of Special Education	X
Local Preschool Coordinators	X
Schoolwide integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center	X

**Stakeholder Meeting #8 (1/15/2015)** – The stakeholders met in January to review the data and infrastructure analysis, finalize discussion of the SIMR, identify and review root causes, establish reasonable targets, generate broad areas of improvement based upon the previous meeting activity of “what’s working” and “what is not working” and to review and react to a draft Theory of Action. Please see also Stakeholder Meetings #6, #7, and #9 in Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2(F).

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

### Plan

#### Data Analysis

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

#### Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

### Overview

#### A. Description of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR)

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) in consultation with internal and external stakeholders identified the SIMR as increasing the mathematics proficiency of students with disabilities in grades (3) – (5) in six (6) Local School Systems (LSSs). The MSDE SIMR is aligned with Indicator 3C: proficiency of students with disabilities on the English/language arts and math Statewide assessments in grades 3 – 8 and high school. Specifically the Maryland SIMR is to increase proficiency of students with disabilities on the mathematics Statewide assessments in grades three (3) – five (5).

#### B. Baseline and Targets

FFY	Average Percentage of Students with Disabilities At or Above Proficient at Grades 3, 4, and 5 in the Six (6) Selected LSSs
2013 (Baseline)	35%
2014	35%
2015	35%
2016	38%
2017	41%
2018	44%

#### C. Description of State Program

The State of Maryland has 24 LSSs from 23 counties and Baltimore City. The MSDE generally divides its LSSs into six regions. The **Baltimore Metropolitan Region** has six (6) LSSs: Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Carroll County, Harford County, and Howard County. It also has the SEED School of Maryland, a publicly-funded, residential boarding school that is identified as an LSS for accountability under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The Baltimore Metropolitan Region is the largest of the six (6) State regions. The **National Capital Region** consists of Montgomery County and Prince George's County and is the second-largest region in the State. The **Western Maryland Region** has four (4) LSSs: Allegany County, Frederick County, Garrett County, and Washington County. The **Upper Shore Region** has five (5) LSSs and includes Caroline County, Cecil County, Kent County, Queen Anne's County, and Talbot County. The **Lower Shore Region** has four (4) LSSs and includes Dorchester County, Somerset County, Wicomico County, and Worcester County. Finally, the **Southern Maryland Region** is home to three (3) LSSs – Calvert County, Charles County, and St. Mary's County.

As of Fall 2013, those 24 LSSs served 866,169 PreK–12 students (see <http://www.mdreportcard.org>). Of this student population, 102,882 (11.9%) were children and youth with disabilities, ages three (3) through 21, receiving special education and related services in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and State law. Of the 102,882 children and youth with disabilities, 90,652 (88%) were school age children and youth, ages six (6) through 21 years old.

## D. Process Used for Developing Phase I of the SSIP

The data and infrastructure analysis began internally with a review of a broad base of information related to student outcomes from reports and data requests. Next, stakeholders reviewed the data and participated in an iterative process over time with facilitated brainstorming activities to generate recommendations. Identification of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) focused on the development of three components – what result area, where or which subpopulation group, and which LSSs would be involved. With the proposed SIMR, internal and external stakeholders identified root causes, coherent strategies, and developed a Theory of Action. While most of the face-to-face Phase I activities with stakeholders were completed by January 2015, they continued to be involved through email communications and met for a final Phase I review of activities and a draft of the SSIP on March 17, 2015.

## E. Overview of Stakeholder Involvement

In the Spring of 2014 MSDE leadership met with LSS special education directors and their teams from all 24 jurisdictions to review identification and placement patterns for students with disabilities and disproportionate gaps in student performance. These were followed by a series of meetings in the Fall of 2014 and Winter of 2015 with Maryland stakeholders, representing a broad range of organizations instrumental in advocating for children with disabilities, providing professional learning opportunities and technical assistance to families and educators, and delivering special education services. In addition to LSS Directors, representatives included other state organizations such as Maryland's Protection and Advocacy agency (Maryland Disability Law Center), and the Parent Training and Information agency (Parents' Place of Maryland) as well as other state agencies (e.g., MD Department of Disabilities), Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), and State educational organizations for general and specialized teachers. Special attention was given to ensure that representatives of Maryland family groups were involved. In addition to external stakeholders, key staff from various MSDE Divisions reviewed data summaries and engaged in infrastructure analysis. These 26 external stakeholders had areas of expertise that included district and school administration, parent partnerships, delivery of multi-tiered instruction and interventions, data analysis, policy planning, early intervention, early childhood services, behavior interventions, mathematics instruction, teacher preparation, and inclusive practices for students who need the most comprehensive supports. Stakeholders were involved in Phase I through face-to-face meetings, reviews of data, summaries of input in meetings, and email. See Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2F for a list of the representatives engaged in all parts of the Phase I SSIP Development.

## 1. Data Analysis

### A. How Key Data were Identified and Analyzed (1(a))

In order to conduct a comprehensive review of quantitative and qualitative data, MSDE considered student performance data (disaggregated by jurisdiction, placement, race, disability category, and students receiving Free and Reduced Meals (FARMs) as well as other factors such as attendance, suspension, graduation, dropout rates, and post-school outcomes. Qualitative data included information gathered from the State Professional Development Grant (SPDG) and the priorities emerging through the state partnership with the Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center. Other qualitative data included the input from stakeholders based on their experience as parents, advocates, professional developers, or service providers. These "real world" experiences lent a story to the numbers, and led groups to provide direction to the State in next data analysis steps and allowed the State to create consensus around the SIMR.

### ***Quantitative Data Analysis – Data Sources.***

Data were examined for the 2013-2014 school year, and where relevant, longitudinal data over time were examined. Sources of data included the following:

- [Maryland's Public Website for State Performance Plan Results](#) - The Maryland Public Website for State Performance Plan Results is a web-based application that serves as the public reporting site for the IDEA Part C and Part B SPP/APR data. Individuals may examine data for each SPP indicator over time by State aggregate as well as disaggregated by the State's 24 LSSs.
- [Maryland Report Card](#) - The Maryland Report Card is the State's website that provides detailed information relative to the performance of the State, the LSSs, and individuals schools. The Maryland Report Card also highlights information on School Progress, Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), demographics, enrollment, and attendance.
- [Maryland 2013-2014 Student Publications](#) - There are several publications on this website that provide data about students in Maryland school systems. Documents used in the data analyses included:
  - [Maryland Public School Enrollment](#) - The MSDE annually publishes enrollment data of all students. These data are also disaggregated by grade, gender, and race for elementary and secondary enrollment.
  - [Maryland Special Education/Early Intervention Services Census Data](#) - The document includes information collected annually on children with disabilities who reside in the State. To collect these data, Maryland uses the Special Services Information System (SSIS) database to compile information. The MSDE uses the SSIS database as a source of information to meet planning, monitoring, and accounting responsibilities; a recording and

reporting tool for decisions made by LSSs; and as an instrument for federal reporting.

- [Maryland Public School Suspension and Expulsions](#) - The MSDE annually publishes several documents related to the number of incidents of in-school and out-of school suspensions of students, including students with disabilities. Data from the *Maryland Public School Suspensions by School and Major Offense Category In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions* were the primary sources used in the data analyses. The data are disaggregated by gender and race.
- **Internal Data Reports**
  - Special Education Child Count from the DSE/EIS;
  - Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS) from the Office of School Effectiveness, School & Community Nutrition Programs Branch; and
  - English Learners from the Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability, Office of Instructional and Teacher Effectiveness, English Language Learners Program.

### ***Qualitative Data Analysis – Data Sources.***

As quantitative data were gathered, other data sources provided qualitative input. These included:

**The DSE/EIS Complaint Database** - The number and type of state complaints are monitored and tracked in the DSE/EIS Compliant Database. These data are compiled and used by the DSE/EIS to identify areas of needed assistance and support and to ensure identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification, consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02.

**SPDG Reports** - There are three (3) LSSs participating in Maryland's State Personnel Development Grant, each with two schools. The project focuses on addressing the knowledge and skill development needs of general and specialized educators working with students whose disabilities are mild or moderate. Quantitative and qualitative data on LSS, school and classroom use of implementation science strategies were reviewed in relationship to student performance on formative assessments of mathematics.

**SWIFT School Data Snapshots** - There are four (4) LSSs each with four (4) schools receiving technical assistance from MSDE and SWIFT Center staff. They use an implementation science approach to assess school practices and review student data to select priorities for improvement. School teams generate Data Snapshots that include data from the SWIFT-FIT, a research based tool administered by trained assessors, and the SWIFT-FIA, a progress-monitoring tool, both measuring implementation of the SWIFT Core Features. It also includes data on the capacity of the school to install new practices through a "Drivers" assessment, as well as evidence of behavioral and academic student outcomes.

**Stakeholder Focus Groups** - Several Stakeholder groups were convened in Phase I to review data, request additional information, and make recommendations to the MSDE. These meetings also provided opportunities to identify barriers and facilitators of improvement in student performance, as well as strategies and issues for further discussion. This discussion contributed to the root cause analysis to inform the development of coherent and evidence-based strategies to address the areas of focus. Meetings occurred in the Spring and Fall of 2014 and the Winter of 2015.

**Literature Review** - As the SIMR was identified, the MSDE core development team embarked on a literature review of evidence-based practices related to the emerging SIMR as well as best practices discussed in the field.

### ***Questions Guiding the Analysis***

The MSDE, DSE/EIS and stakeholders examined trend and disaggregated data to identify problem areas, identify a measurable result, and the population who would be affected. Some sample questions that guided these examinations and discussions included:

- § *To what extent are students with disabilities in Maryland performing proficiently or advanced on the Maryland State Assessment, and where are the greatest gaps when compared with nondisabled peers?*
- § *Is there disproportionate suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities, and is there a discrepancy by race/ethnicity?*
- § *Is poverty (measured by FARMS) influencing identification or placement of students with disabilities?*
- § *To what extent do students with disabilities have access to general education instruction alongside their non-disabled peers, and is there any relationship between placement, performance, and any other factor?*

- § Are students with disabilities graduating or dropping out at rates comparable to their non-disabled peers?
- § Is there a relationship between attendance/absences (more than 20 days) and disability category, grade, or race?
- § Is there disproportionate performance by gender or race across LSSs and grades in reading and math performance?
- § Is there disproportionate identification of students with disabilities or placement of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity?
- § Does the absence of 20 or more days affect the academic proficiency for students with disabilities? And if so, how?
- § What policies or practices are in place that may be affecting academic performance, suspension, placement, attendance, and disproportionality by race?

## B. Trend Analysis and Disaggregation of Data (1(b))

### Broad Data Analysis Results

The information below represents the broad-based analysis that preceded and contributed to the identification of the SIMR. It includes both quantitative and qualitative information in the context of current priorities and initiatives in place in Maryland.

**Enrollment:** The total enrollment of students has remained relatively stable over the last 10 years, with the percentage of students with disabilities (ages 3 – 21) slightly declining from 13% of the total school age population in 2003 to 11.9% of the student population in 2013-2014 school year.

**Gender:** While male students are 51% to 49% females in the general student population; 68% of the students with disabilities are male compared to 32% of females.

**Attendance/Absences:** Overall, student attendance has remained high over time for students with and without disabilities, at approximately 93-94% for students receiving special education services in elementary and middle school and 94-96% for same age students in the general population. In high school, overall attendance slightly declined to 88 – 89% over the last 10 years for students with disabilities and 92-93% for regular education students. Variation is seen however when looking at chronic absenteeism, defined in Maryland as absent 20 or more days. While the rate of absences increases as students move into middle and high school, special education students have a higher rate of chronic absences as seen in the table below.

School Year	Percent of students absent $\geq$ 20 days					
	Elementary		Middle		High	
	Regular Education	Special Education	Regular Education	Special Education	Regular Education	Special Education
2014	5.5%	11.6%	7.6%	16.8%	15.6%	28.0%

**Graduation:** More Maryland students are receiving their high school diplomas at higher rates than ever before. As the graduation rate has hit record levels, the dropout rate has declined. The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate reached 86.39% in 2014 -- more than 4 percentage points better than the 81.97% rate registered in 2010. The graduation rate jumped more than 1 percentage point over 2013, from 84.97%. Among students receiving special services, the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate rose in two of three categories. The graduation rate for special education students, for example, improved more than 3 percentage points in one year, from 60.03% to 63.45%.

**Dropout Rate:** The overall dropout rates have fallen to new lows and are decreasing for both special education and regular education students. However students with disabilities drop out of school at a rate almost twice as high as non-disabled students. The 4-year adjusted cohort of students sorted by grade level similarly shows that classes of students decrease their dropout rate over time, but overall students with disabilities are dropping out at approximately twice the rate (15.82%) when compared to the general population (7.58%).

**Disability Identification:** The total number of school age students with disabilities, age 6 – 21, is 90,652, or 10.47% of the total student population. Identification rates vary from 7.38% in rural Calvert County to 15% in Baltimore City, with wide variability among the 24 jurisdictions. These variances do not appear to be influenced by size or location within the state. The



largest disability population is **Specific Learning Disabilities** (34.6%) followed by students who have **Other Health Impairments** (18.44% who may be students with Attention Deficit Disorder, or other disabilities that affect learning) and **Speech/Language Impairments** (15.21%) and then students with **Autism** (10.25%) and **Emotional Disabilities** (7.31%). The remaining 15% of the population of special education are students who have **Intellectual Disabilities** (5.76%), **Multiple Disabilities** (4.59%), with less than 1% each for students who are Deaf or have Hearing Impairments, Vision Impairments, Orthopedic Impairments, Deaf-Blindness, Traumatic Brain Injury, and Developmental Delay.

**Poverty:** There is not a clear pattern of association between poverty and disability identification. Districts with high rates of poverty as measured by students who receive Free and Reduced Meals (FARMs), do not necessarily have high rates of students with disabilities identified and, conversely, students with low poverty rates may have higher proportions of students with disabilities compared to others and the state average. However, within the group of students who receive FARMs, there is a slightly higher than average proportion of students who have disabilities, across all jurisdictions.

**Race/Ethnicity:** The majority of students in Maryland identify as White (41%) or African American/Black (35%). Hispanic students make up almost an additional 14% of the student population. African American students are identified as having a disability at a rate higher than their presence in the student population (43% versus 35%); White students are slightly underrepresented in receiving special education services (38.5% versus 41%). The fewest non-white students are in rural Allegany and Garrett Counties in Western Maryland; the largest non-white populations are in Baltimore City and Prince George's County, a Washington DC suburb.

Race	All Students	Students w/Disabilities, 6-21
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.3%	0.3%
Asian	6.1%	2.7%
African American/Black	34.9%	43.2%
White	40.9%	38.5%
Hispanic	13.6%	12.1%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.1%
Two or More Races	4.1%	3.2%

**Placement:** Students with disabilities are being placed in general education classes at a higher and higher rate over time, with more time spent learning the general education curriculum alongside their nondisabled peers. Ten years ago, 55.38% of students with disabilities participated in general education settings for 80% or more of the day; this has increased to 69%. The variation across jurisdictions, however, is large, ranging from 54% in the second largest school system to 92% in one of the smallest school systems. The 5 largest school systems with 75,000 to 150,000 students rank in the bottom third for including students with disabilities in general education instruction. These districts also have a number of special schools (public and nonpublic) as well as private schools for nondisabled students. The LSSs that have historically competed for and won discretionary funds to promote inclusive practices hold the highest rates for placing students in general education and maintain that rate over time.

**Performance in Math/Reading:** The trend in progress in Reading and Math achievement for students with disabilities has mirrored that of their nondisabled peers in increasing over time, but at a lower rate. The exception is in the last two years: as teachers prepared to teach to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards, students across the state performed lower on the state assessment that was not aligned with these standards in both areas across most grades. The gap in proficiency between special education and general education students grows as student's age; in Math, 39.9% of students with disabilities score proficient or advanced in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade as compared to their nondisabled peers (78.1%). This 38 percentage point gap increases to a difference of 46.6 points in 8<sup>th</sup> grade. While nondisabled students maintain a relatively constant level of proficiency as a group, the percent of students with disabilities achieving proficient/advanced scores decreases after grade five.

#### Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced and GAP in MATH (2013-2014)

In Reading, the overall rating of proficient and advanced performance of students with disabilities is higher across all grades than in math. The gap in proficiency and advanced performance is also smaller until 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced and GAP in READING (2013-2014)						
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
<b>Regular Ed Students</b>	80.0	89.8	92.3	87.9	84.1	82.1
<b>Special Ed Students</b>	52.5	58.8	63.3	46.0	37.9	33.2
<b>GAP</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>48.9</b>

**Behavior Outcomes:** Students with disabilities make up 25% of the suspensions and expulsions in Maryland school systems but only 10.5% of the total population. The offenses resulting in behavioral consequences are proportionate to regular education students for offense category; they are slightly lower for dangerous substances, and slightly higher for threats/attacks. Suspensions of students with disabilities are showing a decreasing trend over time. The largest numbers of students are from the largest jurisdictions (Prince George's: 1,803; Baltimore City: 1,464; and Baltimore County: 1,285). It is interesting to note that the largest school system, Montgomery County only had 674 suspensions.

**Practices and Priorities in SWIFT Partner Schools:** Twelve of the 16 partner schools have completed data snapshots, and 3 of the LSSs have developed district data snapshots that identify common priorities and others that can be leveraged through the SWIFT work. All schools are identifying high quality Tier 1 instruction that promotes student engagement as a critical priority to be strengthened in order to successfully include ALL students. Most of them have also identified advance tier behavior intervention, math instruction/intervention, and parent engagement as areas for growth.

