

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Maryland



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

Policy and Accountability;

Performance Support and Technical Assistance (TA);

Family Support and Dispute Resolution;

Interagency Collaboration; and

Resource Management and Monitoring.

The DEI/SES' matrix organizational design facilitates performance orientation within each branch, process orientation across all branches, and an operational plan inclusive of all branches. This infrastructure integrates knowledge to improve compliance and results and ensures consistent communication within the DEI/SES, throughout MSDE, and with external stakeholders and partners.

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

Transparency: Maintaining an open door to stakeholders and regularly communicating through formal and informal outreach

Stakeholder Engagement: Engaging our stakeholders in timely and meaningful consultation on priority topics, including policies that affect children with disabilities

Effectiveness: Serving stakeholders in a timely and effective manner and ensure the availability of the best "real-time" data for decision-making and dissemination of evidence-based models throughout the State

Alignment: Arranging our priorities to be synchronous with those of MSDE and federal requirements while also including the concerns of our LEAs, LITPs, PAs, and advocates

Accountability: Striving to improve compliance and performance results for all LEA/PAs. The DEI/SES has developed a tiered system of general supervision and performance support to identify systems and agencies in need of differentiated support and TA (Differentiated Framework)

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

Effective policies and procedures

State Performance Plan (SPP) goals & targets

Accountability to Improve Performance (AIP)

Fiscal management

Dispute resolution

Targeted TA & support

The DEI/SES has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for performance support and TA to provide a tiered system of monitoring and supports to address the needs of each LEA. The Differentiated Framework illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for students with disabilities. The Division is committed to maintaining compliance and providing supports to improve the quality of special education services. An LEA/LITP/PA is assigned to a tier based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The corresponding support an LEA receives is differentiated based on that LEA's assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of the LEA/PAs' needs. The Differentiated Framework involves directing the DEI/SES' attention to LEA/PAs in need of more comprehensive engagement, TA, and support in order to enable those programs to meet indicator targets, improve results, narrow the achievement gap, correct identified noncompliance, and maintain compliance.

The majority of Maryland's LEA/LITP/PAs are currently in the Universal Tier of General Supervision. This Tier represents LEA/PAs that have met identified performance and compliance criteria, resulting in a determination status of "Meets Requirements" or is in the 1st year of "Needs Assistance." In the Universal Tier of Engagement, the focus is on professional learning and follow-up coaching and support to address statewide needs based on overall State trend data (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to early intervention/special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide TA include State and regional professional development, online tools, resources through Maryland Elevate, and Technical Assistance Bulletins (TABs). Comprehensive monitoring for the "Universal" tier occurs once every 4 years.

An LEA/LITP/PA receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for two consecutive years or one year of "Needs Intervention" is assigned to the Targeted Tier of General Supervision. An LEA/PA in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for identified noncompliance, or they may have reoccurring noncompliance despite correction within the required one-year period. The corresponding Targeted Tier of Engagement focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, & TA) to address the needs of the LEA/LITP/PA on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LEA/LITP/PA from needing substantial support. The LEA/LITP/PA's leadership is required to engage with the DEI/SES to review State and local data and information in order to implement an Improvement Plan (IP) that is approved by the DEI/SES to build capacity to effectively address the identified needs. LEA/LITP/PAs in the Targeted Tier receive comprehensive monitoring every 3 years.

An LEA/LITP/PA receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for 3 consecutive years, "Needs Intervention" for 2 consecutive years, or "Needs Substantial Intervention" for 1 year is assigned to the Focused Tier. 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 LEA/LITP/PA through significant systems change. A multi-faceted State and local leadership team meets regularly to develop and implement a focused collaborative action plan designed to effect systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. The State Superintendent and the DEI/SES Assistant State Superintendent work closely with the LEA/PA Superintendent to develop a cross-departmental, cross-divisional State and local implementation team. The MSDE provides increased oversight activities to assess progress and may direct federal funds, impose special conditions, and/or require regular submission of data. Comprehensive monitoring for LEA/PAs in the Focused Tier occurs every other year.

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Data Collection

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

Special Services Information System (SSIS) 618 Data Collection

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 LEAs and PAs, which are to monitor and verify their data collection systems at the local level. Most PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students.

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

The SSIS secure server is available twenty-four (24) hours a day for file submissions. The secure server is backed up nightly and replicated off-site.

Files posted are reviewed and edited daily;

Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using the Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk; and Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed.

The SSIS Manual provides detailed information for LEAs/PAs to build mechanisms within their systems for data accuracy. The DEI/SES runs edit reports of the files for the LEAs and PAs to correct and resubmit their files to the DEI/SES. To ensure validity, the DEI/SES SSIS Manual provides data standardization for definitions and provides system edits similar to those suggested systems edits provided by the IDEA Data Center (IDC). Validity of the data and consistency with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data instructions are 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 LEAs and PAs submit data.

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

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

The accuracy of the data is dependent upon the accuracy of the submitted school-level data. Questions and discrepancies in the data are verified by the DEI/SES staff with the respective LEA/LITP/PA. The LEA/LITP/PA SSIS Data Manager corrects errors and resubmits the entire data file to DEI/SES to ensure that corrections are made in both the database and the error file. SSIS 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 LEA/LITP/PA corrects the errors online.

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

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

25

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

IDEA Requirements

The DEI/SES conducts a comprehensive student file review to ensure LEAs/LITP/PAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR). The LEAs/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 LEA/LITP/PA will be reviewed at least once during the four-year cycle. Please see the information above about monitoring schedules based upon the Differentiated Framework.

Effective Policies, Procedures, and Practices (PPP)

Maryland has policies and procedures aligned with IDEA. State law and COMAR support State implementation of the IDEA. Each LEA/LITP/PA is responsible for developing policies, procedures and practices for effective implementation in accordance with federal and State requirements. The DEI/SES has embedded the review of LEA/LITP/PA policies, procedures, and practices within existing components of general supervision.

Significant Disproportionality

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

State Performance Plan (SPP)

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

Accountability to Improve Performance (AIP)

The DEI/SES now places greater emphasis on requirements related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. In addition, the DEI/SES works collaboratively with LEA/LITP/PAs to identify root causes and focus on areas in need of improvement. The AIP process verifies data, documents compliance with both IDEA and COMAR regulatory requirements, and provides TA for the timely correction of identified findings of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance concerning the records of individual children with disabilities always result in verification of correction using a two-prong process consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01. Comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every four years in each LEA/LITP/PA to ensure the LEA/LITP/PAs are compliant with State and federal regulations, have a system of general supervision in place to monitor child progress and make data-informed decisions, and are focused on improving outcomes for children with developmental delays and disabilities, and their families.

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

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

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

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

Fiscal Management

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

Dispute Resolution

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

Targeted TA and Support

Through the SSIP and data from the examination of the LEA/LITP/PA performance, ongoing state activities are used for program improvement and progress measurement. The DEI/SES also aligns improvement activities with existing MSDE initiatives, such as Maryland's Every Student Succeeds Act. TA activities, designed to address the needs of each individual LEA/LITP/PA, are based on data that are collected and correction of any noncompliance, consistent with OSEP's 09-02 Memo and 23-01 QA.

Enforcement

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

Technical Assistance System:

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

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

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

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

Opportunity by braiding of resources to support innovative practices;

Incentives through Statewide recognition of child progress and gap reduction;

Systemic Capacity by providing Statewide data systems that include the Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS), Maryland Online IFSP, and the Maryland Online IEP (MOIEP);

Local Capacity building through expert consultation, establishing of Communities of Practice (CoP), training, coaching, and opportunities for diagnostic site reviews;

Intervention through the DEI/SES Differentiated Framework: Tiers of Engagement that include universal support for internal decision-making processes based on implementation science, and dissemination of proven practices with demonstrated results.

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

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

Analyze: The team studies the processes currently in place to analyze data at the State and LEA/LITP/PA levels. The team reviews the available data that include formative, summative, longitudinal summary reports and early warning alert systems that may be in place. The purpose of each data source is reviewed, and the strength and limitations are identified. The team describes/defines the sources and processes to analyze data and identifies opportunities for programmatic support and/or TA. The team analyzes the data using an agreed-upon protocol and reports their finding(s).

Plan: The team reviews the effectiveness of existing processes and interventions to narrow the gap between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The team shares current research and research-based practices for narrowing the achievement gap. Allocation of resources is reviewed to determine their effectiveness in narrowing the gap. The team uses evidence-based questioning strategies such as Teams Intervening Early to Reach all Students (TIERS): Asking the Right Questions and implementation science tools that include the Hexagon Tool where information is gathered and organized. These provide the team with a complete picture of the targeted interventions and their use in the LEA/LITP/PA (see: <https://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resource/the-hexagon-an-exploration-tool>). Based on the data analysis, plans are created and resources are aligned to narrow the achievement gap. Strategic, measurable, attainable, results-based, and time-bound (SMART) goals and ideas for sharing success and replication are included in the developed plans.