### ***Statewide Strengths in Educating Students with Disabilities***

Students with disabilities in Maryland are being included in general education at greater rates each year. Student performance for students with and without disabilities has shown an increasing trend over time, except for the last years as schools transition to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. Students with disabilities are entering post-secondary programs at higher rates than in the past, and students with disabilities are being suspended at lower rates. New discipline regulations promise to reduce suspensions even farther.

### ***State Concerns and Opportunities for Improving Results for Students with Disabilities***

While students with disabilities are being included at higher rates each year, there remains a large discrepancy across jurisdictions. The largest school systems in the state (Baltimore City, Prince George's County, Baltimore County, Anne Arundel County, and Montgomery County) remain the most segregated systems, along with the smaller and more rural Charles and Calvert counties. Two of these LSSs (Baltimore City and Prince George's County) have a largely African American population, which greatly skews the state data for disproportionate separate placements.

While there is a gap across grades in Reading and Math performance for students with disabilities, the lower performance and larger achievement gap across all grades for math and increases dramatically in middle school. It is notable that the SPDG work focuses on improving math instruction and student proficiency. In addition, emerging priorities for improvement in the SWIFT Center partner schools and districts include math instruction and intervention.

### ***Disaggregation of Data***

An initial review of the data led to the selection of key areas to disaggregate the data for certain areas by grade, race/ethnicity, and disability categories. Based on the broad analysis and considering the current initiatives that could be leveraged after much discussion and data examinations (see Section 1(F)), stakeholders recommended a focus on math achievement and gap reduction. Stakeholders recommended a focus on math performance in elementary years as the initial target, and discussed the impact of improvement in early skills as developing the foundation for improved performance in the middle school years. Specific disaggregated data included the following sources:

- ii *State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Compliance and Results Data*, disaggregated over time

and by LSS;

- ii *Maryland School Assessment* Data for Reading and Mathematics disaggregated over time, by grade, by race, and by jurisdiction;
- ii *Maryland School Assessment* Data for Reading and Mathematics disaggregated over time, by grade, by children with disabilities, and by nondisabled;
- ii *Disability Identification Data*, disaggregated by race, poverty (FARMS), and LSS;
- ii *Graduation Data* of youth with disabilities by disability, gender and race;
- ii *Attendance Data*, disaggregated by disability, race, gender, grade and LSS;
- ii *Suspension Data*, disaggregated over time, by race, and by jurisdiction; and
- ii *Placement Data*, disaggregated by race, disability, poverty, and LSS.

### Data Results

Data were disaggregated by various factors to look at math performance in grades 3, 4, and 5, to determine trends or patterns of influence. Further data disaggregation will be conducted within targeted jurisdictions related to the SIMR in Phase II.

**Placement:** Of students in grades 3, 4 and 5, more students score proficient and advanced who are included in general education instruction for 80% or more of the day.

MATH	Students with disabilities	
	general education ≥80% of the school day	general education 40 to 79% of the school day
Basic	42.8%	
Proficient	57.0%	
Advanced	0.2%	
TOTAL	100.0%	

Students who are least likely to participate in general education settings are students with multiple disabilities and students with intellectual disabilities.

**Attendance:** Students who are absent for 20 or more days have consistently lower math achievement in elementary school than students who are absent less than 20 days.

	Math Performance and Absences	
	Less Than 20 Days	20 or More Days
	Percent	Percent
Gr 3 Proficient	49.63%	34.00%
Gr 4 Proficient	60.67%	44.92%
Gr 5 Proficient	45.26%	31.68%

**Poverty:** Students who receive Free or Reduced Meals (FARMS) do not appear to have a greater risk for lower achievement rates. In fact, the percent of students who receive special education services are performing slightly lower than students who receive special education services as well as FARMS.



MATH	FARMS+Spec.Ed.	All Spec Ed	All Students
Basic	55.8%	60.6%	19.7%
Proficient	43.7%	33.7%	54.3%
Advanced	0.6%	5.6%	26.0%

**Disability:** Students with Specific Learning Disabilities and Other Health Impairments are among the most frequently identified yet are among the lowest in scoring proficient or advanced in Math in 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grades in Maryland. Students with intellectual disabilities consistently demonstrate the lowest proficiency across all three grades.

MATH:	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Hearing Impaired	21.9%	78.1%	0.0%
Visual Impairment	26.8%	73.2%	0.0%
Speech or Language Impairment	31.3%	68.6%	0.1%
Autism	45.3%	54.2%	0.5%
Traumatic Brain Injury	42.3%	53.8%	3.8%
Orthopedic Impairment	46.3%	53.7%	0.0%
Emotional Disability	47.2%	50.3%	2.5%
Specific Learning Disability	50.3%	49.3%	0.4%
Deaf	48.1%	48.1%	3.7%
Other Health Impaired	54.0%	45.3%	0.7%
Multiple Disabilities	56.1%	43.4%	0.5%
Intellectual Disability	88.1%	10.2%	1.7%

**Race/Ethnicity:** Student proficiency in math in elementary school is quite variable across different racial/ethnic groups. Highest proficiency rates are noted for students with disabilities who are Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Asian, and White. African American and Native American students and Hispanic students demonstrate lower math proficiency.

#### 2013-2014 Special Education Students Proficient in Math

Race/Ethnicity	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Asian	62.4%	70.5%	70.0%
White	61.9%	72.1%	51.0%
Two or More Race	50.9%	67.2%	54.8%
Hispanic	37.0%	56.8%	35.2%
Black or African American	36.6%	46.1%	29.4%

American Indian or Alaska Native	33.3%	62.5%	55.6%
----------------------------------	-------	-------	-------

**Priorities, Variability, and Concerns in LSSs:** Looking at achievement data or gap data alone is not sufficient to identify needs within local jurisdictions. For example while Worcester County has the highest level of general and special education math performance and among the lowest gaps in math proficiency in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades their ranking slips in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. Washington County ranks 13 out of 24 jurisdictions in math proficiency for general education 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students but has the biggest gap between special and general education performance. The jurisdictions that have the lowest performance and biggest gaps across elementary grades are Baltimore City, and Prince George's, Dorchester, Charles, Caroline, Kent, Talbot, and Cecil counties. Most of these counties are in the eastern shore or southern region of Maryland.

**Future data analyses:** In looking at data on students with disabilities across the State, patterns emerged which bear further scrutiny as implementation strategies are designed in Phase II. For example, students who are African American are over-identified as having an intellectual or emotional disability as compared to the student population or the disability population, and are under-identified as having autism compared to other races. A higher proportion of students with intellectual disabilities live in poverty across all races. Students who are African American are included in general education placements less than students of other races/ethnicities, and are placed in special education classrooms for most of the school day at rates far greater than their proportion of the total population or their presence in the disability population. These need to be further examined in relation to the SIMR as well as the design of coherent strategies to address the SIMR.

### ***Relationship of Data to SIMR Selection***

The analysis of data was developed and presented to stakeholders in multiple meetings. As can be noted in the Data Analysis, Stakeholder Participation, Section 1F below, stakeholders identified a number of initial areas on which to focus. Post-secondary outcomes are improving, and Maryland has had improved graduation rates and decreasing dropout rates. Literacy instruction has been a focus of MSDE guidance and there are more literacy tools and resources available to schools than math. This led the MSDE and stakeholders to focus on math performance of elementary school students with disabilities with the expectation that improved performance in elementary school would pave the path to improved performance in middle schools and beyond. Stakeholders recommended targeting grades 3 through 5.

## **C. Data Quality (1(c))**

The State has adopted a data-informed decision-making approach to programmatic improvement and places great importance on the ability of the LSSs to provide timely and accurate data. The DSE/EIS collaborates with the Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability (DCAA) in accessing, verifying, and validating data.

### ***Data Strengths***

Maryland's use of a Unique Student Identifier (USID) enables the MSDE to disaggregate data based on demographics, attendance, disciplinary removals, achievement, gender, race/ethnicity, children with disabilities, etc. The MSDE, DSE/EIS also has a strong history of accurate data based upon its Special Services Information System (SSIS) that is analyzed against the MSDE, DCAA data. This is also demonstrated by the high levels of data accuracy and timeliness as noted in the MSDE Letters of Determination by the OSEP.

### ***Data Security***

The Maryland Online Individualized Education Program (MOIEP) was designed to collect data for Section 618 and State Performance Plan data reporting as the result of IEP team decisions. As a data tool, the LSSs using the MOIEP, transmit data nightly to Maryland's SSIS. The SSIS resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk and replicated off-site. The Division of Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability maintains the Education Data Warehouse and is responsible for the collection of data from LSSs and other entities; and ensures the validation, definition, and maintenance of multi-year data in accordance with Department and Division policies and procedures for data quality and accessibility.

### ***Strategies to Foster Timely and Accurate Data***

The MSDE, DSE/EIS has in place a number of policies and mechanisms intended to foster and ensure that data collected and submitted to various databases are both timely and accurate. These include the following:

**Maryland Online Individualized Education Program (MOIEP) Database Structure.** The MOIEP database was built with a mechanism to detect data entry errors in order to improve the accuracy of data entry. For example, when inaccurate dates are

entered into the system, a message appears during data entry to indicate that there is a problem with the data. The Database also has an audit feature that ensures that all required information is entered into the system before an IEP can be made "closed."

**SSIS Data.** The Special Services Information System (SSIS) functions as a centralized data submission system for the IDEA Part B Section 618 data. Section 618 data are submitted via a secure server file transfer from LSSs that are to monitor and verify their data collection systems at the local level. Most public agency special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students.

**Local Determinations.** In order to emphasize the importance of timely submission of high quality data, the State has incorporated this requirement into its local determination criteria. The LSSs are required to submit all data, including programmatic and fiscal reports, in a timely and accurate manner.

**Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) Record Reviews.** As part of the State's birth through 21 MCIR process, monitoring staff from the DSE/EIS examine student records for the presence of documentation that supports reasons for missing timelines. The State's goal is to ensure that documentation in each student record is consistent with data entry and meets the regulatory requirements.

**Improvement Plans/Corrective Action Plans.** The DSE/EIS requires the LSSs submit data to the SSIS Database in a timely and accurate manner and assigns Improvement Plans and/or Corrective Action Plans when local programs fail to do so.

**Local Application for Federal Funds Assurances.** The DSE/EIS includes language in the Local Application for Federal Funds (LAFF) that LSSs will provide data for all children with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the manner and timeframe specified.

**Professional Learning and Technical Assistance.** The DSE/EIS, in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University (JHU), Center for Technology in Education (CTE) conduct hands-on Statewide professional learning opportunities for LSSs when there are major changes to the Maryland Online IEP. The DSE/EIS conducts regional meetings of LSS data managers twice a year to review amendments to the SSIS database, manual, and/or reporting timelines to help ensure competence with data entry and database report capabilities.

### **Data Quality Concerns**

There were no concerns relative to data quality activities. The DSE/EIS continually collaborates with the Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability in accessing, verifying, and validating data. Also, as discussed earlier, the MOIEP is built with a mechanism to detect data entry errors in order to improve the accuracy of data entry.

### **Data Use**

The MSDE believes that the data used in the analysis is of high quality, accurate, and easily used to inform decision-making. At this time the available baseline data is from the Maryland State Assessment (MSA) of student performance. A limitation on the use of these data is connected the State adoption of a new assessment aligned with the Common Core beginning in the 2014-2015 school year. Students will take the applicable Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment, based on Maryland's College and Career-Ready Standards aligned with the Common Core. This new assessment requires future standard setting and establishment of targets and at least two years of assessment data before the MSDE is able to predict trends. The baseline and targets established in the SSIP will require future revision.

## **D. Compliance Data Considerations (1(d))**

During the Data Analysis process, the MSDE, DSE/EIS and stakeholders considered all SPP/APR data, including compliance data from the Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR). The aggregate State compliance indicator data were substantially compliant at greater than 95%. The LSSs continue to correct noncompliance within one year of notification. One area for continued examination is the significant discrepancy in the disciplinary removals of children and youth with disabilities by race/ethnicity as compared to nondisabled peers in four (4) LSSs. Although noncompliance has not been identified for this indicator, a child's absence from instruction for any reason, including disciplinary removal may need to be addressed within coherent evidence-based improvement strategies.

## **E. Additional Data Needed (1(e))**

Stakeholders did not identify a need for additional data at this time. As Phase II progresses, additional data disaggregation

analyses will be conducted as needed to inform decision-making.

## F. Stakeholder Participation in Data Analysis (1(f))

The MSDE and stakeholders looked at a variety of disaggregated data to (1) select the State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. Four (4) stakeholder group meetings were conducted to examine data, starting with broad data analysis, which became more focused over time. Facilitated whole and small group activities enabled participants to identify priorities for improving student outcomes and to discuss current practices and issues related to addressing the priority areas.

All stakeholders were invited to attend and participate in each meeting (except the 4/29/14 meeting, which was specific to statewide leaders) and were also provided the opportunity to provide additional input into the data analyses after meeting notes/materials were distributed. The specific participation and feedback of stakeholders is indicated below:

### Internal Stakeholders

Stakeholder	4/29/14	5/29/14	10/10/14	10/16/14
Deputy Superintendent, Office of Finance and Administration		X	X	X
Deputy Superintendent, Office of Teaching and Learning	X	X	X	X
Assistant Superintendent Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Assistant Superintendent Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability		X	X	X
Deputy Superintendent, Office of School Effectiveness	X	X	X	X
Policy & Accountability Branch Chief, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Interagency Collaboration Branch Chief, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch Chief, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Part B Data Specialist, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
MITP Program Manager, Division of Special	X	X	X	X

Education/ Early Intervention Services				
Monitoring & Accountability Section Chief, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Early Education Section Chief, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Quality Assurance Specialist, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Education Program Specialist, Math, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Marilyn Muirhead SPDG Educational Specialist, Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Consultant			X	X

**External Stakeholders**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>5/29/14</b>	<b>10/10/14</b>	<b>10/16/14</b>
Parents	X	X	X
Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)	X	X	X
Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECAC)	X	X	X
Parents' Place of Maryland (PPMD)	X	X	X
Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)	X	X	X
Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	X	X	X
Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)	X	X	X
Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)	X	X	X

Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)	X	X	X
Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X	X	X
State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)	X	X	X
Ready At Five Partnership	X	X	X
Maryland State Family Child Care Association (MSFCCA)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Teacher Educators (MATE)	X	X	X
Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family	X	X	X
University of Maryland – Department of Education Policy Studies	X	X	X
Maryland Coalition of Inclusive Education (MCIE)	X	X	X
Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE)	X	X	X
Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health	X	X	X
Maryland Department of Disabilities (MDOD)	X	X	X
Maryland Department of Human Resources	X	X	X
Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X	X	X
Local Directors of Special Education	X	X	X
Local Preschool Coordinators	X	X	X
Schoolwide integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT)	X	X	X

Below is a brief summary of the data analysis stakeholder meetings:

**Stakeholder meeting #1 (4/29/14) – Preschool and School-Age** Student proficiency in reading and math, suspension, Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Data, and students who receive Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS) were disaggregated by race. Local leaders from LSSs, Local Infants and Toddlers Programs (LITPs), and Preschool Coordinators examined disaggregated State data then met as an LSS team to examine their local data and recommend targets.

**Data discussion:** Across all LSSs, students with disabilities performed lowest of all subgroups in reading and math at all grade levels – but more so in math, followed by English Language Learners. Of the racial/ethnic groups in the general population, African American students performed lowest in reading and math at most grade levels. Students living in poverty performed lower than those not receiving FARMS, across all grades for both reading and math, but with a higher gap in performance for math, particularly in recent years.

**Stakeholder meeting #2 (5/29/14) – SPP/APR Data, Assessment, Graduation, Dropout and Race Data** were presented. The reading and mathematics Maryland State Assessment (MSA), graduation, and dropout data were disaggregated by race, disability, gender, and LRE. Stakeholders asked MSDE to examine the performance of students by grade on reading and mathematics assessments, in relationship to attendance to determine if there may be any relationship between absence from instruction and performance on the MSA.

**Data discussion:** Students with disabilities are performing below the state target for reading and math and for drop out and graduation. Students with emotional disabilities were more likely to be suspended from school than other disability groups.

African American students were disproportionately suspended compared to other racial/ethnic groups.

**Stakeholder meeting #3 (10/10/14)** – The DSE/EIS reviewed the initial broad data analysis, including additional data requested by various stakeholder groups. The following data were examined by stakeholders at this meeting:

- State Part B SPP/APR Results Indicator Trend Data (2007-2012);
- State Part B SPP/APR Compliance Indicator Trend Data (2007-2012);
- Ages of Student – Trend Data (2007-2012) by 3-5, 6-21, and 3-21;
- Race – Trend Data (2007-2012);
- Disability – Trend Data (2007-2012);
- Post School Outcomes by Local School Systems – Trend Data (2009-2012);
- Students with Disabilities, Absent 10 or More Days by Grade and Disability, Three Year Olds, and PreK through Grade 12;
- Students with Disabilities, Absent 10 or More Days by Grade and Race, Three Year Olds, and PreK through Grade 12;
- Absent Less than Five Days – All Students and Students with Disabilities;
- Absent More than 20 Days – All Students and Students with Disabilities;
- Math Performance of Students with Disabilities Absent Less than 20 Days and Absent More than 20 Days, Grades 3 through 8;
- Reading Performance of Students with Disabilities Absent Less than 20 Days and Absent More than 20 Days, Grades 3 through 8;
- Suspension Data – A National Comparison – General Education and Special Education;
- Percentage of Students Suspended by Disability Trend Data (2009 – 2013);
- Percentage of 3-5 Year Olds with Disabilities Suspended Trend Data (2011) Suspension Rates in Maryland by Race, General Education vs. Specialized Education (2012-2013); and
- Relative Risk Ratio for Suspension of Students in General and Specialized Education by Race (2010-2012).

**Data discussion:** Students with disabilities attend school at a rate close to their nondisabled peers. However when looking at absences for 20 or more days, they miss school much more often, particularly in middle school and 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades. African American students with disabilities are only slightly more likely to be absent more than 20 days compared to their White counterparts across grades. Removals from the classroom for suspension and for separate class or school placements occur disproportionately higher for African American students with disabilities. This is particularly influenced by the low rates of placement in general education settings by the two largest jurisdictions whose African American population is over 90%. Upon discussion and following a brainstorming activity, stakeholders targeted these potential areas of improvement of student results:

- v Math performance for all students with disabilities across all grades (gap reduction) and
- v Disproportionate placement of African American students with disabilities in separate special education classes and schools.

**Stakeholder meeting #4 (10/16/14)** – In a joint meeting of the Maryland Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) and the local Special Education Citizens' Advisory Councils (SECACs), state leaders who represent families of students with disabilities reviewed the data analysis that had occurred to this point. Stakeholders were asked to consider the data in relationship to the Division's involvement with current State initiatives, including the:

- ii DSE/EIS strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, that focuses on early childhood, professional learning, access, equity, progress, and secondary transition;



- ü State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to close the math gap using tenets of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), evidence-based math practices, and parent engagement;
- ü Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center work to promote inclusive school reform;
- ü Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver;
- ü Race to the Top (RTTT); and
- ü Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant (RTTT, ELCG).

Stakeholders continued to review data related to the composition of the population of students with disabilities, including types of disabilities, race/ethnicity, and FARMS. Data were shared relative to:

- ü The **settings** in which students are receiving special education and related services, including these distributions by race/ethnicity.
- ü **Student proficiency** on the statewide assessment, showing data related to proficiency levels by disability category, grade level, as well as gap analysis between students with and without disabilities.

**Data discussion:** Stakeholders agreed upon the following concerns:

- v Disproportionate segregation of African American students with disabilities out of general education and comprehensive schools
- v Disparities in assessment performance of certain local school systems, noting that LSSs may need assistance and technical support in understanding, reviewing, and using their local data to make data-informed decisions
- v Poor math performance across grades/jurisdictions
- v Post-school outcomes (noting that this may not be truly reflective of actual post-school experiences)
- v Diversity in achievement by disability, and in particular, discrepancies for students identified with an emotional disability in segregated placements and in academic performance
- v The group had no concerns about the adequacy, quality, or depth of data presented and discussed.



## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Analysis of State Infrastructure

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

#### Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

## 2. State Infrastructure Analysis to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

The MSDE DSE/EIS recognizes that the organizational capacity of the MSDE and LSSs to support the improvement of student results, build State and local capacity to sustain improvement, and to scale up evidence-based promising practices is critical to success. Toward that end, the MSDE identified several ways in which infrastructure could be assessed, including state capacity for implementation of evidence-based strategies and sustainment of results.

### A. How Infrastructure Capacity was Analyzed (2(a))

The purpose of the infrastructure analysis was to identify systemic strengths and areas for improvement to build State capacity to support LSSs to implement, scale up, and sustain evidence-based practices. The analysis, which resulted in the preliminary SIMR, was used as the base for infrastructure analysis discussions: to improve math results for students with disabilities in grades 3 – 5. The State structures that were reviewed included governance, fiscal, quality standards, data, professional development/technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The infrastructure analyses resulted in the identification of capacity-building areas to be strengthened in order to improve results. The activities, processes, and results of the infrastructure analysis are described below and in the following sections.

#### State Capacity Assessment

The SWIFT State team is an MSDE cross-Divisional team charged with providing technical assistance to SWIFT partner LSSs and schools in the SWIFT process for change; delivering professional learning to support implementation of priorities; identifying the state capacity needs to sustain and scale up implementation of SWIFT Core Features; and supporting the state in integrated, coherent planning. The SWIFT State Implementation Team participated in an externally facilitated State Capacity Assessment, adapted with approval by the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center (Fixen, Duda, Horner, & Blasé, 2014). As a baseline measure (May 2014), many aspects of implementation had not yet occurred. A second assessment is being scheduled for late Spring 2015.

#### Internal and External Stakeholder Input

An analysis of infrastructure with external stakeholders who also participated in data analysis, and the internal MSDE stakeholders from the State Superintendent's Executive Team were conducted over four sessions. Please refer to Infrastructure Stakeholder Involvement, Section 2F for details of Stakeholder involvement.

### B. Description of the State Systems (2(b))

#### Governance

The organizational structure of the MSDE is designed to effectively, efficiently, and equitably focus the Department's work on the MSDE's ambitious mission: *to provide every student, including students with disabilities, with a world-class education that ensures post-graduation college- and career-readiness.* Under the leadership of the State Superintendent, Dr. Lillian M. Lowery, MSDE is organized into three Offices, each led by a Deputy State Superintendent: the Offices of School Effectiveness, Teaching and Learning, and Finance and Administration. The DSE/EIS is in the Office of Teaching and Learning. The Assistant State Superintendent of the DSE/EIS is a member of the State Superintendent's Executive Team which allows for advocacy for improvement for students with disabilities and to leverage resources – personnel and fiscal.

**Please refer to Attachment A - MSDE Organizational Chart.**

## ***Legal Foundation***

The Maryland State Department of Education is Maryland's State Education Agency (SEA) responsible for the implementation of the IDEA and the general supervision of Local Education Agencies (LEAs – referred to as LSSs in Maryland) for the provision of services to children and youth with disabilities. The MSDE, DSE/EIS is accountable to the State leadership, Maryland General Assembly, and State Board of Education to improve academic achievement and functional outcomes for children and youth with disabilities, in order to ensure these children leave school college, career, and community ready.

## ***Administrative Structures and Leadership to Carry Out the IDEA***

Within the MSDE **Office of Teaching and Learning**, the DSE/EIS is able to complement and collaborate with the other Divisions directly responsible for instruction, assessment, accountability and the public reporting of student progress of all children, including children and youth with disabilities. The mission of the **DSE/EIS** is to provide leadership, support, and accountability for results to LSSs, and stakeholders through a seamless, comprehensive system of coordinated services to children and youth with disabilities, birth through 21, and their families. The DSE/EIS organizational structure is based upon principles of collaboration and shared responsibility and is organized by five branches: Policy and Accountability; Programmatic Support and Technical Assistance; Family Support and Dispute Resolution; Interagency Collaboration; and Resource Management. The Division matrix organizational design integrates knowledge and skills for improvement of compliance and results, and ensures consistent communication within the DSE/EIS, throughout the Department, and with external stakeholders and partners. **Please refer to Attachment B – Division Cross-Matrix Organizational Structure.** The core functions of the DSE/EIS are *leadership, accountability for results, technical assistance and program support, and fiscal and resource management*. For more information on the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, please refer to Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2(F). The DSE/EIS is committed to measuring and reporting its progress in accomplishing the ambitious Goals and Action Imperatives set forth in *Moving Maryland Forward*. The *Key Measures of Success* table in the strategic plan presents our expectations for change from baseline in 2013 through 2018. Each Branch within the DSE/EIS is responsible for the development and implementation of an operational plan of objective actions to address each goal and action imperative.

## **Fiscal**

The MSDE is committed to the use of fiscal and program data to engage in a finance planning process to identify funds and resources needed to sustain the system. It ensures that funds and resources are allocated equitably to meet the needs of the program and used efficiently and effectively to implement high quality programs. Funds and resources are procured, allocated, used, and dispersed to improve program effectiveness and ensure efficient use of resources. The MSDE is organized to ensure that spending is in compliance with contract performance and all federal, state, and local fiscal requirements. Some of the responsibilities related to fiscal stewardship are described below.

The **Office of Finance and Administration** is responsible for developing and implementing the MSDE administrative and financial policies, procedures, and systems. The Chief Operating Officer provides guidance, management, and coordination of the services provided by the **Division of Business Services** and advises the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education on the financial implications of proposed courses of action. The Accounting Branch develops and recommends policies and procedures relative to financial and cost accounting to ensure the MSDE is in compliance with all applicable State and federal accounting and reporting requirements. This Branch also initiates monitoring activities to detect possible financial problems and recommend corrective courses of action, and provides regular and Special Payments payrolls, controls inventory, and transmits authorization to the Comptroller's Office for payments to vendors for various services and goods. The Budget Branch recommends policies and procedures for the formulation and execution of the MSDE budgets. The Procurement, Grants, and Contracts Section: interprets and applies laws, regulations, and guidelines promulgated by the State and MSDE; maintains liaisons with all regulatory agencies; and administers the Risk Management Program. The Financial Reporting and Coordination Branch provides integrated fiscal support services to the Office of the State Superintendent and several Divisions within the Department; including grant management and financial training to MSDE staff; and reviewing program financial documents prior to their submission to the Budget, Accounting, and Administrative Services Branches.

The Local Finance Reporting Office is responsible for developing, collecting, reviewing, evaluating, editing, reporting, and publishing local schools systems' financial data. It administers the automated financial reporting system (the Annual Financial Report and Grant Reporting System) to serve the purpose of answering State and/or federal surveys in the form of special projects or reports. This office also administers compliance with Maintenance of Effort requirements (MOE) under the Bridge to Excellence, makes determinations on eligibility for Nonrecurring Cost exclusions from MOE calculations, and provides support to the LSS Master Plan review process.

The MSDE uses *The Financial Reporting Manual for Maryland Public Schools*, developed and adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education to assure uniform reporting at the local, State, and federal levels. Each LSS and PA that receives sub-awards of the federal IDEA funds to support its special education or early intervention programs must comply with applicable programmatic and fiscal regulations. It is the responsibility of the DSE/EIS to ensure all sub-recipients of federal funds comply with applicable State and federal regulations. The DSE/EIS developed the Local Application for Federal Funds (LAFF) process and the associated submissions as necessary requirements for the DSE/EIS to discharge its administrative responsibilities related to its sub-awards of the federal IDEA Part B funds.

State and federal regulations under the IDEA require that each LSS submit an application for the expenditure of federal funds. Each LSS is required to develop the LAFF with meaningful public input from entities such as its Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committee (SECAC), parents, community partners, special and general educators, and administrators. Through the LAFF, the LSS provides assurances of compliance with federal and State regulations and reports on the proposed expenditures of allocated federal funds in order to provide a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for students with disabilities.

In addition to the federal funds passed through to LSSs, the DSE/EIS uses selected IDEA set-aside funds for competitive and noncompetitive grants for LSSs. For the 2014-2015 school year the DSE/EIS awarded one (1) highly competitive Bridges for Systems Change Initiative grant to enable the MSDE, community, and the LSS partners to engage in a collaborative approach to support schools and classrooms to impact student outcomes, and build local capacity to sustain evidence-based promising practices.

Fiscal data are used for both planning and for accountability/monitoring of expenditures. All sub-awards of federal funds must be used and accounted for consistent with all program requirements, State and federal statutes and regulations, grant conditions, and the new Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (2CFR §200). The policies, procedures, and practices established by the MSDE for the procurement, distribution of funds, semiannual programmatic and fiscal review, sub-recipient monitoring, and audits support the effective and efficient use of funds. Each step in the process is supported by multiple steps from the DSE/EIS internal fiscal procedures to Department review procedures.

## **Data**

The MSDE has developed an integrated data system that collects data from LSSs in accordance with the *Maryland Student Record Manual*. This includes, but is not limited to attendance, assessments, graduation, enrollment, and discipline of all students, including students with disabilities. Student records provide an accurate presentation of the academic performance. The MSDE Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability collect data from all LSSs on all students. The State assigns each student a Unique Student Identifier (USID). MSDE integrates two data systems; the Child Find/Special Education data generated from online Individual Education Programs for students with disabilities and the State's accountability system that holds all student demographic, behavioral, and state assessment data. These systems are easily integrated for multiple areas of analysis. Special education data systems are the:

- ***Maryland Online Individualized Education Program (MOIEP)***. The MOIEP is a secure web-based application that serves as the primary case management tool for LSSs serving children and youth with disabilities in Maryland. The main user function is the development and monitoring of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) which are entered into the MOIEP by local users. The State has access to the IEPs of all children receiving services and can utilize the data analysis functions of the MOIEP to generate both predefined and dynamic reports, including reports that display child outcomes progress, to assist with programmatic data-informed decision-making. The MSDE and the LSSs are able to generate reports on a regular basis to monitor statewide and local compliance/results and audit for data validity and reliability. Evidence that the data on the processes and results component is part of a State's or an LSS's system of general supervision includes the following:
  - data are collected as required under the IDEA and by the U.S. Secretary of Education,
  - data are routinely collected throughout the year,
  - LSSs submit data in a timely and accurate manner, and
  - data are available from multiple sources and used to examine performance of the LSSs.
- ***Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS)***. In order to facilitate local data analysis for students with disabilities, the DSE/EIS, in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (CTE) is developing the Maryland Special Education and Early Intervention Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS). This system encompasses the integration of statewide demographic and outcome data with special education and early intervention services data collection tools through a linked special education longitudinal data warehouse.

- **Complaint and Dispute Resolution.** The IDEA provides parents certain rights and procedural safeguards. The Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch collects and analyzes data on an ongoing basis using the parent contact and dispute resolution database to ensure effective implementation of the dispute resolution system.
- **Ready at Five.** Ready at Five publishes school readiness data, based on the performance of kindergarteners on the Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR) Work Sampling System (WSS). Children are identified as either fully ready, approaching readiness, or developing readiness in seven domains of learning: Language and Literacy, Physical Development, Social Studies, Scientific Thinking, Mathematical Thinking, The Arts, and Social/Personal Development. Statewide Readiness Data are published on the organization's website, found here <http://www.readyatfive.org/school-readiness-data/statewide-readiness-data-2014.html>
- **MD EXCELS.** Maryland EXCELS is a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) that awards ratings to registered family childcare providers, licensed childcare centers (e.g., Head Start, facilities, and school age-only childcare), and public pre-kindergarten programs that meet increasingly higher standards of quality identified areas. Maryland EXCELS is voluntary and is designed to increase parent and provider awareness of the key elements of high quality childcare. A database has been created to collect the QRIS data for future monitoring and analysis. Please also see Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2D.

### **Quality Standards for Teaching Children and Youth**

A core value of the MSDE is the belief that: *In order to be prepared for the challenges of work and college, Maryland students must graduate from high school equipped with the knowledge and skills to help them succeed.* Maryland has led the nation in establishing strong academic standards and accompanying curriculum, but to achieve world-class status the State must continue to raise those standards and improve the achievement of all students.

In June 2010, by unanimous vote, the Maryland State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards, national education standards that define the skills and knowledge that students should master during their K-12 education by unanimous vote. The MSDE website - [Maryland's College and Career Ready Standards](#) - includes numerous resources for LSSs, educators, and parents. Through the Division's strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, the DSE/EIS focuses on building the capacity of LITPs, LSSs, and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to narrow the performance gap and enable all children to be college, career, and community ready when they leave school. The Division works collaboratively with other Divisions within the MSDE to improve achievement of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards and performance on statewide accountability measures.

### **Professional Learning and Development (PLD)/Technical Assistance (TA)**

The MSDE implements a coordinated system of professional development to address recruitment and retention, standards and competencies, and ongoing systematic professional development strategies. The MSDE has combined Professional Development/Learning (PD/L) and Technical Assistance (TA) as support structures for LSSs. TA has a more individualized focus whereas PD/L may have a more broad based distributive focus.

Since 1986, the MSDE, in conjunction with local school systems and institutions of higher education (IHEs) conduct a survey annually to determine critical teacher shortage areas. Although some data is collected annually, the report is published biennially. The latest [Maryland Teacher Staffing Report, 2012-2014](#), provides data on teacher candidates completing programs in IHEs that have Maryland Approved Programs (MAP) and in Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs (MAAPP). The report also collects the hiring needs of the local school systems to determine critical shortage areas by analyzing the data and applying the criteria agreed upon. The process includes additional data beyond the traditional formula used since the beginning of the report. It incorporates the recommendations of an Expert Panel, composed of representatives of various stakeholders, that was convened in 2008 to review the process and make recommendations. The criteria developed by the Expert Committee are used in this study.

The scope of the report has expanded over the years, and now includes shortage areas for both teachers and select non-classroom professionals; information on traditional higher education as well as alternative preparation programs; the graduates; geographic shortage areas; teacher attrition; highly qualified teachers (as defined by the 2001 No Child Left Behind [NCLB] Act); and the number of retired/rehired teachers and principals. This report also includes a number of important incentives and strategies for the recruitment and retention of quality teachers and principals for Maryland public schools.

### **Standards for Professionals**



The Division of Educator Effectiveness certifies teachers and other professional personnel; oversees the preparation of education candidates, and approves the education programs of nonpublic schools. This Division is also responsible for **the Professional Standards and the Teacher Education Board (PSTEB)** that originated in 1971 as an advisory board established to set standards and regulations by which teachers and other professionals are prepared and licensed for Maryland public schools. The board's twenty-five members are appointed to three-year terms by the Governor with Senate advice and consent (Code Education Article, §6-701 through §6-708).

The **Maryland Teacher Professional Development Standards (MTPDS)** were adopted in 2004 and have guided professional development in the State since that time—not only for teachers but for administrators and other educators at all levels. The Maryland standards are based on the National Staff Development Council's (NSDC) Standards for Staff Development (2001). Importantly, the standards acknowledge that teacher professional development encompasses a wide range of learning activities, such as teacher study groups, coaching and mentoring relationships, teacher networks, participation on school improvement teams and committees that develop curricula and assessments, workshops, and college and university courses.