Implement: The plan is implemented with the supports and resources identified from the LEA/LITP/PA, the DEI/SES, and other external partners. Monitoring of progress, identification and removal of barriers to change, and diagnostic site reviews are conducted.

Track: Team members meet quarterly face-to-face and/or through technology applications. Assigned monitors provide updates on each data set, financial reports are discussed, and plans are modified as needed (e.g., based on intervention implementation fidelity, child performance, etc.). The team completes an annual review and report of the work through the SMART Process. Success is shared, and the work is scaled up as appropriate.

Accessing Technical Assistance by MSDE

The OSEP, in the 2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix, identified the MSDE, DEI/SES in need of TA to address the low performance and participation of students with disabilities on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The MSDE, DEI/SES partnered with the MSDE, Division of Assessment, Accountability and Information Technology, including the MSDE NAEP Coordinator, John Hopkins Center for Technology and Education, and stakeholders to provide guidance and TA to LEAs, PAs, and families. The DEI/SES has also continued to receive TA from federal Technical Assistance Centers including the IDEA Data Center (IDC), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), and the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO).

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

Professional Development System:

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

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

tool, it's especially useful during the mentoring process. It helps mentors and mentees identify the mentee's particular areas of strength and areas of need. In addition, it provides clear stepping stones to guide the mentee's professional development on an ongoing, career-long basis. The online version of "Stages", accessible through the Professional Development Online Tracker (PDot), includes links to professional development courses, videos, curricula, webinars, books, and other materials that can be invaluable during (and after) mentoring.

In order to improve program quality and services to positively impact student results, the MSDE DEI/SES, in collaboration with numerous partners, provides resources, training, consultation, and TA to local special education directors, service providers, community partners, stakeholders, and parents through a variety of formats and forums. Dissemination of these trainings, resources, media, and tools to strengthen student outcomes and the special education services provided to students with disabilities is supported through the DEI/SES Maryland Learning Links website in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (CTE).

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

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

80

Parent Members Engagement:

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

Committees/Councils, including the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), and Education Advisory Council (EAC), support Maryland's comprehensive birth through twenty-one (21) system of services. Parents and advisory/advocacy committees are engaged in target settings, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress in numerous ways. Parents, including representatives from the Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC) in Maryland, Parents Place of Maryland, are actively involved in the SICC, SESAC, and EAC Parents Place of Maryland employs eleven (11) parents of children and students with identified delays and disabilities. The SICC currently has three (3) parent members, all from different local jurisdictions systems, who attend regularly. Maryland's SESAC has eighteen (18) parent members who attend regularly. Nonmember parents attend both the SICC and SESAC since the meetings are open to the public. The EAC is a diverse coalition of over 25 individuals and organizations, including individual advocates, advocacy law centers, disability societies/councils, educational consultants, and other agencies with a focus on empowering and supporting children with disabilities and their families. As mentioned before, Parents Place of Maryland, Maryland's PTIC, is a valuable stakeholder with membership on each committee.

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

Several ongoing committees have regular participation by parents, including:

The State Implementation Teams (Part B and Part C);

These teams are responsible for moving SSIP work forward.

One (1) parent that serves on each Team.

The Inclusion State Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);

This team advances technical assistance activities which are focused on advancing effective evidence-based inclusion policies and practices within the State's comprehensive birth through age 21 education system.

Two (2) parents that serve on this Team.

The State Inclusion Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);

This team develops state-level guidance and support for the local school systems that were awarded the PS Inclusion grants.

Two (2) parents that serve on this Team.

The Pyramid Model Leadership Committee, which is not led by DEI/SES, but the DEI/SES serves as partners (Part C and Part B); and

This committee focuses development, evaluation, and sustainability of a statewide collaborative effort, guided by national models, that supports the local implementation of the Pyramid Model framework.

Two (2) parents that serve on this Committee.

The Maryland Certificate of Program Completion (MCoPC) Endorsement Task Force

The task force's charge is to review the requirements for the Maryland Certificate of Program Completion requirements and develop standards for endorsements that can be added to the MCoPC that address employment, postsecondary education, and community/citizenship.

Six (6) parents serve on this Task Force.

In addition, MSDE has convened an ongoing Special Education Workgroup to discuss and make recommendations on instruction and services for students with disabilities. Workgroup meetings are held approximately once per month and each meeting includes a dedicated time for public comment

during which parents of students with disabilities in Maryland have the opportunity to provide their input. Parents are also engaged as members of the workgroup with four (4) parents of students with disabilities currently serving as members.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

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

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

Baby LEADers – goals of the grant include but are not limited to increasing parent participation in planning for IFSP, Extended IFSP, and IEP services and decision-making; increasing parent knowledge to support young children through the transition from an IFSP to an IEP; increasing parent knowledge of the Division of Early Childhood's Recommended Practices and Family Guides supporting the State's rollout of evidence-based practices and strategies; empowering families to use the resources they need to participate in their own family and community activities; and improving parent/provider communication and family partnerships regarding early intervention and preschool services for children to improve service delivery and substantially contribute to improving child outcomes.

Guiding the Journey: A Transition Program for Parents – goals of the grant include, but are not limited to, conducting secondary transition trainings for parents of students aged 14 and older; and increasing parental involvement and expertise in the transition planning process.

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

The DEI/SES provides the EAC an opportunity to review all TABs and parent guides before they are finalized and disseminated. Since the start of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the DEI/SES has developed over forty-five (45) guidance documents. Ultimately, these documents are published on the MSDE's website to ensure wide dissemination to both providers and families. The DEI/SES TABs and family guides can be found here:

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

In addition to the strategies mentioned above, the value of the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) as an integral mechanism to broaden the opportunity for stakeholder feedback on the implementation activities and targets of the SPP/APR, among other critical issues, cannot be understated. The SESAC is established to advise and assist the Maryland State Department of Education, DEI/SES in administering, promoting, planning, coordinating and improving the delivery of special education and related services to assure that all children with disabilities, three through 21 years of age, and their families have access to appropriate education and related services. SESAC membership conforms to the requirements of Federal and State regulations with over 51% of members who are parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Membership is representative of a broad base of families, state agencies advocating for, funding, and/or administering programs for students with disabilities, private agencies responsible for addressing vocational, community, and business matters pertaining to students with disabilities, representatives from local education agencies, etc. Each year, the SESAC holds a meeting in January dedicated to review and receive input on the SPP/APR, including revisions to implementation activities and targets. DEI/SES staff present data on each indicator, review and compare current and prior years data, set State targets, and provide feedback on strategies to develop and implement policies to improve results for students with disabilities. In addition, the SESAC hosts an annual meeting with the leaders of each Special Education Citizens' Advisory Committee (SECAC). This meeting offers local SECAC family leaders the opportunity to be actively involved in State level administration of special education and to provide feedback and insight on local matters impacting SPP/APR data as well as other special education data and the policies and practices that drive those data.

Finally, the DEI/SES Family Support Section also provides Technical Assistance to the Local Family Support Coordinators in each jurisdiction in Maryland, including the Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf. Technical Assistance included discussions about:

- 1) Finding and interpreting local and State SPP/APR data;
- 2) Reviewing their SPP/APR improvement strategies;
- 3) Providing feedback on SPP/APR data, improvement strategies, and targets; and
- 4) the importance of including this in conversations with local SECACs, advisory groups and families.

Family support coordinators encourage and support effective parent participation on a variety of committees and workgroups at all levels of decision-making.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Throughout the year, stakeholders are made aware of data analysis, improvement strategies, and program data/progress evaluation in a variety of ways, including through Statewide meetings/webinars, SICC/SESAC/EAC meetings, and family support conferences. Statewide webinars occur frequently, but not necessarily with specific regularity as they are often dependent on hot topics or immediate concerns or initiatives. The SICC, SESAC, and EAC meetings occur frequently and regularly with the schedule set at the beginning of each fiscal year. For both types of meetings, stakeholders can provide feedback on data analysis, improvement strategies, evaluation, and target setting. In addition to Statewide meetings and regular stakeholder workgroups, the State has regular family support conferences and webinars. These meetings are regularly attended by parents and family support professionals. Below are examples of topics discussed at Family Support Conferences/webinars in FFY 2020, FFY 2021, and FFY 2022:

Routines-Based Interview;
Authentic Assessment;
Data highlights;

Parent/Family Survey;
Improving Family Engagement;
Early Intervention Personnel Standards;
Components of IEP Goals
Tips to Support Mask-Wearing for Students with Disabilities;
Helping Prepare Parents Prepare for a Return to In-Person Instruction/Services;
Review of MSDE TABs;
Decision-Making for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities
Improving Outcomes through Family Support;
Understanding the IFSP/IEP Process;
Helping Families Create a Vision for Their Child;
A review of Parental Rights Maryland's Procedural Safeguards Notice Document; and
Compensatory Education/Recovery Services Topics.

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

Below is a timeline of the mechanisms used to set targets, baselines, analyze data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate progress for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APR Cycle, including revisions to Indicator 2 targets in FFY 2021 and Indicator 17 targets in FFY 2022.

Timeline:

July 2021 – October 2021

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

October 2021 - December 2021

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

December 2021-January 2022

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

February 1, 2022

Submitted SPP-APR FFY2020

April 2022

Developed a 2nd Part B Survey to obtain feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 5, and 6
Disseminated 2nd Part B Survey to stakeholders to solicit input
Reviewed stakeholder survey responses
Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies
Submitted Final FFY 2020 Part B APR

November 2022

Analyzed dropout data trends using new methodology
Developed proposed targets for dropout indicator

December 2022/January 2023

Presented proposed Indicator 2 baseline, targets, and improvement strategies to stakeholders
Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies for Dropout indicator

February 1, 2023

Submitted SPP-APR FFY2021 with proposed Indicator 2 revised baseline and targets

October 2022-December 2023

Met with SSIP groups (stakeholders) to revise theory of action and discuss new baseline and targets.

February 1, 2024

Submitted SPP-APR FFY2022 with proposed Indicator 17 revised baseline and targets

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

To make the set targets available to the public, the State disseminated final targets included in both APRs to the stakeholders (including parents, advocacy groups, Maryland's PTI Center, SICC, SESAC, EAC, and Program Directors/Coordinators, etc.). The FFY 2021 APR, including APR targets, Improvement Strategies, evaluation of indicator data, and local system-specific data, was posted on mdideareport.org. The FFY 2022 APR, including APR targets, Improvement Strategies, evaluation of indicator data, and local system-specific data, will be posted on mdideareport.org no later than 120 days from submission consistent with submission in previous years.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

As required in the IDEA of 2004, the MSDE reported to the public on its FFY 2021 (July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022) performance and will report to the public on the performance of LEA/LITP/PAs on Part B Indicators for FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023). Performance data in numbers and percentages will be reported for each LEA/LITP/PA, along with the State target, State performance data, and a narrative description of the indicator. In partnership with the Johns Hopkins University CTE, the MSDE has developed an accessible, state-of-the-art SPP/APR website for local and State performance data. The website currently includes APRs from FFY 2005 to FFY 2021 and can be accessed at mdideareport.org. In addition to the complete SPP/APR, the website includes State and LEA/LITP/PA results for all applicable indicators and tools for comparing local performance in relation to the State targets. Each LEAs special education APR data (with the exception of assessment data) can be found here: http://mdideareport.org/special_main.aspx. The public may see progress and slippage through a combination of tables and graphs populated on the website. In addition, this site also includes the OSEP's annual State determination and the MSDE's annual LEA/LITP/PA determinations.

Assessment data is located on the State's Report Card page: <https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/>

The FFY 2022 APR will be included on this website shortly after the State's submission to the OSEP on February 1, 2024. Copies of the APR and SPP will be provided to LEA/LITP/PAs, SESAC, and other stakeholders simultaneously immediately following the submission of the report.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state has addressed this requirement in the Technical Assistance System section of the Introduction.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	73.35%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	68.14%	70.38%	72.62%	73.35%	73.85%
Data	67.48%	66.84%	63.52%	73.35%	74.08%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	74.35%	74.85%	75.35%	75.85%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions’ priorities, including but not limited to the State’s SPP/APR and State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were

provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,536
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	663
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	106

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,281

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4,536	6,586	74.08%	74.35%	68.87%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Unfortunately, Maryland's original data submission was impacted by the failure of one of the State's largest LEAs to submit their fourth quarter exit data in time for the EDFacts submission deadline. This LEA is one of four (4) LEAs in Maryland who elects not to use the State's Online IEP System. The four (4) LEAs are required to submit data to the MSDE at least quarterly. The LEA's failure to submit timely quarterly data was a result of a ransomware attack and has since been remedied.

MSDE received this LEA's data after the submission period and, with the complete dataset, the FFY 2022 graduation rate should be 70.75% (5,236/7,401), as opposed to 68.87% reported above. Although the corrected graduation rate is higher than that calculated using the incomplete EDFacts submission, Maryland still did not meet the target for FFY2022 and demonstrated slippage (a decrease of 3.33 percentage points).

Nineteen (19) of Maryland's twenty-four (24) LEAs demonstrated a decrease in the percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular high school diploma between the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years, contributing to the slippage noted for this indicator.

In the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic, the 2021-2022 school year saw parents making decisions for the health and well-being of their families that significantly impacted Maryland's special education exit data. During the 2021-2022 school year, 2,825 students ages 14-21 moved out of Maryland and continued to receive special education services in another state or country. If even an eighth of those students would have otherwise graduated in Maryland in SY 2021-2022 (i.e. 353 students), then Maryland would have exceeded its FY 2022 target.

Graduation Conditions

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

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

Graduation Conditions

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

Subject Area Specific Credit Requirement

English - 4 credits

Math - 3 credits

1 in Algebra/Data Analysis

1 in Geometry

1 in additional Mathematics credit

Science - 3 credits

1 in Biology

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

Social Studies - 3 credits

1 in US History

1 in World History

1 in Local, State, and National Government

Fine Arts - 1 credit

Physical Education - ½ credit

Health - ½ credit

Technology Education - 1 credit

Other

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

Students must also meet attendance, service-learning, and any local education agency requirements.

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

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

Government

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

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	13.26%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.03%	2.55%	2.55%	2.55%	13.26%
Data	4.21%	3.98%	3.26%	3.06%	13.26%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.00%	12.75%	12.50%	12.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,536
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	663
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	106
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,281

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,281	6,586	13.26%	13.00%	19.45%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Unfortunately, Maryland's original data submission was impacted by the failure of one of the State's largest LEAs to submit their fourth quarter exit data in time for the EDFacts submission deadline. This LEA is one of four (4) LEAs in Maryland who elects not to use the State's Online IEP System. The four (4) LEAs are required to submit data to the MSDE at least quarterly. The LEA's failure to submit timely quarterly data was a result of a ransomware attack and has been remedied since.

MSDE received this LEA's data after the submission period and, with the complete dataset, the FFY2022 dropout rate is 17.61%, as opposed to 19.45%. Although the corrected dropout rate is lower than that calculated using the incomplete EDFacts submission, Maryland still did not meet the target for FFY 2022 and demonstrated slippage (an increase of 4.35 percentage points).

Eighteen (18) of the twenty-four (24) LEAs in Maryland demonstrated an increase in the number of students who existed special education due to dropping out between the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years, contributing to the slippage noted for this indicator. LEAs report that, during school year 2021-2022, a substantially higher proportion of students were exited compared to school year 2020-2021 due largely to the return to in-person learning, particularly within the dropout category; LEAs were less likely to exit students using the dropout code during virtual learning and more likely to with the re-opening of schools, contributing to the slippage for indicator 2. In addition, the state's baseline for this indicator was set during the virtual school year (2020-2021) when less students were being exited as dropouts, which also helps explain why Maryland was unable to meet the target of 13.00% this school year.

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

The State's Dropout Rate is the percentage of students dropping out of school ages 14-21 in a single year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer, from evening high school, and other alternative programs. Using the MSDE 2021-2022 school year Dropout Rate data, the MSDE, DEI/SES reports an Annual Dropout Rate of 17.61%, (1,303/7,401 X 100).

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Assessment indicator baselines and targets were set using FFY 2020 assessment data. These data were collected in the fall of 2021 using a shortened version of the State's regular assessment and testlets for the State's alternate assessment. As OSEP has indicated, the change in methodology by using full assessments in subsequent years requires the State to revise its baseline and targets. The state has begun the process of revising baselines and targets, including ensuring vast stakeholder input. These new baselines and targets will be submitted in the State's FFY 2023 APR submission.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,586	8,234	5,825
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,006	374	580
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	6,841	6,809	4,488
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	657	733	637

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,602	8,222	5,188
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	823	316	2,464
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	7,039	6,800	1,883
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	662	733	635

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,504	8,586	98.12%	95.00%	99.04%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7,916	8,234	93.87%	95.00%	96.14%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,705	5,825	90.50%	95.00%	97.94%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,524	8,602	98.04%	95.00%	99.09%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7,849	8,222	92.97%	95.00%	95.46%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4,982	5,188	91.41%	95.00%	96.03%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The State's assessment results can be found on the State's report card website: <https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/> using the data downloads page: <https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/Graphs/#/DataDownloads/datadownload/3/17/6/99/XXXX/2023>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	11.00%	14.00%	17.00%	20.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%	14.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	17.50%	21.00%	24.50%	28.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	17.00%	20.00%	22.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	10.50%	13.00%	15.50%	17.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Assessment indicator baselines and targets were set using FFY 2020 assessment data. These data were collected in the fall of 2021 using a shortened version of the State's regular assessment and testlets for the State's alternate assessment. As OSEP has indicated, the change in methodology by using full assessments in subsequent years requires the State to revise its baseline and targets. The state has begun the process of revising baselines and targets, including ensuring vast stakeholder input. These new baselines and targets will be submitted in the State's FFY 2023 APR submission.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,847	7,183	5,068
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	452	104	128
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	628	613	804