Currently, Learning Forward **Standards for Professional Learning** are at the very core of our professional development and technical assistance and support for local school systems, schools, and general and specialized educators. They are: 1) provide a clear vision of high-quality professional development that recognizes local needs, priorities, and resources; 2) guide planning, designing, implementing, and evaluating high-quality professional development; 3) support alignment of professional development with goals for improving student learning and state, district, and school policies and priorities; 4) inform allocation of resources for professional development; and 5) define accountability for ensuring that professional development is of the highest quality and readily accessible to all teachers.

### **Professional Learning/Development**

The DSE/EIS targets specific universal professional learning activities to local early intervention and early care and education leaders. These include the annual DSE/EIS Professional Learning Institute, quarterly face-to-face Birth through 21 Leadership professional learning, and monthly Birth through 21 Leadership teleconferences. In addition, there are other formalized professional learning opportunities and tools:

- The MSDE and Maryland colleges and universities have developed the **Maryland Professional Development School (PDS) Network** to connect Maryland colleges and universities and their local school system partners in their efforts to implement the Redesign of Teacher Education in Maryland. The MSDE sponsors regional network meetings of stakeholders in these partnerships: college/university liaisons, school system PDS representatives, school principals and site coordinators, and preservice mentor teachers.
- To assist general and specialized educators, the DSE/EIS, through a federal State Improvement Grant (SIG) developed an online tracker, [Professional Development Online Tracker \(PDot\)](#). This online tool assists personnel to identify particular areas of strength and areas of need. In addition, it provides clear stepping stones to guide professional development on an ongoing, career-long basis. The online tool includes links to professional development courses, videos, curricula, webinars, books, and other materials that can be invaluable.
- As part of the Maryland RTTT grant, the MSDE conducted 11 regional **Educator Effectiveness Academies** during the summers of 2011, 2012, and 2013. Academy content was delivered through voluntary regional conferences and on-line content sessions in 2014. Beginning in 2013, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services joined the EEA planning team and the EEA master teacher cadre. Content specific to the needs of educators who teach students with disabilities was subsequently included in the EEA content sessions.

### **Online Professional Learning Activities and Resources**

In order to improve program quality and services to positively impact child and family outcome results, the MSDE, DSE/EIS, in collaboration with numerous partners, provides resources, training, consultation, and technical assistance to LSSs, service providers, community partners, stakeholders, and parents in numerous formats and forums. Dissemination of these trainings, resources, media, and tools to strengthen student outcomes is supported through the DSE/EIS website – [Maryland Learning Links](#) - in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education (CTE). Several online professional learning resources have been highly utilized for providing ongoing training and support to general and specialized educators and service providers.

[School Improvement in Maryland – mdk12.org](#) is the **School Improvement in Maryland** web site which provides information on instruction and assessments, data analysis, and school improvement for students, parents, teachers, administrators, and school board members.

## ***Differentiated Framework for Technical Assistance***

The DSE/EIS has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for program support and technical assistance to provide a tiered system for both **monitoring** and **technical assistance** to address the needs of each LSS. The *Differentiated Framework* illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. An LSS is assigned to a tier of general supervision and oversight based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The corresponding technical assistance and support (engagement) an LSS can expect to receive is differentiated and based on that system's assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of needs. **Please see Attachment C, Differentiated Framework.**

- The **Universal Tier of Engagement** is available to all LSSs and focuses on professional development/learning and support to address statewide needs based on overall State trend data, (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide technical assistance include State and regional professional development, online tools, resources through Maryland Learning Links, and Technical Assistance Bulletins.
- **Targeted Tier of Engagement** focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, and technical assistance) to address the needs of the LSS on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LSS from needing substantial support. The LSS leadership is required to engage with the DSE/EIS to review State and local data and information in order to implement an Improvement Plan that is approved by the DSE/EIS to build capacity to effectively address the identified needs. Evaluation and periodic feedback are critical elements of Targeted Engagement. A Targeted Assistance and Support Committee (TASC), consisting of jointly identified local and state cross-Divisional members, provides performance-based and responsive support. The goal of the **Focused Tier of Engagement** is to direct substantial support to address the continuous lack of improvement of a LSS through significant systems change. A joint multi-faceted State and local Focused Intervention and Accountability Team (FIAT) meets quarterly to develop, implement, and review progress and change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. Principles of effective systems change, implementation, evaluation, and sustainability are foundational elements of the technical assistance. Frequent feedback and general supervision is maintained throughout the term of the technical assistance.
- The **Intensive Tier of Engagement** focuses on providing support based on a Formal Agreement that is developed to guide improvement and correction with onsite supervision. The MSDE may direct, recover, or withhold State or federal funds.

## **Accountability/Monitoring**

The MSDE is committed to ongoing program evaluation and accountability. It expects the LSSs to meet agreed-upon standards. Mechanisms to document the need for change, track progress, and demonstrate improvement are included, as well as the State's role to facilitate the local use of accountability and improvement planning processes.

## ***Maryland Bridge to Excellence Master Plans***

In 2002, the Maryland General Assembly enacted the *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act*. This legislation provides a powerful framework for all 24 school systems to increase student achievement for all students and to close the achievement gap. The *Bridge to Excellence* legislation significantly increased State Aid to public education and required each LSS to develop a comprehensive Master Plan, to be updated annually. This Plan is expected to link school finance directly and centrally to decisions about improving student learning, including a review of the performance of children and youth with disabilities on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators. The LSS Master Plans are to also address the needs, supports, and technical assistance for general and specialized educators and service providers. By design, the legislation requires school systems to integrate State, federal, and local funding and initiatives into the Master Plan. Under Bridge to Excellence, academic programming and fiscal alignment are carefully monitored by the Master Plan review process. The review of LSS Master Plans involves all Divisions within the MSDE, including the DSE/EIS.

Beginning in 2011, Maryland integrated the Race to the Top (RTTT) Local Scopes of Work with the existing Bridge to Excellence Master Plan (BTE) and reviewed and approved the Scopes of Work within the Master Plan review infrastructure in accordance with RTTT and BTE guidelines. The purpose of this integration was to allow Maryland's LSSs to streamline their efforts under these programs to increase student achievement and eliminate achievement gaps by implementing ambitious plans in the four RTTT reform areas. This integration also enabled the MSDE to leverage personnel resources to ensure that all Scopes of Work receive comprehensive programmatic and fiscal reviews

## ***Differentiated Framework for Accountability and Continuous Improvement***

The DSE/EIS has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for program support and technical assistance to provide a tiered system for **monitoring** and **technical assistance** to address the needs of each LSS (See also Professional Development/Technical Assistance – Differentiated Levels of Engagement). The *Differentiated Framework* illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. **Please refer to Attachment C, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, *Differentiated Framework*, page 25.** An LSS is assigned to a tier of general supervision and oversight based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings.

- **Universal Tier of General Supervision** is assigned to most LSSs. They have met identified performance and compliance criteria, resulting in a determination status of “Meets Requirements” or are in the first year of “Needs Assistance.” These LSSs have no findings of noncompliance or have corrected all findings of noncompliance within one year and have maintained compliance. Each LSS is monitored annually through a desk audit and cross-divisional data analysis of SPP Indicators, local priorities, and fiscal data. Additionally, a cyclical general supervision monitoring of select LSSs includes, at a minimum, student record reviews for the IDEA requirements, a review of policy, procedures, and practices, and sub-recipient fiscal monitoring. Each LSS develops and self-monitors an internal work plan including Local Priority Flexibility to address locally identified needs.
- An LSS receiving a determination status of “Needs Assistance” for two or more consecutive years or “Needs Intervention” is assigned to the **Targeted Tier of General Supervision**. An LSS in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for identified noncompliance, and/or although noncompliance may be corrected within one year, compliance is not sustained. Targeted monitoring occurs semi-annually and includes customized data analysis with real-time local and State data. Activities may include, but are not limited to: student record reviews using selected sections of the student record review document, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LSS’s system of general supervision, interview questions, and/or case studies. State and local joint cross-departmental and cross-divisional teams are formed to address identified needs. The LSS develops a local Improvement Plan which is submitted to and approved by the DSE/EIS.
- When a LSS is given a determination status of “Needs Substantial Intervention” it is assigned to the **Focused Tier of General Supervision**. This is the result of uncorrected findings of noncompliance, active CAPs for two or more years, and little progress despite general and targeted technical assistance. Focused general supervision is comprised of enhanced and differentiated monitoring and in-depth data analysis. This tier of general supervision oversight also requires the participation of the State Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent for Teaching and Learning, and the DSE/EIS Assistant State Superintendent work closely with the local school superintendent to develop a cross-departmental, cross-divisional State and local implementation team. The MSDE provides increased oversight activities to assess progress and may direct federal funds, impose special conditions, and/or require more frequent submission of data. Maryland’s focused monitoring as seen in the *Differentiated Framework* occurs quarterly and may include, but is not limited to: student record reviews using selected sections of the student record review document, a review of the LSS’s real time data, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LSS’s system of general supervision, interview questions, classroom observations, and case studies.
- **Intensive Tier of General Supervision** is given to an LSS that fails to progress and correct previously identified noncompliance despite receiving technical assistance and support. The failure to comply has affected the core requirements, such as the delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight. The LSS enters into a formal agreement with the MSDE to guide improvement and may have additional sanctions. The LSS informs the MSDE of its unwillingness to comply with core requirements.

## ***Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR)***

In response to OSEP’s shift in monitoring priorities, the MSDE, DSE/EIS revised its monitoring procedures and now includes a greater emphasis on requirements related to improving educational results for children and youth with disabilities. In addition, the MSDE, DSE/EIS uses the *Differentiated Framework*, thus enabling the MSDE, DSE/EIS to work collaboratively with the LSSs to focus on areas in need of improvement. This is accomplished through Maryland’s Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) process. General supervision is accountable for enforcing the requirements and for ensuring continuous improvement. The primary focus of the MCIR process is to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities and their families and ensure that the MSDE meets the program requirements within the IDEA.

The MCIR process verifies data, documents compliance with both the IDEA and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR)

regulatory requirements, and provides technical assistance for the timely correction of identified findings of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance concerning the records of individual students with disabilities always result in verification of correction using a two prong process, consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every 6 years in each LSS. While some monitoring activities are universal for all, other monitoring activities are customized to examine areas of need. These areas are identified through a variety of sources such as but not limited to: indicator data verification; other data reviews, grant reviews, fiscal data, Medicaid monitoring, Family support data, State complaints, and advocacy organization concerns.

## C. System Strengths and Areas for Improvement (2(c))

As a part of the review of infrastructure, the internal SSIP planning team reviewed state initiatives, resources, and regulations as well as the areas above. Teacher preparation programs and professional learning opportunities through the MSDE have resulted in higher levels of co-teaching and collaboration among general and specialized educators. Regulations to implement instruction based on the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) are supporting the increase in high quality teaching practices that meet the diverse needs of learners. A recent focus on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) in both academic and behavioral supports promises to assist LSSs in systematically meeting the needs of ALL learners and include students with disabilities in those systems. The State's Strategic Plan for the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, *Moving Maryland Forward*, provides a guide for State plans for narrowing the achievement gap for students with disabilities. To meet this vision, competitive discretionary funding has focused strategically on making positive results in narrowing the gap for students with disabilities. Funding for the Maryland State Professional Development Grand (SPDG) has been leveraged to narrow the math gap in 3 school systems. Strategically, the MSDE is partnering with the national SWIFT Center to focus on school-wide change and district capacity building to improve behavioral and academic outcomes for ALL students, with a focus on 16 schools in 4 school systems. The SWIFT Center work is serving as a catalyst for supporting existing cross-Divisional collaborations and developing coherent strategies that can be shared statewide.

In conducting the State Capacity Assessment, strengths were evident in the functioning of the State Implementation Team and the participation of the SWIFT State Coordinators and their access to State leadership. Strengths of the cross-Divisional Implementation team are in providing professional learning opportunities to partner LSSs and supporting the installation of evidence-based practices. Future work will be focused on state planning in concert with the SSIP. Needs were noted in the involvement of leadership across Divisions, communication structures from the State Implementation Team to the State Executive Team, and to Local School System partners. Implications relate to improving cross-Divisional communication and investment in technical assistance capacity on the part of the State.

As a result of iterative SWOT Analyzes by internal and external stakeholders (refer to 2(F)), the chart below summarizes their input on the strengths of Maryland's systems and Areas for Improvement.

	Strengths	Opportunities (Areas for Improvement)
<b>Governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Vision and mission of the MSDE and the DSE/EIS</li> <li>· Only 24 LSSs – easier to engage in dialogue (autonomy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Shared staff by overlapping divisions to work on similar projects/initiatives</li> <li>· Cross Division communications</li> </ul>
<b>Fiscal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Federal and state competitive grant opportunities</li> <li>· Division offers local priority – local use of funds</li> <li>· Fiscal workgroup that drives through data where money will be spent (stakeholder input)</li> <li>· Shared initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Increase cross divisional work plans to leverage funds better; cost sharing – integrate funding</li> <li>· Continue to explore opportunities for braiding funding</li> </ul>
<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Data available online – MD Report Card, Mideareport.org, mdk12.org, Complaints/due</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Increase use of data-informed decision making to prioritize PD/TA</li> </ul>



	Strengths	Opportunities (Areas for Improvement)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>process</li> <li>LADSS</li> <li>MOIEP/SSIS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teach parents how to look at data</li> <li>Increase LSS use of local data for decision making</li> </ul>
<b>Quality Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (MCCRS)</li> <li>Early Learning Standards aligned with MCCRS</li> <li>Professional Development Standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist LSS administrators, school personnel, and general and specialized educators to implement strategies to improve results for all students.</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Development/ Technical Assistance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State provides flexible dollars for LSSs to develop and implement specific PD/PL</li> <li>State monitors use of evidence based practices and standards</li> <li>Shared initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide onsite PD/TA to LSSs</li> <li>Provide resources to LSS leaders, school administrators, and general and specialized educators</li> <li>Blending resources with aligned State initiatives</li> </ul>
<b>Accountability/ Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong monitoring and accountability protocols</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alignment of Department accountability and monitoring for student results</li> </ul>

## D. State-level Improvement Plans and Initiatives (2(d))

There are several State initiatives and priorities across the various Divisions within the MSDE that are designed to engage each Division in the MSDE mission to create a world-class education system that prepares all students for college and career success in the 21st century.

### [MSDE Plan for Education Reform.](#)

Maryland has been engaged in strengthening its education system to meet changing social and economic conditions. Maryland's education reforms have been designed to pave a path for all students to have the skills and academic success to compete in the changing, technology-based, 21st century world. Through several decades of reform that have brought Maryland to its current status as national leader, one thing has remained constant—Maryland's commitment to continually improving the education and achievement of all students.

To fully prepare students to excel in college and the workforce in the 21st century, Maryland has focused its efforts around four areas of reform: higher standards for curriculum and assessments, robust data, effective educators, and strategic help for struggling schools. The State is also committed to strengthening Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education across all four reform areas. Once fully implemented, these comprehensive reforms will provide all students with a world-class education that gives them the skills and knowledge they need for future success. Below is a chart of the various initiatives within the MSDE that are aligned to support our Department mission and strategic plan.

Goals	Higher Standards	Robust Data	Effective Educators	Strategic Help for Struggling Schools	Science, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics (STEM)
<b>State</b>					

Initiatives					
DSE/EIS Strategic Plan	X	X	X	X	X
Race To The Top	X	X	X	X	X
RTTT – Early Learning Challenge Grant	X	X	X	X	X
ESEA Flexibility	X	X	X	X	X
SPDG	X	X	X	X	X
SWIFT	X	X	X	X	X
Bridges	X	X	X	X	X

It can be noted as the SSIP Phase I activities were completed that the four areas of reform and the commitment of the State to STEM were used as unifying themes. The initiatives listed above also served as a means of identifying points of intersection to ensure the MSDE coordinated efforts.

### ***Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) Strategic Plan***

The DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward* was developed and informed by the innovative thinking and transformative ideas of stakeholders from across the State. This included LSS superintendents, special education directors, early intervention and preschool special education coordinators, instruction and curriculum specialists, family advocates, parents, and community partners. The DSE/EIS Assistant State Superintendent's Advisory Council, State Advisory Councils, and the DSE/EIS leadership staff collaborated to produce this final plan. The MSDE is the State Education Agency and State Lead Agency for early intervention and special education and related services to infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities, and their families, birth through age 21.

This plan fully integrates the overall aims of the MSDE, including a strong commitment to collaboration and shared responsibility, a multi-tiered system of support, and family and community partnerships. By working collaboratively across the Department, and throughout the State, Maryland intends to build the capacity of the Department and LSSs to narrow the existing achievement gap in order to prepare all students for college, career, and community living after successful completion of secondary school. To narrow the gap requires effort in four major areas: Early Childhood, Professional Development, Access, Equity, and Progress, and Secondary Transition. **Please refer to Attachment D for a graphic representation of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan.**

The DSE/EIS is committed to a strategic planning process rooted in a set of principles that will remain essential to the successful implementation and measurement of the *Moving Maryland Forward* plan and the achievement of its intended outcomes.

- **Strategic Collaboration** We involve stakeholders through participatory processes that promote innovation, the sharing of best practices, and dissemination of research and evidence-based models. We are also committed to strengthening partnerships and planning with the other MSDE divisions and external stakeholder groups.
- **Family Partnerships** We promote families and school staff to engage in active regular two-way, meaningful communication as equal partners in decisions that affect children and families in order to jointly inform, influence, and create policies, practices, and programs.
- **Data Informed Decisions** We make every effort to serve stakeholders in a timely and effective manner and to ensure the availability of "real-time" data for decision making and dissemination of models of best practices throughout the State.
- **Evidence Based Practices** We will work to identify and implement evidence-based practices with fidelity to improve child outcomes.

Four (4) DSE/EIS core functions necessary to close the gap are: to provide leadership, a shared accountability for results, technical assistance and program support, and fiscal and resource management. **Please refer to Attachment E – The DSE/EIS Core Functions.** This comprehensive system aligns policy and requires the essential relationship between the MSDE, the LSSs, and schools to ensure the timely and appropriate provision of services to children and youth with disabilities and their families.

### ***Race to the Top (RTTT)***

On August 24, 2010, Maryland was awarded one of the federal government's coveted Race to the Top (RTTT) grants in the amount of \$250 million over four years. The aims of the RTTT program were to boost student achievement, reduce gaps in achievement among student subgroups, turn around struggling schools, and improve the teaching profession.

Maryland has one of the nation's most honored systems of public education, but for our State to continue to be competitive our schools must continue to improve. President Barack Obama, in announcing the \$4.35 billion Race to the Top initiative, said the program is based on a simple principle: "whether a state is ready to do what works."

Maryland developed its RTTT proposal with unprecedented collaboration and transparency. To help frame its proposal, the State called upon a top level committee of educators and State education leaders. Following extensive stakeholder input, the MSDE laid out the State's robust plan to move its education system from national leader to world class, setting an ambitious agenda focused on improving education by:

- ***Implementing higher, more rigorous standards and advanced assessments aligned to those new standards to help prepare students for success in college and careers***

In school year 2013-14, the new Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards were fully implemented in all schools across the State. These new, more rigorous academic standards are based on the Common Core State Standards, a set of consistent, high-quality academic goals for what students should know and be able to do in English Language Arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics. Maryland took the Common Core State Standards and adapted them to the specific needs of the State – creating the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. Students will receive an education that not only leads to a high school diploma, but also prepares them for success, without remediation, in college, career-training, and life after graduation. (See also Section 2.B. Quality Standards.)

- ***Building a statewide technology infrastructure that links all data elements with analytic and instructional tools to monitor and promote student achievement***

Maryland's work to improve data collection and analysis and technology in the State's education system hits directly at the heart of the MSDE's overarching vision of equity, efficiency, and excellence. Through the development and expansion of the State's longitudinal data system (see also, 2.B. Data, LADSS), educators, policy makers, parents, and other stakeholders will have a clear view of long-term student outcomes and be able to make policy decisions that help close gaps and increase the achievement of all students.

- ***Redesigning the model for teacher and principal evaluations, with a focus on preparation, development, and retention***

Over the course of the first three years of RTTT, the State worked with its local school systems, teachers' associations, and principals' organizations to develop a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system, giving school systems the flexibility to include local measures within the broader statewide requirements. During that time, school systems had the opportunity to field test their new evaluations and provide the State with vital feedback. Findings from the field test were used to make refinements and enhancements to the evaluation system before it was implemented across the State in school year 2013-14. Maryland has incorporated **Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)** as a measure of student growth in teacher and principal evaluations, believing the SLOs will allow for specific school and local school system goals to be captured while also maintaining a focus on the importance of student growth. The SLOs are measurable instructional goals for a specific group of students over a set period of time. Through the SLO process, educators are empowered to examine data and student outcomes to make meaningful decisions about what is most important for their students to learn and how their students' learning is measured.

- ***Fully implementing the innovative Breakthrough Center approach for turning around the State's lowest-performing schools***

Through the RTTT, Maryland has worked to significantly improve the performance of the State's lowest performing schools and set them on a path for continued improvement by fully implementing the innovative Breakthrough Center approach for transforming low-achieving schools and school systems. The Breakthrough Center's focus on building a community of

practice for turnaround does not begin and end with Priority and Focus Schools. The Breakthrough Center aims to build this community throughout the state, and in many cases, the nation. The MSDE's Breakthrough Center coordinates, brokers, and delivers support to schools and local school systems across the State. During years one through four of Maryland's RTTT grant, the Breakthrough Center provided hands-on support to the State's 21 Priority Schools, the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools in the State, and their 20 feeder schools in Baltimore City and Prince George's County.

### ***Race to the Top, Early Learning Challenge Grant (RTTT – ELC)***

On December 16, 2011, Maryland received the US Department of Education four-year, \$50 million Race To The Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTTT – ELC) Grant. Maryland was one of only nine states receiving an award. The RTTT – ELC grant will enable Maryland to create a seamless Birth to Grade 12 reform agenda to ensure that all young children and their families are supported in the State's efforts to overcome school readiness gaps and to move early childhood education in Maryland from a good system to a great system. The MSDE is the fiscal agent for the grant and its Division of Early Childhood Development (DECD) takes the lead in applying the funds. The Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education advises the MSDE on the implementation of the RTT-ELC State Plan. Participating state agencies, including the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH), the Maryland Department of Human Resources (DHR), and the Governor's Office for Children (GOC), collaborate with the MSDE in support of the State Plan. Ten innovative projects address the scope of Maryland's RTTT – ELC State Plan.

### ***ESEA Flexibility Waiver***

On May 29, 2012, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) approved Maryland's request for ESEA Flexibility for the 2012-2013 and the 2013-2014 school years. The ED provided all ESEA Flexibility States with the opportunity to apply for an Extension to this ESEA Flexibility for the 2014-2015 school year. Maryland sought to extend ESEA flexibility through the end of the 2014–2015 school year because the implementation of the flexibility has enhanced the ability of the MSDE and the local school systems to increase the quality of instruction for all students as well as improve their achievement levels. The waiver has allowed Maryland to target resources and implement rigorous interventions in our lowest performing schools. Maryland believes that the flexibility of the waiver has allowed the State and its LSSs to focus on implementing the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards, transition to the College and Career-Ready PARCC Assessments, provide support, recognition, and intervention to all Maryland public schools, and develop a teacher and principal evaluation system that incorporates student growth as a major component.

### ***The MSDE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)***

The overarching goal of the MSDE's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is to improve mathematics achievement results for students with disabilities in Pre-K through Grade 6. Over the remaining two and a half years of this grant Maryland will continue to use SPDG funds to accomplish three major project goals by providing technical assistance and ongoing support to build capacity at the State, LSS, and school levels. The following shows the goals and description of how the State is working toward achieving SPDG goals:

*Goal 1: Increase use of data-informed decision-making and implementation science application by State, district and school leaders.* The State, in partnership with JHU-CTE, has developed a protocol, **TAP-IT**, for data-based decision making that provides guidance for: **T**eam formation, **A**nalysis of student learning and teacher implementation data, **P**lan action steps to address identified needs, **I**mplementation, and **T**racking progress and implementation data to enable informed decision-making for needed adjustments to the SPDG program at participating schools. The State is also providing ongoing support at the school level for use of the **Snapshot Data Tool**. Teachers use this tool to collect classroom assessment information on a daily or weekly basis. This enables teachers to monitor student progress and adjust their instruction based on student needs.

*Goal 2: Increase use of evidence-based practices in early and elementary math instruction*

The evidence-based practices selected for this project are Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Team Based Cycle of Instruction (TBCI), and Structured Cooperative Learning. By providing ongoing support with the formation and operation of an LSS-IT, the MSDE has helped the LSS to develop a district level system of ongoing support for the implementation of evidence-based strategies with fidelity.

*Goal 3: Increase parent involvement in educational decision-making and instruction*

The MSDE has partnered with its Parent Information and Training (PTI) center, Parents' Place of Maryland (PPMD) to provide training to families on mathematics activities to be used with their students at home. In addition, the MSDE, in partnership with the PPMD, has developed an innovation that integrates parent/family involvement into instructional delivery. This was

accomplished by introducing a new component into TBCI. This component, **Family Connections**, provides a routine way for teachers to address their professional responsibility to communicate with families. The **Family Connections** are made through the Community Standard “*Explain what you’ve learned to your family team member*”, the Honeycomb for Home activity, and the Expectation “*Answer the Challenge Question and share with family*”.

### ***Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT)***

Maryland is one of five (5) States in the nation to participate in the SWIFT Center partnership. SWIFT is a national K-8 technical assistance center committed to eliminating silos in education by bridging general and specialized education through academic and behavioral supports, creating powerful learning opportunities for all students and teachers, and promoting active, engaged partnerships among families and community members. Four local school systems in Maryland are participating in the SWIFT Center work with four schools identified in each system. The MSDE DSE/EIS collaborates with the Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability (DCAA) and Division of Student, Family and School Support (DSFSS) to implement this initiative. SWIFT uses implantation science and TA tools aligned with implementation frameworks developed by the SISEP Center, with a framework to promote inclusive school practices in five domains:

- Collaborative and Distributed Leadership
- Multi-tiered System of Academic and Behavioral Supports with data-informed decision making
- Integrated Organizational System
- Positive family and community partnerships
- Aligned Inclusive Policy

### ***Bridges Systems Change Initiative***

In March 2014, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services released a Request for Proposal for a highly competitive State IDEA Set-aside grant to affect change system-wide, birth through 21 years of age. The Bridges for Systems Change Initiative Grant is aligned with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: [Moving Maryland Forward](#) and supports the attainment of the goals and objectives of the strategically targeted Action Imperatives. It requires a strong systemic commitment to the design, implementation, and evaluation of sustainable/scalable processes and products in collaboration with family and community, Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), the Regional Comprehensive Center, the DSE/EIS, and identified partners. This opportunity was established to serve as a catalyst for supporting local jurisdictions, the DSE/EIS, and their strategic partners in developing an infrastructure that provides a seamless, coordinated, and comprehensive system of services for Maryland’s infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities, and their families through the braiding of funds to blend programs. This highly competitive grant has been awarded to one LSS to significantly **enhance, restructure, and transform** services within their existing system for improved results; specifically to increase the academic performance of African American students which will directly reduce the number of African American students referred and found eligible for special education services.

### ***Attendance Matters Campaign***

The MDSE is partnering with **Attendance Works**, a national nonprofit, to declare September as “Attendance Awareness Month.” The MSDE works with local school systems and leaders to get students in school, keep them there, and move them along the track to college and career. **Attendance Works** released a report detailing the correlation between attendance and achievement. It can be found at [www.attendanceworks.org](http://www.attendanceworks.org). In partnership with **Attendance Works**, the MSDE is making available a wealth of tools and strategies that can be used to fight chronic absenteeism. For **LSS leaders** it is important to provide data and offer support, including the development of a plan to prioritize local needs. **School leaders** must make attendance a priority and provide resources to implement effective attendance plans. **Community leaders and partners** can support district and school efforts by linking community resources—including afterschool, health, and mentoring, family support, and food and nutrition programs— to meet student needs.

## **E. Representatives involved (2(e))**

The following relevant external education organizations, representing LSS personnel, local school boards, local superintendents, Institutions of Higher Education, content specialists, parents, families, the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), and advocates supported the development of Phase I of Maryland’s SSIP.

- Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)
- Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education
- Local Directors of Special Education
- Local Preschool Coordinators
- Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)
- Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)
- Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)
- Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)
- Maryland Association of Teacher Educators (MATE)
- Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)
- Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health
- Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)
- Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)
- Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family
- Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)
- Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)
- Maryland State Family Child Care Association (MSFCCA)
- Parents' Place of Maryland
- Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)
- Ready At Five Partnership
- Schoolwide Integration for Transformation (SWIFT) Center
- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)
- State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)
- University of Maryland – Department of Education Policy Studies

The following relevant internal MSDE stakeholders, included representatives from the MSDE Divisions that support the components of State infrastructure that influence and leverage change in State and LSSs include:

- **Office of the State Superintendent,**
  - Race to the Top Coordinator & Teacher/Principal Evaluation (RTTT)
- **Office of the Chief Operating Officer,**
  - Division of Business Services



- Division of Rehabilitation Services
- **Office of School Effectiveness**
  - Division of Academic Policy and Innovation (ESEA Waiver)
  - Division of Educator Effectiveness
  - Division of Student, Family, and School Support (Title I)
- **Office of Teaching and Learning**
  - Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability (Breakthrough Center)
  - Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (SPDG, SWIFT, Bridges Systems Change Initiative, Strategic Plan)
  - Division of College and Career Readiness

With the selection of the SIMR, the relevant external and internal stakeholders were identified. These stakeholders have direct State or local involvement with LSSs, State initiatives aligned with the SIMR, families, professionals, and advocates. The following relevant Internal and external stakeholders are committed to supporting the implementation of Phase II of the SSIP:

- Local Directors of Special Education
- Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)
- Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education
- Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)
- Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)
- Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)
- Maryland Association of Teacher Educators (MATE)
- Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)
- Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health
- Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)
- Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)
- Maryland Department of Disabilities
- Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)
- Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family
- Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)
- Parents' Place of Maryland
- Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)
- Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)
- **Office of the State Superintendent**
  - Race to the Top Coordinator & Teacher/Principal Evaluation (RTTT)

- **Office of School Effectiveness**

- Division of Academic Policy and Innovation (ESEA Waiver)
- Division of Student, Family, and School Support (Title I)

- **Office of Teaching and Learning**

- Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability (Breakthrough Center)
- Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (SPDG, SWIFT, Bridges Systems Change Initiative, Strategic Plan)

The role of the external and internal stakeholders will be to work with the DSE/EIS to develop Phase II of the SSIP to address: 1) State and local infrastructure development; 2) support for the LSSs to implement Evidence Based Practices; and 3) Design an Evaluation Plan.

## F. Stakeholder Involvement (2(f))

The MSDE engaged both external and internal stakeholders in discussions and feedback related to State and local capacity. Stakeholders participated in a total of five (5) facilitated meetings using the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) process for analysis. They were also provided information and the opportunity to examine alignment and coordination of the MSDE Offices/Divisions. The MSDE and stakeholders also reviewed the results of the adapted State Capacity Assessment (SCA) conducted in late spring 2014.

All stakeholders were invited to attend each meeting and then given the opportunity to provide feedback to the infrastructure analysis after meeting notes were distributed. Some stakeholders were unable to regularly attend stakeholder workgroup meetings due to preexisting commitments, but provided significant input outside of meetings. The Assistant State Superintendent of the DSE/EIS and the MSDE Executive Team, for example, was heavily involved in each step of the SSIP process through internal planning meetings and document reviews.

### Internal Stakeholders

Stakeholder	11/10/14	12/10/14	1/12/15	2/5/15
Chief of Staff	X	X	X	X
Special Assistant to the State Superintendent (STEM)	X	X	X	X
Executive Director, Governmental Relations	X	X	X	X
Director, Departmental Coordination & National Legislative Liaison	X	X	X	X
Race to the Top Coordinator & Teacher/Principal Evaluations	X	X	X	X
Chief Operating Officer	X	X	X	X
Division of Business Services	X	X	X	X
Office of Human Resources	X	X	X	X
Office of Information Technology	X	X	X	X
Division of Rehabilitation Services	X	X	X	X
Office of School Effectiveness	X	X	X	X
Division of Academic Policy and Innovation	X	X	X	X



Division of Educator Effectiveness	X	X	X	X
Division of Student, Family, and School Support	X	X	X	X
Director, Program Improvement and Family Support Branch (Title I) Division of Student, Family, and School Support	X	X	X	X
Office of Teaching and Learning	X	X	X	X
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Division of Early Childhood Development	X	X	X	X
Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability	X	X	X	X
Division of Career and College Readiness	X	X	X	X
Division of Library Development and Services	X	X	X	X
Branch Chief, Policy & Accountability, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Branch Chief, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Research Consultant, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X	X	X
Consultant	X	X	X	X

### ***External Stakeholder Input***

The external stakeholders represented families, disability organizations, advocacy organizations, general and special education instructional personnel, LSS leadership, Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), local Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECACs), and State organizations representing families and teachers that collaborate on various IDEA services and issues. Areas of expertise among these stakeholders included district and school administration, parent partnerships, delivery of multi-tiered instruction and interventions, data analysis, policy planning, early intervention, early childhood services, behavior interventions, mathematics instruction, and inclusive practices for students who need the most comprehensive supports.

#### External Stakeholders

Stakeholders	11/10/14	12/10/14	1/15/15
Parents	X	X	X

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)	X	X	X
Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECAC)	X	X	X
Parents' Place of Maryland (PPMD)	X	X	X
Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)	X	X	X
Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	X	X	X
Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)	X	X	X
Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)	X	X	X
Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)	X	X	X
Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X	X	X
State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)	X	X	X
Ready At Five Partnership	X	X	X
Maryland State Family Child Care Association (MSFCCA)	X	X	X
Maryland Association of Teacher Educators (MATE)	X	X	X
Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family	X	X	X
University of Maryland – Department of Education Policy Studies	X	X	X
Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)	X	X	X
Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE)	X	X	X
Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health	X	X	X
Maryland Department of Disabilities (MDOD)	X	X	X
Maryland Department of Human Resources	X	X	X
Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X	X	X
Local Directors of Special Education	X	X	X

Local Preschool Coordinators	X	X	X
Schoolwide integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center	X	X	X

**Stakeholder meeting #5 (11/10/2014)** - Stakeholders were provided an overview of the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP's) purpose for having states conduct the infrastructure analysis: to have states look at how their agency is working as a whole, not just in the area of special education, in order to see how initiatives are or can be aligned, how activities such as professional development are coordinated, and where coordination and collaboration can be improved. Stakeholders received information about the MSDE infrastructure:

- ü Organizational structure of the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE);
- ü Special Education Strategic Plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*;
- ü Two Race to the Top grants;
- ü ESEA Flexibility Waiver;
- ü Division's State Professional Development Grant (SPDG);
- ü Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT);
- ü Bridges for System Change Initiative; and
- ü Resources for Professional Learning and Development (PLD), and technical assistance.