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,862	7,116	4,347
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	334	38	226
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	453	223	26

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,080	7,847	13.39%	11.00%	13.76%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	717	7,183	7.84%	9.00%	9.98%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	932	5,068	18.95%	17.50%	18.39%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	787	7,862	9.46%	14.00%	10.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	261	7,116	3.51%	2.50%	3.67%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	252	4,347	5.31%	10.50%	5.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response**3B - Required Actions**

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	42.50%	45.00%	47.50%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	52.50%	55.00%	57.50%	60.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	55.50%	58.00%	60.50%	63.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	27.50%	30.00%	32.50%	35.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	35.50%	38.00%	40.50%	43.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	55.50%	58.00%	60.50%	63.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family

engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Assessment indicator baselines and targets were set using FFY 2020 assessment data. These data were collected in the fall of 2021 using a shortened version of the State's regular assessment and testlets for the State's alternate assessment. As OSEP has indicated, the change in methodology by using full assessments in subsequent years requires the State to revise its baseline and targets. The state has begun the process of revising baselines and targets, including ensuring vast stakeholder input. These new baselines and targets will be submitted in the State's FFY 2023 APR submission.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	657	733	637
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	35	111	233

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	662	733	635
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	142	57	250

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	35	657	6.40%	42.50%	5.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	111	733	14.87%	52.50%	15.14%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	233	637	24.50%	55.50%	36.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities were most impacted by learning loss during the pandemic, as many require supports that are difficult or impossible to deliver in virtual instruction. The FFY 2020 assessment, administered in the fall of 2021 and was the basis for target setting,

does not demonstrate the full impact of these losses, because an abbreviated form of the assessment was used. The assessment utilized the instructionally embedded testlets rather than the summative assessment, which is typically used for assessment. This may have impacted student scores, as the tests are not comparable. These students may also have been especially impacted by ongoing interruptions to instruction caused by schedule changes, staffing shortages, and other challenges.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	142	662	20.10%	27.50%	21.45%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	57	733	6.83%	35.50%	7.78%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	250	635	23.28%	55.50%	39.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	16.50	16.00	15.50	15.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	23.50	23.00	22.50	22.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	47.50	47.00	46.50	46.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	13.50	13.00	12.50	12.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	6.21	6.11	6.01	5.91
Math	C <=	Grade HS	34.00	33.50	33.00	32.50

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

18 Parent Members

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Assessment indicator baselines and targets were set using FFY 2020 assessment data. These data were collected in the fall of 2021 using a shortened version of the State's regular assessment and testlets for the State's alternate assessment. As OSEP has indicated, the change in methodology by using

full assessments in subsequent years requires the State to revise its baseline and targets. The state has begun the process of revising baselines and targets, including ensuring vast stakeholder input. These new baselines and targets will be submitted in the State's FFY 2023 APR submission.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	63,673	65,295	56,937
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,847	7,183	5,068
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	27,808	27,849	28,508
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,177	2,734	3,473
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	452	104	128
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	628	613	804

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	64,510	65,760	50,673
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,862	7,116	4,347
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	18,345	11,412	17,566
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,450	1,111	80
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	334	38	226
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	453	223	26

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13.76%	48.66%	32.76	16.50	34.90	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.98%	46.84%	34.71	23.50	36.86	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	18.39%	56.17%	39.28	47.50	37.78	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Despite the gains in 4th and 8th grade, the magnitude of the gains (in terms of percentage increase) for general education students were greater in 4th and 8th grade, than it was for special education students. The State believes that younger special education students may have been especially impacted by ongoing interruptions to instruction caused by schedule changes, staffing shortages, and other challenges present during the return to in-person instruction during the in the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school years.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Despite the gains in 4th and 8th grade, the magnitude of the gains (in terms of percentage increase) for general education students were greater in 4th and 8th grade, than it was for special education students. The State believes that younger special education students may have been especially impacted by ongoing interruptions to instruction caused by schedule changes, staffing shortages, and other challenges present during the return to in-person instruction during the in the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school years.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10.01%	32.24%	18.71	13.50	22.23	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.67%	19.04%	13.59	6.21	15.38	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	5.80%	34.82%	28.93	34.00	29.03	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Despite the gains in 4th and 8th grade, the magnitude of the gains (in terms of percentage increase) for general education students were greater in 4th and 8th grade, than it was for special education students. The State believes that younger special education students may have been especially impacted by ongoing interruptions to instruction caused by schedule changes, staffing shortages, and other challenges present during the return to in-person instruction during the in the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school years.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Despite the gains in 4th and 8th grade, the magnitude of the gains (in terms of percentage increase) for general education students were greater in 4th and 8th grade, than it was for special education students. The State believes that younger special education students may have been especially impacted by ongoing interruptions to instruction caused by schedule changes, staffing shortages, and other challenges present during the return to in-person instruction during the in the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	71.43%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	71.43%	66.43%	61.43%	61.43%	50.00%
Data	71.43%	57.14%	Not Valid and Reliable	Not Valid and Reliable	

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	40.00%	35.00%	30.00%	25.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

6

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	19		40.00%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES's analysis of the data demonstrated that nineteen (19) LEAs met the minimum cell size of 5 students from 2021-2022. Six (6) LEAs were excluded due to not meeting a minimum cell size of five (5). In other words, six (6) LEAs had less than five (5) students with disabilities that were suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) days in the 2021-2022 school year. Of the six (6) LEAs that were excluded from analysis due to not meeting the minimum cell size, three (3) LEAs suspended or expelled zero (0) students with disabilities greater than ten (10) days. One (1) LEA had one (1) student with a disability suspended or expelled greater than ten (10) days, one LEA had two (2) students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than ten (10) days, and one (1) LEA had four (4) students with disabilities suspended or expelled greater than ten (10) days. Despite being excluded due to not meeting the minimum cell size, none of the six (6) excluded LEAs had rate ratios of 2.0 or greater.

No LEAs were excluded due to not meeting an n-size of at least twenty (20).

Given that state has set a low cell size threshold of five (5) students suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) days and that no LEAs are excluded from the State's analysis due to the minimum population or n-size, the State and its stakeholders believe that the State's methodology is reasonably designed to identify discrepancies if they exist.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

No LEAs were identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension identified in FFY 2022 using FFY 2021 (2021 - 2022) data.

In past years, when LEAs were identified, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff, using a discipline review document, conducted a review of the suspension policies and procedures related to:

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

Staff from the MSDE and the LEA utilized the discipline review document to conduct a review of policies, procedures, and practices and to ensure

compliance with federal and State regulations. Additionally, the MSDE conducted individual student record reviews from an additional data period to ensure that the implementation of policies and procedures, and practices were consistent with federal and State regulatory requirements, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state has explained how its LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy and explained why it believes its methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies if they occur.

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

10

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
9	0	15		0%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services (DEI/SES) utilized a Rate Ratio to compare the 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 .

If the Rate Ratio is 2.0 or greater, the LEA is considered to be significantly discrepant. In addition to meeting the Rate Ratio of 2.0 or above, the local school systems must meet the criteria for the minimum cell and n-size. The minimum cell size for all LEAs is five (5) students with disabilities from at least one (1) race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) school days in a school year. The minimum n-size for all LEAs is twenty (20) students with disabilities from at least one race/ethnicity group in that LEA.

Fifteen (15) LEAs met the minimum cell size of at least five (5) students with disabilities from a particular race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) school days in a school year. No LEAs were excluded due to n-size.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

For each of the local education agencies (LEAs) identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension by race/ethnicity, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff, using a discipline review document, conducted a review of the suspension policies and procedures related to:

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

4) procedural safeguards.

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State believes its methods are reasonably calculated to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs because LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy via statewide collected disciplinary data that captures both students with and without disabilities.

Fifteen (15) LEAs met the minimum cell size of at least five (5) students with disabilities from at least one (1) race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) school days in a school year. No LEAs were excluded due to n-size.

Six (6) of the excluded LEAs had less than five (5) SWD suspended or expelled greater than 10 days. The additional four (4) LEAs excluded had less than ten (10) SWD total suspended or expelled greater than 10 days.