Following this review, stakeholders worked in groups on infrastructure analysis using the SWOT analysis process. The areas for analysis included **Governance, Data, Quality Standards, Personnel Development/Technical Assistance, and Accountability/Monitoring.**

Each small group conducted two analyses and then worked as a whole group to discuss and modify each analysis. It was noted that the state elections may affect state leadership and there have been personnel changes at the MSDE. Emphasis was also put on the need for coaching to be an integral part of professional learning and development.

As a result of this initial SWOT analysis, stakeholders made the following observations:

Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<b>Governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Vision and mission of DSE/EIS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Too many initiatives, not aligned</li> <li>· No systematic plan statewide that crosses divisions</li> </ul>	Only 24 LSSs – easier to engage in dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Lack of alignment and coordination</li> </ul>
<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Data available online – MD Report Card, Complaints/due process, distributed at meetings</li> <li>· LADSS</li> <li>· Preschool Readiness Data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Available online, yet hard to find</li> <li>· Access</li> <li>· Inconsistent databases across LSSs</li> <li>· Accuracy of the data</li> <li>· Indicator 8 – some data not disaggregated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Generate a variety of data reports from SLDS (LADSS)</li> <li>· Teach parents how to look at data</li> <li>· Local systems can drill down</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Changing assessments (Readiness, Statewide) lose the ability to look at data over time</li> </ul>

Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
		enough; response rates		
<b>Quality Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Moving Maryland Forward</i> (State strategic plan)</li> <li>· Meetings including general and special ed</li> <li>· Inclusion of advocates and SECAC members in events, such as leadership conference where information is disseminated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Uneven dissemination of info to people/public in local school systems</li> <li>○ Info stays at the top</li> <li>○ Staff turnover</li> </ul> <p>State beginning to focus on quality as part of accountability. There is a plan in place – some intense work has begun with a few LSSs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Standards are unifying the work of the State and driving everything the Division of Special Ed/EIS is doing</li> <li>· State using data to prioritize TA and decision-making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Shift in state leadership (elections)</li> <li>· Budget concerns</li> <li>· Personnel changes at state (MSDE)</li> </ul>
<b>Personnel Development/ Technical Assistance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· State provides flexible dollars for LEAs to develop and implement specific PL</li> <li>· State monitors [that] dollars are used according to evidence based practices and standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Lack of time, dollars, knowledge to provide PLD, ongoing <b>coaching</b> – may impact LSSs</li> <li>· Not everybody who needs PLD gets it (e.g., gen ed and support personnel)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide onsite TA to LEAs</li> <li>· Provide resources</li> <li>· Blending resources is an opportunity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Budget concerns</li> <li>· State leadership changes (election)</li> <li>· Personnel changes (MSDE)</li> </ul>
<b>Accountability/ Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· MMSR</li> <li>· MDIDEA report</li> <li>· MSA</li> <li>· MD Report Card</li> <li>· SESAC, SICC, SSIP Stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Data reported annually but not necessarily analyzed systematically</li> <li>· Separate accountability plans, doesn't seem cohesive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Develop short-term accountability goals</li> <li>· Actually analyze data on a regular basis and develop action plans</li> <li>· State lead stakeholder meetings</li> <li>· Compare data with other states</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Lack of cohesion</li> <li>· Accountability silos</li> <li>· Teacher prep/PD – special and general ed</li> <li>· Will for change.</li> </ul>

Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leverage various initiatives to support students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	

**Stakeholder meeting #6 (12/10/2014)** – By this time it was agreed that math performance would be targeted for grades 3 – 5. Data related to the gap in math performance over time in these grades were reviewed. It was also agreed to target districts participating in the SPDG and SWIFT Center. Both efforts have prioritized math performance and were at initial stages of exploration (SWIFT) and installation (SPDG). Additionally, an LSS receiving a significant state discretionary grant was included. External stakeholders met to take a deeper look at the MSDE infrastructure. Specifically, they examined the components of the MSDE infrastructure in relationship to the targeted SIMR and in conjunction with the identification of root causes of poor performance. This meeting also provided time for stakeholders to have initial discussions about strategies to address improvement of the SIMR.

- **Infrastructure review:** Preliminary discussion of root causes (barriers) included low expectations of students with disabilities, teacher preparation in math, lack of parental knowledge of “today’s math,” paraprofessionals acting as the child’s teacher in the classroom, learned helplessness in students, and lack of meaningful access to curriculum. Leverage points are the State’s move toward using Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles, co-teaching emphasis across the State, cooperative learning in elementary schools, and increased use of technology in the classroom. Potential evidence based strategies in professional learning, instruction, organizational structure of schools, and family/community engagement were identified. It is notable that **UDL, tiered instruction, and culturally competent instruction** were identified in multiple areas.

### Internal Stakeholder Input

**Stakeholder Meeting #7 (1/12/2015)** The Assistant State Superintendent, DSE/EIS provided an overview of the SSIP process to the State Superintendent’s Executive Leadership Team. She enlisted their engagement and support in the SSIP process of infrastructure analysis to address the SIMR and to develop coordinated and collaborative strategies for improvement of results for children and youth with disabilities in Maryland. Specifically, the Assistant State Superintendent, DSE/EIS asked for a representative from each of the Leadership Team areas to meet as an internal stakeholder group and that the Executive Leadership Team would continue to engage in dialogue throughout the phases of the SSIP.

See Stakeholder Meeting #8 in Section 3E.

**Stakeholder Meeting #9 (2/5/2015)** - For the internal stakeholder meeting it was decided to combine the Part C and Part B SWOT analyses. This was decided for several reasons and purposes. An important reason was that the DSE/EIS is responsible for both Part C and Part B programs. As such, the Division’s strategic plan spans the birth through 21 early intervention and special education services. It was decided that taking this unified approach with representatives of the Executive Leadership Team provided a comprehensive approach to address both infrastructure analysis and to begin to consider Phase II, infrastructure development. Additionally, by approaching the infrastructure analysis in this unified manner, it was expected to see the extent to which there were cross program strengths and opportunities for improvement.

The Internal MSDE stakeholders representing the State Superintendent’s Executive Team representatives received a brief presentation on the IDEA State Systemic Improvement Plan process. They reviewed and discussed a combined SWOT analysis by external stakeholders for Part C (Early Intervention Services, Birth - 4) and for Part B (Special Education, 3 -21). Additionally, they engaged in analysis and discussion of the infrastructure analyses. They paid particular attention to the **Governance** and **Fiscal** strengths, opportunities, threats, and weaknesses. Below is a chart of the internal MSDE SWOT Analysis:

Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<b>Governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vision and mission of DSE/EIS</li> <li>Extended IFSP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variability among jurisdictions</li> <li>Too many</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 24 LSSs – easier to engage in dialogue</li> <li>SICC/ SESAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-transparency of SSIP process</li> <li>Change in State</li> </ul>

Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Online IFSP for all families</li> <li>Early Childhood Intervention &amp; Education (ECIE) w/DECD in same department (collaboration)</li> <li>Matrix leadership w/EI in all</li> <li>Braided funding</li> <li>Making access happen</li> <li>Birth mandate</li> <li>Eligibility criteria</li> <li>Only 24 LSSs – easier to engage in dialogue (autonomy )</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>initiatives</li> <li>Collaboration between ECIE &amp; DECD               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o improving</li> </ul> </li> <li>Lack of needed staff support</li> <li>Change from compliance to outcome</li> <li>Conceptual strength current status is opportunity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evolving collaboration between ECIE and DECD</li> <li>Transition to results based outcomes (Shift in balance in compliance to outcome)</li> <li>Maryland Learning Links</li> <li>Grants</li> <li>Limited systematic plan statewide that crosses divisions</li> <li>ECAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership in Annapolis</li> <li>Lack of alignment and coordination</li> <li>Competing interests</li> <li>Budget cuts</li> </ul>
<b>Fiscal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal and state competitive grant opportunities</li> <li>Division offers local priority – local use of funds</li> <li>Fiscal workgroup that drives through data where money will be spent (stakeholder input)</li> <li>Use federal money to share staff throughout MSDE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies and procedures are daunting even as welcomed</li> <li>ESEA flex plan currently does not support Title 1 103A funds</li> <li>Bureaucracy of how many signatures, timelines – slowness of the process for checks and balances</li> <li>Fiscal process is time consuming</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget cuts requiring MSDE to look at other sources of funds/creative ways and partnerships</li> <li>Beneficial to have cross divisional plans to learn how to leverage funds better; cost sharing – integrate funding</li> <li>More opportunities for braiding funding</li> <li>Shared staff for overlapping divisions to work on similar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State government turnover – changes in priorities</li> </ul>

Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share initiatives</li> <li>Purchasing policies and procedures – guidelines and training</li> <li>Title 1 103A – funds could be available to support this area</li> <li>Having only 24 LSSs allows for leveraging of partnerships</li> <li>Strong monitoring and accountability protocols for fiscal</li> <li>Share funds with Division of Early Childhood</li> <li>Leverage of federal funds</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>projects/initiatives</li> <li>Cross divisional plans</li> <li>Creating a fiscal workbook for consistency, clarity, maximize completion time, comprehensive workbook</li> <li>Prioritizing funding activities</li> </ul>	
<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data available online – MD Report Card, Complaints/due process data, distributed at meetings</li> <li>LADSS</li> <li>Preschool Readiness Data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Available online, yet hard to find</li> <li>Access</li> <li>Inconsistent databases across LSSs</li> <li>Accuracy of the data</li> <li>Indicator 8 – some data not disaggregated enough; response rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generate a variety of data reports from SLDS (LADSS)</li> <li>Teach parents how to look at data</li> <li>Local systems can drill down</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing assessments (Readiness, Statewide) lose the ability to look at data over time</li> </ul>
<b>Quality Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Moving Maryland Forward</i> (State strategic plan)</li> <li>Meetings including general and special ed</li> <li>Inclusion of advocates and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uneven dissemination of info to people/public in local school systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Info stays at the top</li> <li>Staff</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards are unifying the work of the State and driving everything the Division of Special Ed/EIS is doing</li> <li>State using data to prioritize TA and decision-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shift in state leadership (elections)</li> <li>Budget concerns</li> <li>Personnel changes at state (MSDE)</li> </ul>

Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	SECAC members in events, such as leadership conference where information is disseminated	turnover  State beginning to focus on quality as part of accountability. There is a plan in place – some intense work has begun with a few LSSs	making	
<b>Personnel Development/ Technical Assistance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State provides flexible dollars for LEAs to develop and implement specific PL</li> <li>State monitors [that] dollars are used according to evidence based practices and standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of time, dollars, knowledge to provide PLD, ongoing coaching – may impact LSSs</li> <li>Not everybody who needs PLD gets it (e.g., gen ed and support personnel)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide onsite TA to LEAs</li> <li>Provide resources</li> <li>Blending resources is an opportunity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget concerns</li> <li>State leadership changes (election)</li> <li>Personnel changes (MSDE)</li> </ul>
<b>Accountability/ Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Online data system               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MD IDEA Report</li> <li>MD Report Card</li> </ul> </li> <li>MMSR</li> <li>MSA</li> <li>State oversight of data system</li> <li>Linking funds for program improvement</li> <li>Posting of data/outcomes lends to accountability</li> <li>Looking at outcomes regularly</li> <li>SESAC, SICC, SSIP Stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just starting to focus on outcome data so lack of longitudinal data</li> <li>Determining outcomes related to personnel</li> <li>Variability in/across jurisdictions               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different personnel</li> <li>Different focuses</li> </ul> </li> <li>Data reported annually but not necessarily analyzed systematically</li> <li>Separate accountability plans, doesn't seem cohesive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refine data for all the variables</li> <li>Develop short-term accountability goals</li> <li>Online IFSP</li> <li>Dev. screening</li> <li>Analyze data on a regular basis and develop action plans</li> <li>Stakeholder input and receptiveness to partnerships within MITP</li> <li>State-lead stakeholder meetings</li> <li>Compare data with other states</li> <li>Extended option offers focus on children who might have fallen through "cracks"</li> <li>Leverage various initiatives to support students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of cohesion</li> <li>Dev. screening</li> <li>Lack of state and local resources to fully implement the SSIP process</li> <li>Accountability silos</li> <li>Teacher prep/ PD-separate special and general ed</li> <li>Will for change</li> </ul>



Infrastructure Components	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
			with disabilities	

There are a number of infrastructure strengths:

- A strategic plan that lays out the vision and mission for the DSE/EIS within the broader mission of the MSDE provides a strong governance component;
- Databases that capture most of the individual student information and make it possible to have an online IEP for managing individual student data, LSS data, and aggregating for state data reports. Data reporting that provides both the MSDE and the public with multiple ways of examining and comparing data for students with disabilities, as well as for all students.
- Innovative and creative methods have been used to leverage fiscal resources as well as ensure accountable management and reporting of the use of funds with standardized protocols for monitoring and accountability;
- Quality standards are in place to guide both teacher preparation programs and the MSDE in professional development activities. There are also quality standards for how professional development is delivered to align with adult learning principles;
- Professional Learning and Development and Technical Assistance are guided by the Tiered Approach, Differentiated Framework, as well as the professional learning and development database that supports identifying needs and how they were addressed; and
- DSE/EIS has developed a strong accountability and monitoring component through the Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) and the Differentiated Framework.

There are also areas in which the MSDE and the DSE/EIS need improvement. These include further developing and strengthening the cross-divisional communications' channels to continue to support coordination and collaboration. Similarly, there is a need to continue to explore ways that fiscal and human resources can be leveraged and shared to support efficiency and effectiveness of operations that lead to student improvement. There is a wealth of data; yet, a need exists to develop and expand the skills of the MSDE, LSSs, schools, and classroom personnel to use the available data. There is also a need to expand the public's knowledge of the available data and how to access reports of interest. Specifically related to the SIMR area of math, it is recognized that until the last few years much emphasis had been placed on literacy without as much concerted focus on math. This provides an area that can be developed and expanded. The MSDE and the DSE/EIS intend to build on the strengths in order to address the infrastructure improvement areas.

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Measurable Results for Students with Disabilities

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

#### State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

#### A. SIMR Statement (3(a))

The Maryland Part B State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is ***to increase the mathematics proficiency of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 in six (6) LSSs***. The MSDE, DSE/EIS identified this child outcome as a result of the iterative data and infrastructure analyses with internal and external stakeholders that identified the strengths of the MSDE infrastructure and State initiatives for coordination within and across Divisions.

Description

#### B. Data and Infrastructure Analyses Substantiating the SIMR (3(b))

The average math achievement gaps for children with disabilities in grades 3 – 5, as compared to their nondisabled peers are 38.2, 39.4, and 44.8 percentage points, respectively (see also Data section 1, Data Results). The average math achievement gap for children with disabilities in grades 6 – 8 compared to their nondisabled peers is 41.1 percentage points. Although the achievement gap is larger in grades 6-8, research shows that the effects of low-quality instruction in math (as well as other subject areas) are cumulative (Pianta et al., 2007). Among children with math under-achievement in the primary grades, approximately two thirds continue to experience difficulties not only through primary school (Mazzocco & Myers, 2003) but also into middle school (Chong & Siegel, 2008; Mazzocco & Devlin, 2008).

There was much discussion in the Stakeholder meetings about whether the SIMR should address closing the gap, as is the case in several federal initiatives, or increasing the percent of students with disabilities who score proficient and above on the statewide assessment of mathematics. It was noted that while the gap between the performance of students with disabilities and all students has not appreciably decreased over the last five or six years, the percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient and above in mathematics on the statewide assessment has generally increased in a parallel trajectory as that of all students. It was also noted that in aligning with indicator 3C, proficiency rate is the key measurement. From these discussions and observations, it was determined that the SIMR would address *increasing the mathematics proficiency of students with disabilities*.

Mathematical underachievement ultimately has lifelong consequences. Success in mathematics promotes success in occupations and gains in socioeconomic status (Parsons & Brynner, 1997; Rivera-Batiz, 1992). Beyond career success, low math achievement affects financial decision making and healthcare risk assessment (Hibbard, Peters, Dixon, & Tusler, 2007), as well as social activities (McCloskey, 2007).

The MSDE has also chosen to focus on increasing math proficiency in grades 3 – 5 to leverage alignment with existing initiatives. As was noted above, the MSDE examined statewide initiatives. One of those is the SPDG with a math emphasis on similar grades in three LSSs. Another initiative with a focus on integrity of implementation is the SWIFT Center work which is being initiated in four LSSs. In addition to these two initiatives the one LSS that received a significant Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services competitive grant from State IDEA set-aside funds to engage in implementation science to support schools and classrooms to impact student outcomes and build local capacity to sustain evidence-based practices was considered. The geographic distribution of the LSSs was examined, as well as the ethnic/racial diversity. One additional LSS was included in this preliminary round for consideration.

From this initial pool of 9 LSSs (9/24 = 38%), several factors were analyzed and examined. Data specific to these nine (9)

LSSs and the state were examined to determine the percent of students scoring proficient and advanced at each grade for the past three years. Discussions focused on the current capacity of the MSDE to support work in the LSSs. Factors associated with the LSSs were also considered – have there been leadership changes, does the LSS have sufficient resources – personnel and financial – to enhance or expand current initiative work. In the final analysis it was determined that six (6) LSSs would be included in the SSIP. This represents 25% (6/24) of Maryland's LSSs and over 20% of the total number of students with disabilities. These LSSs also provide geographic, racial, and ethnic diversity. All six (6) have agreed to participate in the SSIP Phase II planning process and Phase III implementation and evaluation.

### C. SIMR as Child-Family-Level Outcome (3(c))

The SIMR is aligned with the IDEA Part B SPP Indicator 3C relative to the achievement of children with disabilities in mathematics. Although the SIMR is aligned, it does not duplicate Indicator 3C. The SIMR is specific to mathematics, while Indicator 3C includes reading and mathematics. The SIMR addresses grades 3, 4, and 5, while Indicator 3C addresses all grades tested – grades 3-8 and high school. The SIMR is applicable to only six LSSs, while Indicator 3C applies to all students with disabilities taking the statewide assessment. The SIMR will support statewide improvement on Indicator 3C as improvement strategies are implemented.

### D. Stakeholder Involvement in Selecting the SIMR (3(d))

Over a series of meetings as described in Data Analysis, Sections 1(F), Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2(F), and SIMR, Section 3(D), internal and external stakeholders examined and asked questions of data and of the State infrastructure capacity to identify the SIMR. As noted earlier, an iterative approach was used with stakeholder meetings, even as in this document's elements and activities are described in a linear manner. This approach allowed stakeholders to examine data as well as learn about State-level initiatives and priorities, such as those in the Special Education Strategic Plan, in the same meeting to build shared knowledge. In subsequent meetings new elements would be added while reviewing data and information from previous meetings. For example, in the November meeting a description based on the previous data analyses was given in the area of SIMR focus (math) before conducting the infrastructure SWOT analysis. In order to leverage the systemic work being conducted in the LSSs participating in the SPDG and SWIFT Center partnership – both of which are also prioritizing math performance – stakeholders agreed that LSSs, participating in the SPDG and SWIFT Center partnership, and located across all 6 regions of the state, should be targeted.

#### Internal Stakeholders

Stakeholder	1/12/15	1/15/15
Chief of Staff	X	X
Special Assistant to the State Superintendent (STEM)	X	X
Executive Director, Governmental Relations	X	X
Director, Departmental Coordination & National Legislative Liaison	X	X
Race to the Top Coordinator & Teacher/Principal Evaluations	X	X
Chief Operating Officer	X	X
Division of Business Services	X	X
Office of Human Resources	X	X
Office of Information Technology	X	X
Division of Rehabilitation Services	X	X
Office of School Effectiveness	X	X

Division of Academic Policy and Innovation	X	X
Division of Educator Effectiveness	X	X
Division of Student, Family, and School Support	X	X
Director, Program Improvement and Family Support Branch (Title I)	X	X
Office of Teaching and Learning	X	X
Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services	X	X
Division of Early Childhood Development	X	X
Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability	X	X
Division of Career and College Readiness	X	X
Division of Library Development and Services	X	X
Branch Chief, Policy & Accountability, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Educational Program Specialist, Math, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Educational Program Specialist, SPDG, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Research Consultant, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Consultant	X	X

External Stakeholders

Stakeholders	1/15//15
Parents	X
Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)	X

Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECAC)	X
Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD)	X
Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)	X
Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)	X
Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)	X
Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	X
Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)	X
Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	X
Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)	X
Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)	X
Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)	X
Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X
State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)	X
Read y At Five Partnership	X
Maryland State Family Child Care Association (MSFCCA)	X
Maryland Association of Teacher Educator s (MATE)	X
Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family	X
University of Maryland – Department of Education Policy Studies	X
Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)	X
Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE)	X
Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health	X
Maryland Department of Disabilities (MDOD)	X
Maryland Department of Human Resources	X
Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X
Local Directors of Special Education	X
Local Preschool Coordinators	X

Schoolwide integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center	X
-------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Stakeholder Meeting #7 (1/12/2015)** The Assistant State Superintendent, DSE/EIS provided an overview of the SSIP process to the State Superintendent's Executive Leadership Team. She enlisted their engagement and support in the SSIP process of infrastructure analysis to address the SIMR and to develop coordinated and collaborative strategies for improvement of results for children and youth with disabilities in Maryland. Specifically, the Assistant State Superintendent, DSE/EIS asked for a representative from each of the Leadership Team areas to meet as an internal stakeholder group and that the Executive Leadership Team would continue to engage in dialogue throughout the phases of the SSIP.

**Stakeholder Meeting #8 (1/15/2015)** – The stakeholders met in January to review the data and infrastructure analysis, finalize discussion of the SIMR, identify and review root causes, establish reasonable targets, generate broad areas of improvement based upon the previous meeting activity of “what’s working” and “what is not working” and to review and react to a draft Theory of Action. Please see also Stakeholder Meetings #6, #7, and #9 in Infrastructure Analysis, Section 2(F).

## E. Baseline Data and Targets (3(e))

The MSDE will support efforts to increase the number of children with disabilities scoring Proficient or above and target an average increase of three percentage points from the baseline average score percentage after the first two years of implementation. The chart below illustrates this rate of improvement to be ambitious and achievable. This target will raise the average percentage of children with disabilities scoring Proficient or above on Maryland's Statewide assessment of mathematics by nine (9) percentage points in five years. Baseline data for FFY 2013 (2013-2014 school year) is student performance as measured using scores on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA). Please note that beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, students will take the applicable Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment, based on Maryland's College and Career-Ready Standards aligned with the Common Core. This new assessment will require future standard setting and establishment of targets and at least two years of assessment data before the MSDE is able to predict trends. The baseline and targets established in the SSIP will require future revision.

FFY	Average Percentage of Students with Disabilities At or Above Proficient at Grades 3, 4, and 5 in the Six (6) Selected LSSs
2013 (Baseline)	35%
2014	35%
2015	35%
2016	38%
2017	41%
2018	44%

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

## 4. Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

### A. How Improvement Strategies were Selected (4(a))

Based on the review of data and State infrastructure analyses internal and external stakeholders identified existing evidence-based practices used within other aligned State initiatives. Please refer to the data identified in Data Analysis, Section 1(B), State infrastructure in Section 2(B-D), and State Identified Measurable Result, Section 3(B). From this broad based examination, improvement strategy areas emerged, were discussed, and refined.

Maryland has chosen 5 improvement strategies based on the data analysis that will build the State capacity to support capacity building and improvement in LSSs. These strategies are:

1. Data-informed decision making for continuous improvement;
2. Family engagement and partnership to promote family involvement and student success;
3. High quality general education math instruction based on principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to increase student engagement and learning;
4. Multi-tiered system of supports with evidence-based math instruction and interventions to provide tailored instruction for math deficits; and
5. Equitable access to the general education curriculum and classroom through culturally responsive interactions and specialized instruction for students with disabilities within the regular classroom.

MSDE will support the implementation of these improvement strategies by:

- Increasing collaboration across the MSDE Divisions to provide professional learning and TA in math instruction and culturally responsive practices; and
- Leveraging the resources of the SWIFT, the SPDG, and the competitive State IDEA set-aside Bridges for Systems Change Initiative grant to build upon the LSSs and schools actively engaged in a State TA relationship.

The frameworks of implementation science will be used to identify specific practices within those strategies to implement. DSE/EIS will leverage the SPDG, SWIFT, and other work currently being implemented in the six LSSs to engage in a practice-policy feedback loop. These improvement strategies were selected because they provide a coherent approach and are related to the State's specific needs: 1) narrowing gaps in academic achievement, 2) implementing the College and Career Ready Standards, 3) improving math learning for all students, 4) increasing the use of data-informed decision making, 5) helping educators choose appropriate evidence-based practices, 6) scaling up use of evidence-based practices, 7) providing effective professional development, and 8) increasing family involvement. In addition, they provide the flexibility needed to customize State support to local contexts by increasing the LSSs organizational capacity to sustain evidence-based practices that are yielding improvements in student achievement and to scale up those practices with fidelity.

### B. How Improvement Strategies are Sound, Logical, and Aligned (4(b))



Research indicates that many interventions in education fail due to inadequate implementation (Fixsen, D. L., & Blase, K. A., 2009; Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Duda, M. A., Naoom, S. F., & Van Dyke, M., 2010; Fixsen, D., Blasé, K., Horner, R., Sugai, G., Sims, B., & Duda, M., 2012). What is unique about the DSE/EIS improvement strategies is that they are focused on putting into place structural components that support local capacity building, not just implementing evidence-based math practices. Maryland has chosen improvement strategies that are sound, logical, and aligned from a research perspective, as well as from the data and infrastructure analyses, including identifying LSSs that combine the installation of evidence-based practices, and will result in improvement in the State's SIMR.

## 1. *Data-informed Decision Making for Continuous Improvement*

Over the past decade, educators in Maryland and elsewhere have become interested in and committed to using data-informed decision making (also often referred to as data-based or data-driven decision making). Its use at the central office, school, and classroom levels is encouraged. Teachers, principals, and administrators systematically collect and analyze various types of data, including input, process, outcome and satisfaction data, to guide a range of decisions to help improve the success of students and schools. Achievement test data, in particular, play a prominent role among practitioners—in large part due to increased emphasis on data as a result of the requirements of NCLB (Massell, 2001).

However, the existence of data does not guarantee its use. Raw data must be organized and combined with an understanding of the situation to yield **information**. Information becomes **actionable knowledge** when data users synthesize the information, apply judgment to prioritize it, and weigh the relative merits of possible solutions. At this point, actionable knowledge can inform different **types of decisions** that might include: setting goals and assessing progress, addressing individual or group needs (such as targeting support to low-performing students or schools), evaluating the effectiveness of practices, assessing whether the needs of students or others are being met, reallocating resources, or improving processes to improve outcomes. To promote improvement decisions based on data and to support strategy alignment, the MSDE promotes two continuous improvement cycles.

With a strong technical assistance connection from the MSDE to participating LSSs and the schools that will be the focus of the SSIP, practices will inform local and state policy which in turn will enable the implementation of high quality evidence-based practices. "The **practice-policy feedback loop** provides organizational leaders and policy makers with information (data) about implementation barriers and successes so that a more aligned system can be developed. Feedback from the practice level engages and informs organization leaders so that they can ensure that policy, procedures, resources, etc. enable innovative practices to occur in classrooms, schools, and districts as intended." (AI Hub: Topic 3: Practice-Policy Feedback Loops)

### **TAP-IT Process**

The MSDE promotes continuous improvement through the TAP-IT process (Team, Analyze, Plan, Implement, and Track). It begins with the formation of an implementation **TEAM** that collects all current, relevant data sources. They then **ANALYZE** the data, including formative, summative, longitudinal summary reports, and early warning alert systems that may be in place. The team analyzes the data using an agreed upon protocol to develop a **PLAN** to narrow the gap between children with disabilities and their nondisabled peers. The team shares current research and research based practices and consider the allocation of resources to determine their effectiveness in narrowing the gap. The plan is then **IMPLEMENTED** and progress is monitored. Team members continuously **TRACK** progress through regular meetings. Success is shared, plans are revised, and the work is scaled up as appropriate. The MSDE has actively promoted this collaborative data-based decision making model over the last two year and regularly provides technical assistance and guidance to the LSSs regarding systemic and strategic data use. This will be highlighted in the work of the participating SSIP LSSs.

## 2. **Family engagement and partnership to promote family involvement and student success**

Given the power of family involvement to influence learning, it is not surprising that the IDEA strongly supports a parents' right to be involved in the special education their child receives. As the IDEA states: "Almost 30 years of research and experience has demonstrated that the education of children with disabilities can be made more effective by... strengthening the role and responsibility of parents and ensuring that families...have meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children at school and at home." Maryland's strategic plan promotes engaging families and school staff in active regular two-way, meaningful communication as equal partners in decisions.

Engaging families of students who will be in schools participating in the SSIP work will range from providing family-friendly information (on math problem-solving activities, on their child's performance and progress) and providing training opportunities to understand educational decision-making to soliciting the active input from families in the decisions made



by the school and school system. This has the dual purpose of connecting what is being learned to daily life and providing meaningful ways for the student and her/his family to engage in the life of the school. The data and infrastructure analyses revealed a concern that parents do not know “today’s math.” By engaging families in the improvement process, there is no intent to teach parents “today’s math” but rather to help families use math and be engaged in their child’s education.

An important component of the Maryland SPDG is family engagement through the partnership with The Parents’ Place of Maryland (PPMD), the State’s Parent Training and Information (PTI) in OSEP’s Parent Technical Assistance Center Network. This partnership provides two way communication and commitment. It is also a complementary strategy with high quality math instruction by providing parents/families with ways to interact with their children around math. Currently, PPMD has been developing strategies to engage children with their families around “what are you learning,” rather than around “how to solve” problems.

### **3. High quality general education math instruction based on principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to increase student engagement and learning**

UDL is based on educational research that finds students are highly variable in their response to instruction. Accordingly, to meet the challenge of high standards, the UDL approach shuns “one size fits all” curricula and instruction in favor of flexible designs with customizable options to meet individual needs. UDL has three major principles that include providing multiple means of representation, multiple means of action and expression, and multiple means of engagement. Each of these principles intends to address the diversity of student learning styles and means of demonstrating learning. The use of UDL along with high quality math instruction and interventions increases opportunities for students with disabilities to both engage in instruction and effectively demonstrate what is learned.

The MSDE will build upon the UDL network in Maryland and experts within the State who are working closely with the SWIFT Center to build teacher and school capacity to employ UDL principles. It will also leverage the knowledge base resulting from the SPDG work to implement evidence-based math instruction. The data-informed decision making strategy will be incorporated to support the use of data for formative assessment of student progress. Through the SPDG and SWIFT center work, math has emerged as an important focus area. Leveraging the work of these initiatives, along with implementation of UDL – the lack of which was cited as a root cause – provides a powerful improvement strategy. The implementation of high quality math instruction and intervention using UDL will assist in addressing the root causes of “lack of problem solving skills and perseverance,” “curriculum shift (MCCR),” and potentially the “inadequate identification of math learning problems.”

### **4. Multi-tiered system of supports with evidence-based math instruction and interventions tailored instruction to math deficits**

Implementing a MTSS in a school requires a significant change in practice, and a need for close collaboration with the school district administration. Particularly when it comes to math, screening and progress monitoring tools are limited; evidence-based interventions are scarce and may be expensive.

The MTSS models (Greenwood, Carta, Baggett, Buzhardt, Walker, & Terry, 2008; Greenwood, Kratchowill & Clements, 2008), such as Response to Intervention (RtI) (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2001) and School-Wide Positive Behaviors Support (SWPBS) (Sugai & Horner, 2009) are based on the premise that classroom instruction should be high quality, evidence-based, and universally designed for all students, considering their linguistic and cultural backgrounds, disabilities, and other learning needs. By using data on student performance and progress, the acquisition of targeted skills can be monitored and the need for more intensive instruction or specific interventions for students not “responding” to the universal instruction can be identified. A second tier of intervention focusing on those target skills or behaviors is provided to students who have not acquired the targeted skills. Through ongoing data monitoring, the need for a third tier of more individualized and intensive intervention can be identified and designed for specific students based on their unique needs. Evidence-based instructional strategies, progress monitoring, and fidelity of intervention characterize the implementation of all tiers.

Each intervention type (e.g., behavior, reading, math, etc.) needs criteria for identifying when students need more or less intensive interventions. It is important to note that as students move to more intensive levels (tiers) of support, they do not need to be removed from regular classes or school settings (Sailor, 2008/2009). Interventions can be embedded within the general education instruction and classroom activities, maintaining opportunities for the benefits of inclusion. Copeland and Cosbey (2008/2009) describe four key MTSS principles:

1. The tiers should be additive, not exclusionary: Tier 1 instruction should be supplemented by Tiers 2 and/or 3, and not replaced by them.

2. This model should be an instructional decision making model, not a placement model.
3. Decisions to change interventions, moving a student from one tier to the next, should be based on data.
4. Teachers should evaluate student performance based upon the documented delivery of strategies that have been demonstrated to be effective for their specific students.

The National Center on Intensive Intervention (<http://www.intensiveintervention.org/>) provides a variety of resources and current evidence-based tools and interventions for reading, math, and behavior. As can be seen, math resources are limited. The MSDE intends to leverage the work with the SWIFT Center to access current and evidence-based resources to support its ability to provide PD/L and TA for math instruction and intervention.

A MTSS model has evidence of effectiveness in enabling teachers to use screening and progress monitoring tools to identify specific areas in which students are proficient and where they need additional intervention to acquire important skills. The MSDE will work closely with and develop professional learning in MTSS/math that crosses the SPDG, the SWIFT, and the LSS awarded the State IDEA Set-Aside competitive Bridges for Systems Change Initiative grant, and target TA for the schools identified as part of the SSIP.

## 5. Equitable access to the general education curriculum and classroom through culturally responsive interactions and specialized instruction for students with disabilities within the regular classroom

Research shows a variety of positive short term and long term effects of educating students with disabilities in inclusive classes. In a two-year study of students with learning disabilities, Cole, Waldron, Majd, and Hasazi (2004) found that 41.7% made progress in math in general education classes compared to 34% in traditional special education settings, without the presence of nondisabled peers. When comparing progress with their typical peers, 43.3% of students with disabilities made comparable or greater progress in math in inclusive settings versus 35.9% in traditional settings. The National Longitudinal Transition Study examined the outcomes of 11,000 students with a range of disabilities and found that more time spent in a general education classroom was positively correlated with a) fewer absences from school, b) fewer referrals for disruptive behavior, and c) better outcomes after high school in the areas of employment and independent living (Wagner, Newman, Cameto & Levine, 2006).

For students with severe disabilities, academic benefits include: high levels of active engagement (Hunt, Soto, Maier & Doering, 2003; Wallace, Anderson, Bartholomay & Hupp, 2002), improved academic performance (Brinker & Thorpe, 1984; Cole et al., 2004; Downing, Spencer & Cavallaro, 2004; Wolfe & Hall, 2003; Hawkins, 2011; Hunt & Staub et al., 1994; Katz & Mirenda, 2002; McDonnell, Mathot-Buckner, Thornson & Fister, 2001; Teigland, 2009; Westling & Fox, 2009), access to general curriculum (Carter, Cushing, Clark & Kennedy, 2005) and higher quality individualized education program goals (Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis & Goetz, 1994b).