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	70.40%	70.90%	70.90%	70.71%	71.00%
A	70.71%	Data	70.09%	70.20%	70.24%	70.71%	71.75%
B	2020	Target <=	11.26%	10.76%	10.76%	12.00%	11.75%
B	12.00%	Data	12.04%	12.06%	11.80%	12.00%	11.50%
C	2020	Target <=	5.69%	5.44%	5.44%	6.41%	6.25%
C	6.41%	Data	6.77%	6.85%	6.68%	6.41%	6.24%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	71.25%	71.50%	71.75%	72.00%
Target B <=	11.50%	11.25%	11.00%	10.75%
Target C <=	6.00%	5.75%	5.50%	5.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	103,959

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	74,801
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11,794
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	5,755
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	75
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	298

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	74,801	103,959	71.75%	71.25%	71.95%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11,794	103,959	11.50%	11.50%	11.34%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	6,128	103,959	6.24%	6.00%	5.89%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	64.90%	65.10%	65.10%	60.87%	62.00%
A	Data	62.72%	59.67%	61.60%	60.87%	59.81%
B	Target <=	18.10%	17.90%	17.90%	20.92%	20.00%
B	Data	17.50%	20.09%	19.03%	20.92%	21.32%
C	Target <=				0.00%-0.33%	0.00%-0.33%
C	Data				0.33%	0.48%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	63.00%	64.00%	67.00%	70.00%
Target B <=	19.00%	18.00%	14.00%	10.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	4,579	4,974	1,220	10,773
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,755	2,886	808	6,449
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,154	980	163	2,297
b2. Number of children attending separate school	26	58	21	105
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	8	17	6	31

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,449	10,773	59.81%	63.00%	59.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,402	10,773	21.32%	19.00%	22.30%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	31	10,773	0.48%	0.32%	0.29%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2017	Target >=	68.53%	68.78%	68.78%	68.78%	70.50%
A1	68.53%	Data	68.53%	69.90%	70.44%	72.57%	72.06%

A2	2017	Target >=	52.75%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.50%
A2	52.75%	Data	52.75%	52.25%	49.41%	46.41%	44.44%
B1	2017	Target >=	72.12%	72.37%	72.37%	72.37%	73.00%
B1	72.12%	Data	72.12%	72.74%	72.91%	75.89%	75.12%
B2	2017	Target >=	50.87%	51.12%	51.12%	51.12%	51.50%
B2	50.87%	Data	50.87%	49.88%	47.90%	45.55%	44.23%
C1	2017	Target >=	71.40%	71.65%	71.65%	71.65%	72.00%
C1	71.40%	Data	71.40%	72.58%	71.14%	72.84%	69.29%
C2	2017	Target >=	59.23%	59.48%	59.48%	59.48%	60.00%
C2	59.23%	Data	59.23%	58.40%	56.71%	54.26%	51.69%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	71.00%	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%
Target A2 >=	54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%
Target B1 >=	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%
Target B2 >=	52.00%	52.50%	53.00%	53.50%
Target C1 >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Target C2 >=	60.50%	61.00%	61.50%	62.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,972

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	50	1.26%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	866	21.80%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,358	34.19%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,054	26.54%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	644	16.21%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who	2,412	3,328	72.06%	71.00%	72.48%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,698	3,972	44.44%	54.00%	42.75%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	37	0.93%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	769	19.36%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,417	35.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,306	32.88%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	443	11.15%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,723	3,529	75.12%	73.50%	77.16%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,749	3,972	44.23%	52.00%	44.03%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	64	1.61%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	979	24.65%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	987	24.85%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,185	29.83%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	757	19.06%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,172	3,215	69.29%	72.50%	67.56%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,942	3,972	51.69%	60.50%	48.89%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools and the decision tree for every COS rating. The state believes that its training focus on fidelity of COS practices is, at least in part, contributing to decreases in the child outcomes data. Through this process, local preschool special education providers and leaders have recognized that COS ratings have previously been elevated at entry. The state's renewed focus on age-anchoring seeks to ensure validity COS scores at both entry and exit. The state's data analysis indicates that less children are entering preschool with a COS score of 6 or 7, which overall lowers the percentages for Summary Statement #2. Lower entry COS scores may also be a result of the COVID-19 pandemic during these students time in early intervention.
C1	The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools and the decision tree for every COS rating. The state believes that its training focus on fidelity of COS practices is, at least in part, contributing to decreases in the child outcomes data. Through this process, local preschool special education providers and leaders have recognized that COS ratings have previously been elevated at entry. The state's renewed focus on age-anchoring seeks to ensure validity COS scores both at entry and exit.
C2	The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools and the decision tree for every COS rating. The state believes that its training focus on fidelity of COS practices is, at least in part, contributing to decreases in the child outcomes data. Through this process, local preschool special education providers and leaders have recognized that COS ratings have previously been elevated at entry. The state's renewed focus on age-anchoring seeks to ensure validity COS scores at both entry and exit. The state's data analysis indicates that less children are entering preschool with a COS score of 6 or 7, which overall lowers the percentages for Summary Statement #2. Lower entry COS scores may also be a result of the COVID-19 pandemic during these students time in early intervention.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan

(SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Preschool	2016	Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.25%
Preschool	82.99%	Data	80.98%	82.03%	81.98%	82.01%	78.39%
School age	2016	Target >=	71.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.50%
School age	70.00%	Data	69.00%	69.00%	72.00%	72.00%	69.05%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	85.50%	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%
Target B >=	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

Group	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	1,226	1,533	78.39%	85.50%	79.97%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
School age	5,845	8,564	69.05%	73.00%	68.25%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

106,750

Percentage of respondent parents

9.46%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	9.90%	9.46%

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

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

Note: demographics here refer to the demographics of the student for whom a parent is completing the survey.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Preschool: Parents were asked about the age of their child as of September 30, 2022. A majority (95%) of respondents stated that their child was between 3 and 5 years of age. The parents or guardians of children 4 years of age are underrepresented in the sample by 8 percentage points. The two racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (39%) and Black (30%) children. Parents of Black children are underrepresented in the survey (7 percentage points) when compared to the State population. In addition, parents of White children are overrepresented by 7 percentage points and parents of multiracial students are overrepresented by 5 percentage points in the survey when compared to the State population.

According to Statewide estimates, the most common exceptionality or disability evident in the Maryland preschool population is developmental delay which represents 61% of the population. Although this group did make up one of the largest portions of the sample, compared to the Statewide estimate this group was underrepresented among the respondents by 32 percentage points, representing only 29% of the sample. The second most common exceptionality or disability Statewide is speech or language impairment, and sample estimates were overrepresented compared to the actual population (23% of the population, 33% of the sample; 10 percentage point overrepresentation). Students with Autism represent 13% of the population but represented 23% of the sample; parents of children with Autism were overrepresented by 10 percentage points in this year’s survey, similar to last year. Students with Multiple Disabilities were overrepresented in the sample by 5 percentage points, as they constituted 6% of the respondents.

School age:

The most common racial/ethnic backgrounds of respondents were White (47%) or Black (23%), which is similar to last year’s sample. Parents of Black children were underrepresented by 16 percentage points and parents of White children were overrepresented by 13 percentage points. Hispanic or Latino children were underrepresented by 5 percentage points.

Parents of children with Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability were each underrepresented in the survey by 11 and 9 percentage points, respectively. Overrepresented in this year’s Survey were parents of children with Autism by 9 percentage points and Multiple Disabilities by 4 percentage points.

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

NO

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

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

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

MSDE identified improvement strategies to increase the response rate for the targeted demographic subgroups for both the preschool aged and the school-aged populations. The strategies included:

- 1) Conducting local outreach efforts to inform families of the importance to respond to the parent survey;
- 2) Collaborating with Local Family Support Coordinator (LFSC) in each of the LEA/PA to conduct outreach, training, and supports to address the areas of need gleaned from the annual survey; and
- 3) Collaborating with parent organizations that represent underserved populations using materials that are culturally appropriate and written in the native language.

For example, the Parent Survey results and the survey response questions were shared among the LFSC representing LEA/PA and who also serve on the Special Education Citizens Advisory Council. Data were reviewed, shared, and discussed to potentially increase parent response rates thus increasing the validity of the survey results. MSDE staff will continue to implement and track the impact of these activities in collaboration with the LFSC to determine their effectiveness and to make modifications, as necessary.

MSDE will also continue to implement additional measures to increase response rates and to encourage parents and guardians to complete surveys through paper or online formats, in English and in Spanish. Some specific recent improvements have been the addition of a QR Code to facilitate responding and the tracking of undeliverable surveys. By tracking undeliverable surveys, MSDE can inform counties and special schools about families who are not receiving the survey due to address issues, which gives them an opportunity to update contact lists, ensuring parents of students with disabilities receive and can answer the survey.

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

To assess for nonresponse bias, the State examined if parents of demographic groups found to be underrepresented in the response data also differed in the outcome of interest (i.e., level of agreement) as measured by statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) on a chi square test of independence.

Pre-school:

On average, 80% of respondent parents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, as measured by indicator 8, on the preschool survey.

The representation of parents of 3- and 5-year-olds was not significantly different than their percentage of Maryland's preschool population. Parents of 4-year-olds made up 43% of preschool survey respondents, significantly lower than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population (51%). In analyzing this data for the presence of nonresponse bias, a chi square test was used to compare of the level of agreement of parents of 4-year-old students to that of other age subgroups, revealing no significant difference on indicator 8. These results suggest that nonresponse bias was not present across age groups.

All racial subgroups were proportionately represented in the survey with the exception of parents of Black/African American students. Parents of Black children made up 30% of survey respondents, significantly lower than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population (37%), but higher than the proportion these respondents represented in last year's survey. Again, a chi square test was used to compare of the level of agreement of parents of Black students (80%) to that of other racial subgroups, revealing no significant difference on indicator 8. These results suggest that nonresponse bias was not present across race/ethnicity.

The State also examined response rates of parents of students with specific disability categories and found that parents of students with Autism made up 23% of survey respondents, significantly higher than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population (13%). Similarly, parents of students with speech/language impairments made up 33% of survey respondents, significantly higher than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population (23%). Parents of students with multiple disabilities comprised 6% of survey respondents, significantly higher than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population (1%). Parents of children with developmental delays made up 29% of survey respondents, significantly lower than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population (61%). When these groups' level of agreement on indicator 8 was compared to that of other disability subgroups using chi square tests, only parents of children with multiple disabilities were found to have a significantly different level of agreement (66%) for indicator 8. These results indicate the potential for nonresponse bias here.

School-Age:

On average, 68% of respondent parents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, as measured by indicator 8, on the school-age survey.

The State analyzed the school-age survey responses by age and found the age distribution of children of survey respondents did not significantly differ from the age distribution of the State.

An analysis of survey responses by race was then completed. Parents of White students made up 47% of survey respondents, significantly higher than are represented in Maryland's school-age special education population (33%). Parents of Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander students were also overrepresented as they made up 6% of survey respondents, but only 4% of Maryland's school-age special education population are Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander. Similarly, parents of multi-racial students were also overrepresented as they made up 8% of survey respondents, but only 5% of Maryland's school-age special education population are multi-racial. The parents of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino students, on the other hand, were underrepresented. Parents of Black/African American students comprised 23% of survey respondents, significantly lower than are represented in Maryland's school-age special education population (39%). Parents of Hispanic/Latino students comprised 14% of survey respondents, significantly lower than are represented in Maryland's school-age special education population (19%). A series of chi square tests were conducted to compare these racial subgroups' level of agreement on indicator 8 to detect any response bias present in this survey administration. Parents' level of

agreement ranged from 62% (American Indian or Alaskan Native) to 74% (both Hispanic/Latino and Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders) with an average level of agreement of 68% across all racial subgroups. A series of chi-square tests were conducted to measure any nonresponse bias and found no significant difference for parents of White, Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, multi-racial, Black/African American, or Hispanic Latino students, indicating a lack of nonresponse bias for race/ethnicity.

In terms of primary exceptionalities/disabilities, parents of students with Autism made up 23% of survey respondents, significantly higher than are represented in Maryland's special education population (14%). Parents of students with multiple disabilities were also overrepresented as they comprised 12% of survey respondents, but only 8% of Maryland's special education population. Parents of students with other health impairments and specific learning disabilities were underrepresented as they comprised 11% and 9% of survey respondents, respectively, but 19% and 29% of Maryland's special education population. A series of chi square tests were conducted to detect any nonresponse bias when considering students' primary exceptionalities/disabilities and no significant differences were found for parents of students with Autism, multiple disabilities, other health impairments, and specific learning disabilities, indicating a lack of nonresponse bias when considering primary exceptionality/disability.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

All grade levels (Kindergarten – Grade 12) were well represented in the respondent sample. The majority of respondents (84%) indicated that their child had been referred for special education services between the ages of zero and eight, and 51% had been referred between the ages of two and five. Four percent of respondents (N=382) indicated that their child attended a non-public school as a result of an IEP team decision for a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) while 87% of respondents (N=7,470) indicated that their child attended a public school during the 2022-23 school year. Nine percent of respondents did not answer this question.

Again in FFY 2022, parents provided low responses to issues of training or support. Specifically, parents of school-age students responded less favorably to the school providing them information on agencies that can assist their child in transition from school, providing information about organizations that support parents of students with disabilities, and explaining what options parents have if they disagree with the decision made by a school. MSDE continues to try to support LEAs/PAs facilitate involvement through the creation and dissemination of Parent Information Series documents, including a document specific to secondary transition: <https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/FSDR/ParentInformationSeries-2.aspx>

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported on the representativeness of the demographics of children receiving special education services and the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	25	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

For consistency and clarity, the MSDE's Indicator 9 methodology is similar to the methodology used for identifying Significant Disproportionality. In addition to meeting the 2.0 or greater risk ratio, the LEA must meet the criteria for the minimum cell size and n-size, where cell size is the number of students in an LEA who are a specific race/ethnicity and identified with a specific disability category, and where the n-size is the number of students with disabilities of a specific race/ethnicity enrolled in an LEA. The MSDE utilizes a minimum cell size of five (5) and a minimum "n" size of twenty (20). Unlike the calculation for Significant Disproportionality, the State only examines one (1) year of data in the calculation and does not consider reasonable progress for Indicator 9. As such, disproportionate representation is identified for any LEA with a risk ratio of 2.0 for one (1) year of data or greater who meets the minimum cell size and n-size requirements.

MSDE's analysis of the data for the 2022-2023 performance period demonstrated that zero (0) LEAs were identified as having a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups. No LEAs were excluded from the calculation.

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

No LEAS were found to have disproportionate representation for the 2022-2023 performance period. However, in the past when LEAs were found disproportionate, the MSDE reviewed the policies, procedures, practices, and IEPs (student records) of the LEAs impacted, followed by a review of IEPs, including student records to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.311.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
18	0	25	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

For consistency and clarity, the MSDE's Indicator 9 methodology is similar to the methodology used for identifying Significant Disproportionality. In addition to meeting the 2.0 or greater risk ratio, the LEA must meet the criteria for the minimum cell size and n-size, where cell size is the number of students in an LEA who are a specific race/ethnicity and identified with a specific disability category, and where the n-size is the number of students with disabilities of a specific race/ethnicity enrolled in an LEA. The MSDE utilizes a minimum cell size of five (5) and a minimum "n" size of twenty (20). Unlike the calculation for Significant Disproportionality, the State only examines one (1) year of data in the calculation and does not consider reasonable progress for Indicator 10. As such, disproportionate representation is identified for any LEA with a risk ratio of 2.0 for one (1) year of data or greater who meets the minimum cell size and n-size requirements.

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

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

The MSDE reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of the eighteen (18) LEAs impacted, followed by a review of IEPs and student records to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.311 for the LEAs. The MSDE did not identify noncompliance through this review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	77.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.60%	98.64%	98.51%	97.46%	96.96%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
24,161	23,175	96.96%	100%	95.92%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

For FFY 2022, multiple LEAs indicated that staffing shortages created compliance issues resulting in a slippage in compliance levels. Compared to FFY 2021, in FFY 2022 twelve (12) LEAs experienced slippage in compliance levels. However, one of Maryland's largest LEAs experienced a significant decrease in compliance, from 99.66% to 91.78%. For that LEA, the number of missed timelines increased from eight (8) in FFY 2021 to 192 in FFY 2022.

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

986

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

The MSDE, DSE/EIS identified 986 students with "unacceptable reasons for delays", an increase of 329 students from FFY 2021 (FFY 2021 = 657 students).

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

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

475 (1 day to 15 days) = 48.19%

329 (16 to 45 days) = 33.32%

182 (beyond 45 days) =18.49%

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	15	2	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified seventeen (17) new findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021. Fifteen (15) of the seventeen (17) the findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. Two (2) findings were corrected subsequently, although late.

To date, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that all seventeen (17) LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction was verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each LEA achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual student for which evaluations were not completed within timelines and verified that the evaluation was completed, although late, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Through this review process, the MSDE verified that each individual student identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	1	1	0

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified (1) finding of noncompliance in FFY 2019 that was not corrected in a timely manner. However, the LEA has since corrected the finding of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that the LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction was verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, after the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that the LEA achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual student for which evaluations were not completed within timelines and verified that the evaluation was completed, although late, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Through this review process, the MSDE verified that each individual student identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the one remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021. In addition, the State also reported that the one remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was corrected.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.40%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	99.89%	99.77%	98.81%	98.75%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,772
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	168

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,061
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.	202
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	1,315

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	2,061	2,087	98.75%	100%	98.75%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

26

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified twenty-six (26) students with "unacceptable reasons for delays." The unacceptable reason for each student's delay was identified as paperwork errors, administrative errors, and staffing.