There are also several tools to promote culturally responsive practices, ranging from policy assessments (Kozleski and Sion (2006) to special education culturally responsive practices assessment (Richards, Artilles, Lingner, and Brown (2005). The MSDE will promote exploration of current practices and development of specific improvement across schools through a professional learning community. Further, the Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education, a partner with the MSDE in promoting high quality inclusive instruction and interventions, will provide assistance to participating LSSs in the delivery of specialized instruction within the general education setting.

## C. Strategies that Address Root Causes and Build Capacity (4(c))

Root causes of low math proficiency rates for students with disabilities and identified during the data and infrastructure analyses work included: **low expectations, student mobility, inconsistent instruction, failure to use high quality Tier 1 instruction based on UDL principles, lack of problem solving skills and perseverance, lack of meaningful curriculum access, curriculum shift to the MCCR, inadequate identification of math as a learner problem, and low kindergarten expectations.** In identifying improvement strategies to address the root causes and result in improvement of the SIMR, the MSDE personnel with stakeholders identified five broad areas by looking across data, infrastructure, and root causes.

Broad areas that were determined to need to be addressed were **data-informed decision-making, access, mathematics instruction, attendance, and behavior/discipline.** From this initial identification of areas, discussion moved to identifying actionable and measurable strategies. (See Section 4.B. above.) The MSDE personnel with stakeholder input identified five improvement strategies that are aligned with the DSE/EIS strategic plan, current initiatives, and are supported by the data and infrastructure analysis.

A questioning technique was used to delve more deeply into the root causes identified. For example, inconsistent instruction was identified as a root cause. Using probing questions, one reason identified for inconsistent instruction was the lack of adequate or useful formative assessment data. Again questioning why that is, one reason emerged as the lack of skill in collecting and using data at the school and classroom levels. To address this skill gap, the strategy of data-informed decision making was identified. (See other examples of how the strategies address the root causes identified in Section D below.)

To ensure a direct connection between the proposed actionable and measurable strategies and the five broad areas of need (*data-informed decision-making, access, mathematics instruction, attendance, and behavior/discipline*) stakeholders were asked to compare strategies to need factors using the *Hexagon Tool for Assessing Evidence-Based Practice Readiness of Fit*. Specifically, they were asked to use questions for five of the broad factors to assess whether the strategies addressed the Need – SIMR, fit the current initiatives and priorities, were supported by the infrastructure analysis of Resources and Support, and were Evidence-based promising practices. It was noted that the MSDE, DSE/EIS used two broad factors in making the final selection of the SSIP LSSs – Readiness for Replication and Capacity to Implement.

## D. Strategies Based on Data and Infrastructure Analysis (4(d))

Data analysis and infrastructure analysis both support the need to continue to address equitable access. As was noted in the Data Section students with disabilities who are African American have a greater representation in the population of students with disabilities than in the general population. They also have the lowest proficiency rates in math in grades 4 and 5. Placement in segregated settings is higher for African American students with disabilities. The infrastructure analysis noted that the Maryland Strategic plan has an action imperative that directly addresses the “implementation of equitable services.” Additionally, “lack of meaningful access” emerged as a possible root cause for the low performance of students with disabilities in math, regardless of race/ethnicity. To some extent this strategy, along with others, will address the root causes of a “shift in curriculum” and “lack of problem solving skills.” By ensuring students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum and the general education classroom, Maryland will be ensuring students are receiving the instruction necessary to demonstrate aligned performance. The two strategies identified as a result of the infrastructure analysis are:

- Collaboration across the MSDE Divisions to provide professional learning and TA in math instruction and culturally responsive practices.
- Leverage the resources of the SWIFT, the SPDG, and the Bridges for Systems Change Initiative work to build upon the LSSs and schools actively engaged in a State TA relationship.

## E. Stakeholder Involvement in Selecting Improvement Strategies (4(e))

A series of meetings with stakeholders were held to conduct the data and infrastructure analyses and identify the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Representatives of relevant offices within the MSDE as well as advocacy and professional organizations and LSS administrators examined and asked questions of data to identify coherent strategies in relationship to State initiatives and the DSE/EIS strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*. As noted earlier, an iterative approach was used with stakeholder meetings, even as in this document, elements and activities are described in a linear manner.

### Internal Stakeholders

Stakeholder	1/15/15	3/17/15
Chief of Staff	X	X
Special Assistant to the State Superintendent (STEM)	X	X
Executive Director, Governmental Relations	X	X
Director, Departmental Coordination & National Legislative Liaison	X	X
Race to the Top Coordinator & Teacher/Principal Evaluations	X	X
Chief Operating Officer	X	X
Division of Business Services	X	X

Office of Human Resources	X	X
Office of Information Technology	X	X
Division of Rehabilitation Services	X	X
Office of School Effectiveness	X	X
Division of Academic Policy and Innovation	X	X
Division of Educator Effectiveness	X	X
Division of Student, Family, and School Support	X	X
Director, Program Improvement and Family Support Branch (Title I)	X	X
Office of Teaching and Learning	X	X
Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Division of Early Childhood Development	X	X
Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability	X	X
Division of Career and College Readiness	X	X
Division of Library Development and Services	X	X
Branch Chief, Policy & Accountability, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Branch Chief, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services		
Research Consultant, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Consultant	X	X

External Stakeholders

Stakeholders	1/15//15	3/17/15
--------------	----------	---------

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Parents	X	X
Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)	X	X
Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECAC)	X	X
Parents' Place of Maryland (PPMD)	X	X
Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)	X	X
Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)	X	X
Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)	X	X
Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	X	X
Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)	X	X
Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	X	X
Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)	X	X
Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)	X	X
Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)	X	X
Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X	X
State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)	X	X
Read y At Five Partnership	X	X
Maryland State Family Child Care Association (MSFCCA)	X	X
Maryland Association of Teacher Educator s (MATE)	X	X
Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family	X	X
University of Maryland – Department of Education Policy Studies	X	X
Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)	X	X
Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE)	X	X
Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health	X	X
Maryland Department of Disabilities (MDOD)	X	X
Maryland Department of Human Resources	X	X
Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X	X

Local Directors of Special Education	X	X
Local Preschool Coordinators	X	X
Schoolwide integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center	X	X

**Stakeholder Meeting #8 (1/15/2015)** – Stakeholders identified improvement strategies and activities that are working in the broad areas of: professional learning and development, math instruction, organizational structure of the MSDE and LSSs, and family/community involvement. These informed the MSDE in initially identifying broad areas for improvement. They also identified the need for teacher development in math instructional strategies, use of formative assessments to guide instruction and identify intervention needs, improved family engagement – particularly in supporting math skill development and school involvement, and the relationship of low reading skills to math performance.

**Stakeholder Meeting #10 (3/17/2015)** – The stakeholders met to more fully identify the improvement strategies by comparing them against the State specific needs (see Section 4.A.) and the root causes that had been identified. The stakeholders identified with the MSDE personnel the following - **data-informed decision making, multi-tiered systems of support with evidence-based math instruction, equitable access in the general education curriculum and classroom, family engagement, and high quality math instruction/intervention using Universal Design for Learning.** From this discussion the stakeholders then reviewed a revised draft of the Theory of Action. After much discussion they provided specific recommendations for the MSDE to be able to finalize the Theory of Action. There was also some discussion of what areas the MSDE might want to consider for Infrastructure Development in Phase II of the SSIP process.

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Theory of Action

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: [Attachment F MD Part B Theory of Action](#)



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

## 5. Theory of Action

Maryland's Theory of Action is that when students with disabilities are taught within a MTSS framework based on principles of UDL, using culturally responsive instruction and interventions that are provided when performance falls below standards, and when specialized instruction is delivered within that general education framework, their proficiency in math skills will increase and the gap between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers will decrease. If there is collaboration across Divisions within the MSDE to assist schools and their district administrators in implementing these practices, using data-based decision making processes, and if families are engaged in implementation, then there is a greater likelihood that successes can be sustained within the targeted LSSs and scaled up across other jurisdictions.

### A. Graphic Illustration (5(a))

Attached is a graphic illustration of Maryland's Theory of Action that describes how the State anticipates leveraging resources to maximize existing State initiatives, improve the State infrastructure, and build local capacity to scale up the implementation of evidence based practices to improve the mathematics achievement and reduce the gap in performance of students with disabilities in grades 3, 4 and 5 in 6 LSSs. **Please see Attachment F, Maryland Theory of Action.**

### B. How Improvement Strategies Will Lead to Improved Results (5(b))

The Theory of Action incorporates the coherent strategies identified by stakeholders, aligns it with the MSDE DSE/EIS strategic functions, and considers the root causes in identifying the changes that are needed to lead to accomplishing the SIMR in six (6) local school systems. The sequential Theory of Action offers certain proof points that can suggest whether or not the DSE/EIS is on the right track. As such, the graphic representation will help the DSE/EIS to develop evaluation strategies for both progress and implementation fidelity in the development of the SSIP, Phase II. Specifically:

- The core function of **LEADERSHIP** is based on the belief that strategic collaboration and partnerships within the MSDE and across Offices/Divisions and meaningful family partnerships promote excellence, innovation, and dissemination of research and evidence-based models. This will guide the improvement strategies of collaboration across the MSDE Divisions to provide professional learning and TA in inclusive math instruction and culturally responsive practices and family engagement and partnership. Cross-Divisional collaboration will result in models for LSSs and schools for how special education leadership can effectively work with general education and student support services to impact instruction. Responsiveness to and partnerships with families should result in greater family involvement in supporting their child's education and school decision-making.
- The core function of **ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RESULTS** is based on the belief that real time data and use of data to inform decisions supports the development and implementation of evidence based practices to maximize learning and narrow the achievement gap. This means that data-informed decision making processes are necessary to guide school improvement, and will result in:
  - School leadership teams that know how to use disaggregated student data to inform decisions,
  - Schools leadership teams that evaluate their current practices, select new practices (see below) and evaluate the impact on the math proficiency and performance gap of students with disabilities, and



- Teachers who work in teams to use data to modify instruction, design individual student supports, and provide secondary and tertiary interventions with fidelity.

- The core function of **TA/PROGRAM SUPPORT** is based on the beliefs that professional learning forms the base for courageous conversations and systems change, technical assistance and coaching provide unique supports to meet the context of individual schools and LSSs. Evidence-based instructional practices and interventions provide access to the curriculum and lead to academic/behavioral proficiency, and specialized instruction, program modifications, and supplementary aids/services enable students with disabilities to make progress in the general education curriculum and participate in school with their nondisabled peers. These beliefs become evident in the improvement strategies to develop high quality general education math instruction based on principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), multi-tiered system of supports with evidence-based math instruction and interventions tailored to math deficits, and equitable access to the general education curriculum and classroom through culturally responsive interactions and specialized instruction for students with disabilities. These will result in:

- Schools that identify instructional practices to install based on exploration of current practice, student data, and professional learning,
- Schools that install a math MTSS framework,
- Schools and individual teachers who identify and install culturally responsive practices based on self-assessment, identification of specific needs, and professional learning,
- Teachers who select and use or improve student engagement strategies,
- Students with disabilities who participate in universal/general education math instruction and receive tiered intervention based on their math performance,
- Students with disabilities who receive specialized instruction, program modifications, and supplementary aids/services in the general education classroom,
- Students with disabilities who have higher rates of attendance, and
- Students with disabilities who are more engaged in instruction.
- The core function of **FISCAL/RESOURCE MANAGEMENT** is based on a belief that leveraging national and local resources results in effective and efficient implementation and sustainable evidence-based practices. By leveraging the SWIFT, SPDG, and the Bridges for Systems Change Initiative work will enhance the current work with the LSSs and schools actively engaged in a State technical assistance relationship. These LSSs have district planning teams, school based planning teams organized to promote systems change, and have identified math performance as a priority for improvement. They also have begun to be engaged with local and national experts to explore and/or install math instruction and interventions. By focusing on these jurisdictions, we will have with 6 LSSs with active school and district leadership teams engaged in systems change work that includes the SSIP SIMR in their action plans.

These strategies should lead to the change in practices that will enable us to achieve the SIMR, and see the following associated results:

**STUDENTS with Disabilities in grades 3-5:**

- Increase in math proficiency
- Reduction in performance gap in math
- Reduction in disproportionate placement of African American students in separate classes and schools
- Increase in general education participation and instruction in the regular classroom

**TEACHERS:**

- Increased confidence with teaching students with disabilities in regular classes
- Increased use of evidence-based math instruction based on UDL interventions
- Improved use of culturally responsive practices



**SCHOOLS:**

- Improved student outcome data

**FAMILIES:**

- Increased satisfaction with their child's educational program
- Increased involvement in school decisions

The Theory of Action will also serve as a guidepost for the participating LSSs. It relates which practices should lead to which results, and demonstrates a linkage across initiatives and strategies. For example, the collaboration with other Divisions to provide professional learning and customized technical assistance will support the development of systems within the LSSs to make the important changes needed to see improved results for students. It is anticipated that this theory can drive change and show a clear path to improving the math proficiency of students with disabilities in grades 3, 4 and 5.

**C. Stakeholder Involvement in Developing the Theory of Action (5(c))**

The Theory of Action was developed with stakeholders, as a result of the participation and feedback from internal and external stakeholders for data and infrastructure analysis, identification of the SIMR, discussion of root causes for low math performance, and identification of coherent improvement strategies. The development of the Theory of Action began with the use of a Logic Model to identify the beliefs and values of the MSDE. From this basis the identified coherent strategies were considered as to how the strategies would promote a change in knowledge/practice leading to outcomes. **Please refer to Appendix A, Logic Model.**

Internal Stakeholders

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>1/15/15</b>	<b>3/17/15</b>
Chief of Staff	X	X
Special Assistant to the State Superintendent (STEM)	X	X
Executive Director, Governmental Relations	X	X
Director, Departmental Coordination & National Legislative Liaison	X	X
Race to the Top Coordinator & Teacher/Principal Evaluations	X	X
Chief Operating Officer	X	X
Division of Business Services	X	X
Office of Human Resources	X	X
Office of Information Technology	X	X
Division of Rehabilitation Services	X	X
Office of School Effectiveness	X	X
Division of Academic Policy and Innovation	X	X
Division of Educator Effectiveness	X	X
Division of Student, Family, and School Support	X	X

Director, Program Improvement and Family Support Branch (Title I)	X	X
Office of Teaching and Learning	X	X
Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Division of Early Childhood Development	X	X
Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability	X	X
Division of Career and College Readiness	X	X
Division of Library Development and Services	X	X
Branch Chief, Policy & Accountability, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X

Branch Chief, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services		
Educational Program Specialist, Math, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education Early Intervention Services		
Educational Program Specialist, SPDG, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services		
Research Consultant, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	X	X
Consultant	X	X

External Stakeholders

Stakeholders	1/15//15	3/17/15
Parents	X	X

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC)	X	X
Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committees (SECAC)	X	X
Parents' Place of Maryland (PPMD)	X	X
Maryland Disability Law Center (MDLC)	X	X
Educational Advocacy Coalition (EAC)	X	X
Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE)	X	X
Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	X	X
Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)	X	X
Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	X	X
Maryland Council of Staff Developers (MCSD)	X	X
Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM)	X	X
Maryland Middle School Association (MMSA)	X	X
Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X	X
State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)	X	X
Read y At Five Partnership	X	X
Maryland State Family Child Care Association (MSFCCA)	X	X
Maryland Association of Teacher Educator s (MATE)	X	X
Maryland Family Network/Friends of the Family	X	X
University of Maryland – Department of Education Policy Studies	X	X
Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE)	X	X
Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE)	X	X
Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health	X	X
Maryland Department of Disabilities (MDOD)	X	X
Maryland Department of Human Resources	X	X
Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X	X
Local Directors of Special Education	X	X

Local Preschool Coordinators	X	X
Schoolwide integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center	X	X

**Stakeholder meeting #8 (1/15/2015)** – Stakeholders reviewed the practices identified at the December meeting as “working” and “not working so well” as a prelude to reviewing the continuing refinement of the SIMR, as well as root causes of low performance in math of students with disabilities previously identified. Following this review, stakeholders watched a video describing the process for developing a Theory of Action - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NbMlhCZVW-U>

A preliminary draft was reviewed in small groups to discuss. It was noted the four areas of focus are the Core Functions of the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan with the “If the MSDE” statements followed by statements of what will occur at both the MSDE and LSSs levels which will then lead to higher expectations and access to resources that will allow the provision of effective interventions and services which, in turn, will then result in services in natural settings and improved educational results and functional outcomes. In small groups participants were asked to think about:

- what you have learned through the stakeholder meeting discussions,
- the identified SIMR,
- the evidence-based practices, and
- what you know from your own practice.

**Stakeholder meeting #10 (3/17/2015)** – Following a discussion to refine the coherent strategies, stakeholders reviewed a draft Theory of Action and provided specific recommendations. It was emphasized by participants that there needs to be models of collaborative practice and quality communication across the MSDE, with families, and to the LSSs in this process. Stakeholders also noted that the Theory of Action needs to clearly convey the general approach that will be taken to address the SIMR and needs to be one that can be consistently articulated by the MSDE and stakeholders alike. There was discussion about whether the SIMR should address reducing the gap rather than increasing mathematics proficiency. Participants considered that even when students with disabilities may demonstrate higher levels of achievement, if students with and without disabilities increase in performance at approximately the same rate, the achievement gap for students with disabilities may stay the same. They noted that the SIMR needs to address both areas and that the strategies and theory of action need to take this into consideration.

## Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Marcella E. Franczkowski  
Title: Assistant State Superintendent  
Email: mfranczkowski@maryland.gov  
Phone: 410-767-0238