The range of delays were:

1 to 15 Days = 8 students

16 to 30 Days = 10 students

31 to 45 Days = 1 students

Beyond 45 Days = 7 students

This information is used by the MSDE Monitoring Staff to assist local education agencies and public agencies in analyzing data and in providing technical assistance. The MSDE data management and program staff worked closely with local education agencies' staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported in FFY 2022.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified five (5) findings of noncompliance. All five (5) findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local Education Agency (LEA) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction is verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each LEA/PA achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the IEPs and records for each of individual child with findings of noncompliance in the LEA/PA where the findings of noncompliance were made. The DEI/SES verified that, although late, an IEP was developed and implemented for all those students unless the child was no longer within the local education agency or public agency, or the parent had withdrawn consent. An updated random sample of student records from a subsequent data set was reviewed to determine if those records were also compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE verified that each individual student identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	86.10%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.86%	92.62%	97.14%	99.65%	99.97%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
20,020	20,081	99.97%	100%	99.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

If no, please explain

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For FFY 2021, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified two (2) findings of noncompliance and all two (2) findings were fully corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance.

The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local Education Agency (LEA) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

First, in each LEA/PA where noncompliance was identified, correction was verified in each individual student record where the noncompliance was identified.

Second, using additional student records, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant.

When each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected and the analysis of subsequent data yielded 100% compliance, correction was considered verified, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the IEPs and records for each of the individual children identified with noncompliance in each LEA/PA where noncompliance occurred. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that the records of each individual child contained the required components for secondary transition as defined by 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA/PA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in

FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	24.87%	25.00%
A	24.87%	Data	26.46%	28.04%	26.54%	24.87%	26.77%
B	2020	Target >=	52.00%	53.00%	60.00%	56.32%	57.00%
B	56.32%	Data	65.07%	60.64%	61.87%	56.32%	63.63%
C	2020	Target >=	58.00%	59.00%	74.00%	56.63%	58.00%
C	56.63%	Data	76.93%	67.05%	64.66%	56.63%	65.11%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	25.50%	26.50%	27.50%	28.50%
Target B >=	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	61.00%
Target C >=	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

18 Parent Members
 Juvenile Services Education
 The Parents’ Place of Maryland
 Maryland Higher Education Commission

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	7,355
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,355
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,871
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,614
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)	120
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).	12

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,871	7,355	26.77%	25.50%	25.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,485	7,355	63.63%	58.00%	60.98%	Met 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)	4,617	7,355	65.11%	58.00%	62.77%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Nine (9) LEAs experienced slippage in FFY 2022 compared to FFY 2021 and three (3) of Maryland's five (5) largest jurisdictions experienced a slippage for Indicator 14A. LEAs that did not meet the State Target will be required to develop an Improvement Plan, including a root cause analysis and improvement strategies, to improve post-secondary results for students with disabilities.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

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

Because 100% of Leavers were found to be contained within the MLDSC and as such, their associated postsecondary and workforce data is included in the analysis, full representativeness was achieved.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The State's data include all Leavers (youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school), so no groups of students who were underrepresented or overrepresented.

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

YES

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

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

In Maryland, Indicator 14 is calculated using an administrative records exchange with the Maryland Longitudinal Data System Center (MLDSC) and two additional state agencies that provide post-secondary education and training to individuals with disabilities that do not supply data to the MLDS (rather than through an attempt to survey the students, their families, or teachers). Therefore, there is no true "response rate" as there would be for a survey. Instead, the state reports on Census data. All students with disabilities who have Maryland Public School attendance files are intended to be included in MLDS. In practice, however, some students may not be included in the MLDS due to data entry error or a failure at the LEA level to submit an attendance file for a student. Still, through this process, 100% of Leavers were found to be contained within the MLDS and as such, their associated postsecondary and workforce data is included in the analysis.

After identification of students in the MLDS, the State then collects training and education information about students from the Department of Rehabilitative Services (DORS) and Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) and adds it to MLDS information (although DDA has been unable to provide information since the start of the COVID 19 Pandemic).

The State's goal is to identify post-secondary information for all Leavers (full representativeness) to satisfy its Indicator 14 reporting requirement. . This exchange provides data on the number of youth with disabilities no longer in secondary school and who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school (Leavers), and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. At this time, the data contained in MLDS does not contain any out-of-state employment or college placements, or federal employment placements. However, data sharing agreements are continuing to be developed between MLDS and other agencies (i.e., State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency, Developmental Disabilities Administration) to reflect additional efforts to match additional students' post-school outcomes. The State reports on census data, so a response rate (like would be calculated from a survey) is not entirely applicable. Through its partnerships, the State was able to locate information on all 6,586 (100%) Leavers in the MLDS.

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

The State does not use a survey methodology and thus, nonresponse bias is not applicable. As mentioned above, the State makes efforts to obtain information on every Leaver through its partnerships with outside agencies and as a result the State continues to be able to report on a high percentage of leavers.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	82
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	28

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00%-75.00%	64.00%-75.00%	64.00%-75.00%
Data	58.46%	55.21%	58.49%	28.26%	46.15%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
28	82	46.15%	64.00%	75.00%	34.15%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

MSDE did not meet its target of 64% in this reporting period. The State attributes the challenge of meeting the resolution sessions target to the changing perceptions of dispute resolution.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

MSDE is continuing to respond to this issue by focusing upon parent support and parent education. We continue to be committed to providing high-quality parent support through the use of MSDE Family Support Specialists, who respond to parent requests for assistance through telephone calls, email, and written correspondence. The MSDE Family Support Specialists also serve as school system liaisons in order to ensure that parents have access to school system-based information and resources for support. In this effort, the State has created a Parent Information Series of documents: <https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/FSDR/ParentInformationSeries-2.aspx>

MSDE also continues to strengthen the training and support provided to its Statewide Family Support Providers, this year, the focus has been upon facilitating meaningful communication between families and school system personnel during this period of school building closures as the result of the pandemic. MSDE believes that these efforts can have a positive impact on the successful outcome of resolution sessions for families and the school system.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	184
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	43
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	35

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	73.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	65.22%	70.48%	66.45%	46.96%	54.97%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
43	35	184	54.97%	75.00%	85.00%	42.39%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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

The State believes that the strong voice of Maryland's parent advocacy community may contribute to higher expectations from the mediation process and result in the possibility of more difficult communications between the parties. MSDE is continuing to respond to this issue by focusing upon parent support and school system responsiveness to parental concerns, with a particular emphasis on the need for strong communication during recovery the COVID pandemic. In this effort, the State has created a new Parent Information Series: <https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/FSDR/ParentInformationSeries-2.aspx>

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

Students with disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate progress and narrow the gap in mathematics performance.

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

NO

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

YES

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

The subset is inclusive of students with and without disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5 in the SPDG participating schools (2 per designated LEA – Baltimore County and Howard County Public Schools).

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/MDTheoryofActionFFY2021.pdf>

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	5.56%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	5.56%	7.50%	8.50%	9.50%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of students with disabilities from SPDG sites grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) on MCAP	Total number of students from SPDG sites grade 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) on MCAP	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
7	126	6.93%	5.56%	5.56%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

SiMR data come from grade-level results on the MCAP exam in mathematics administered during the fourth quarter of each school year. Baseline data for FFY 2022 represent student outcomes for the May 2023 administration of MCAP for students with disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5 in the SSIP/SPDG LEAs.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

High-stakes test scores are publicly available data. The data are aggregated by district, participating school, and grade level. Student achievement data are disaggregated by those students with a disability as compared to data for all students participating in the assessment program. The SSIP target is the percentage of students with disabilities who are proficient (levels 3 & 4) in meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations in mathematics.

Demographic Profile of Participating Schools

Baltimore County

- Mars Estates Elementary School (MEES): Total student population 350 learners with 17% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 74% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 58% of the student population identify as African American, 15% identify as White, 17% identify as Hispanic, 8% Multi-racial and 3% identify as Asian.

- Scotts Branch Elementary School (SBES): Total student population 520 learners with 10.9% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 71.5% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 88.9% of the student population identify as African American, 2.35% identify as White, and 7.9% identify as Hispanic.

Howard County

- Hanover Hills Elementary School (HHES): Total student population 823 learners with 13.6% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 36.2% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 41% of the student population identify as African American, 11.42% identify as White, 15.6% identify as Hispanic, 6.4% Multi-racial and 24.6% identify as Asian.

- Jeffers Hill Elementary School (JHES): Total student population 410 learners with 10.2% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 32.7% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 42.4% of the student population identify as African American, 18.8% identify as White, 23.2% identify as Hispanic, 5.8% Multi-racial and 22.4% identify as Asian.

With the introduction of a revised baseline and newly identified LEA participants, the State has not collected additional data demonstrating progress toward the SiMR. The State SPDG plan details a comprehensive data collection and analysis process for documenting student and participant outcomes aligned with the SiMR. Data targets include:

- Students' Mathematics Benchmark/Universal Screener outcome data for the Winter administration.
- Students' Social Emotional Learning Competency outcome(s) for the Fall and Spring Winter of each school year.
- Participant Survey data relative to the impact of professional learning on personnel capacity and the implementation of EBPs with fidelity.
- Coaching Implementation Fidelity data to identify the impact of professional learning and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes.
- Family Partnerships Quality Indicators data to identify the impact of SPDG-supported practices related to sustainability and increased school-family partnerships for engaging families in mathematics learning.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

- Comparability of local assessments has been an ongoing concern with prior SSIP implementation due to a lack of a common assessment measure such as the MAP. Each of the LEAs participating in the SSIP identified and reported outcomes using different low-stakes assessments to measure mathematics performance throughout the school year. While these measures informed instruction within the schools or districts, they were less useful for evaluation purposes across districts. For the implementation of the SSFY 2022 SSIP the participating LEAs are using the MAP Growth measure for universal screening and progress-monitoring of mathematics. A common assessment window for the benchmarks has been identified by each of the LEAs which will allow for a more consistent examination of student progress over time aligned with instructional/improvement targets using student growth norms. School norms provide references for comparing how grade levels of students within a school compare, as a group, to the same grade level of students in another specific school or LEA.
- Previous implementation did not focus on specific or common EBPs/interventions across the local systems or across participating schools this lack of standard practices made the tracking of fidelity of implementation and evidence of improvement a challenge. Variability across interventions and the benchmark measures used to track progress resulted in data that could not be adequately used to track student outcomes over time. The FFY 2022 SSIP incorporates the use of the practice profile methodology by defining specific evidence-based practices for core mathematics,

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/EvaluationPlanDraftFFY23.pdf>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Changes to the evaluation process were defined in the updates to the evaluation plan with an emphasis on greater specificity related to: A formative evaluation will use data gathered during project implementation to help improve progress toward achieving SSIP goals. These will include qualitative input from implementers (University faculty, MSDE staff, school administrators, and implementing teachers), as well as ratings of products designed to guide the work of the SPDG/SSIP (e.g., EBP definitions, fidelity tools, products produced) related to quality, usefulness, and relevance, as well as alignment with research evidence, by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of product.

A summative evaluation will focus on assessment of outcomes: the extent to which the SPDG/SSIP achieved its goals and objectives; the extent to which change in University coursework, State technical assistance, and Local professional learning activities has occurred; the extent to which participants implement EBPs with fidelity; as well as the extent to which there is an impact on student performance. Measures will include surveys (for Stakeholders, independent review panel, targeted participants), ratings based on criteria for content of products delivered (by Stakeholders and Independent review panel), fidelity of implementation, percent of completed components of local products delivered, percent of knowledge acquired through professional learning, and differential data of student achievement on State and local assessments.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

With the focus of the SSIP shifted to newly identified LEAs committed to the use of strengthened strategies in support of the implementation of refined evidence-based practices (EBP), the evaluation plan also shifted to measure both implementation and results. This shift occurred with funding from OSEP for a State Personnel Development Plan (SPDG) that maintained the SIMR but improved the methods for implementation. An additional focus on social-emotional learning as an EBP to support mathematics learning was added.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The State applied for and received a State Personnel Improvement Grant (SPDG) which drives the SSIP improvement actions. The alignment of SPDG and SSIP maintains a clear focus on implementation of well-defined EBPs with fidelity, data-driven decision making, job-embedded professional learning, progress-monitoring using common measures and coaching support. This infrastructure improvement provided a foundation for the State's actions related to governance, professional learning, and data-driven decision-making with the long-term expectation of expansion and scale-up.

Governance

- Integrate the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) Stages of Implementation and Drivers through a collaborative team and data-informed process.
- Identified and established a Core Leadership Team responsible for driving SSIP improvement actions and responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up.
- Expanded the role of the State Stakeholder Advisory Group
 - Focused on school and family engagement as a key factor in SSIP improvement outcomes. focus on school and family engagement.
- Involved educators in collaboration with key community partners in the development of responsive and reciprocal decision making for the improvement of culture, climate, and learning by targeting mathematics achievement.

Professional Learning/Technical Assistance

Addressed and expanded capacity building across the SSIP LEAs and within the State Implementation Team. Implementation activities focus on:

- Emphasized broad stakeholder ownership as the foundation of systemic change.
- Identification of grade level specific school personnel (general education/special education) for the focused implementation of the Maryland Practice Profiles and Instructional Coaching.
 - Provide multiple opportunities for varied professional learning aligned to the Maryland Practice Profiles and integrated with school improvement objectives.
 - Established a collective of ready resources supporting improvement targets related to Maryland's Practice Profiles and identified site specific improvement targets: mathematics fluency, social-emotional learning, and family partnerships related to mathematics.
 - Established an instructional coaching protocol and related professional learning resources grounded in the work of Elena Aguilar and Thomas Guskey.

Data-Informed Decisions

- Supported a plan for continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics and social-emotional learning competencies using EBP aligned to implementation fidelity.
- Established data collection processes and measures to address consistency and validity.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SIMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The FFY22 SSIP infrastructure improvements are represented by the following short-term/intermediate outcomes necessary for achievement of the SIMR; sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or scale-up.

Governance

Collaborative teams, responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up, are integral to the planning and implementation of improvement actions related to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. A climate of trust, respect, and openness is required to build and sustain collaboration over time, building a commitment to systemic change, common goals, and interdependence. Targeted and responsive actions defined by specific collaborative teams committed to systemic change maintains a focus on need.

- Established SSIP Implementation Teams that were cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. Focused on implementation of practices to address evidence-based core mathematics, specially designed mathematics instruction implemented in inclusive learning environments, and embedded social-emotional learning practices supporting student within the academic content.
 - o SSIP/SPDG Core Team consisted of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning (PL) Specialist, SPDG PL Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief. Improvement targets for the team included regular and consistent communication with all partners and collaborators, decision-making relative to allocation of resources, and evaluation processes for identifying and tracking student outcomes. Monthly collaboratives.
 - o SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction mathematics, social-emotional learning (SEL), and instructional coaching. Quarterly meetings.
 - o Stakeholder Advisory Group included diverse representation from the Maryland SICC and SESAC, Parents' Place, Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the (University of Kansas) Elementary Math, SEL specialists and MSDE agency representatives. Quarterly meetings.
 - o School-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, PL, and curricular supports necessary for driving improvement actions. Monthly meetings.
 - o Leveraged connections and relationships to engage families as active participants and contributors to not only WHAT their children are learning, but HOW they are learning. The FFY22 SSIP/SPDG identified Quality Indicators for Partnering with Families in School-based Implementation, and Home Support of Specially Designed Math Instruction. Engaged families support systemic and school-based actions as well as establishes a community commitment to improved outcomes for all students including students with disabilities.

Professional Learning/Technical Assistance

PL when integrated with school improvement and inclusive of ongoing seminars, on-demand supports and contact with peers during the learning process provides opportunities for personnel to engage in learning that transforms practice and sustainable active learning. that the provision of effective PL encompassing models of expected practice, coaching support, and reflective performance feedback were the key considerations for improving student math performance. Implementation of a defined and structured approach to capacity building ensures that highly effective practices embedded within the State and local systems' processes for building the capacity of implementers were in place and with an emphasis on systemic change and sustainability.

- Allocation of State discretionary funding to support locally driven PL, instructional coaching, and continuous improvement. Provided the necessary fiscal resources necessary for implementation.
- Development of specific practice profiles targeting improvement actions to address SiMR:
 - o Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practices aligned with the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for Mathematics and the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Practice Guide. Tier 1 Interventions and effective evidence-based core instructional practices supporting elementary students at risk for or with disabilities.
 - o Increasing Intensity of Instruction/Intervention through Data-Based Individualization and the Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity for Tier 2 or supplemental math intervention.
 - o Evidence-based Math SDI for accelerating learner progress with the adaptation of instruction based on the individual characteristics of learner, with consideration of the cognitive load in the teaching process and cognitive energy required for learning.
 - o Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework incorporating four of the five tenets of everyday SEL instruction designed by Nancy Frey, Dominique Smith, and Douglas Fisher.
- Summer 2023 PL Academy for the launch of SSIP/SPDG improvement actions. A 3-day academy featuring local, State and National experts in the areas of math core and SDI), SEL and PL for the development of school-wide instructional practices targeting improved math performance and social-emotional competence for all learners and narrowing achievement gaps for students with disabilities. Targeted PL to meet the needs of personnel at the participating schools, identify improvement priorities and practices for the 23-24 school year. National experts included Jenny Root, Nancy Frey, and Douglas Fisher.
 - Development of asynchronous learning modules aligned to the Maryland Practice Profiles and integrated with school improvement objectives. Launch of modules 1 and 2. Contracted support for the creation of modules 3 -9 specific to SDI mathematics.
 - Purchase and distribution of PL resources aligned with State and local improvement targets.
 - Cultivate University partnership for the development of preservice and in-service learning for general education and special education teachers.
 - Pilot Maryland's SPDG Coaching Guide and training protocol for district and State personnel linked to the implementation of instructional coaching related to Maryland's Practice Profiles. Technical assistance and feedback provided by Thomas Guskey.
- o Hire MSDE and LEA coaches.
- o Initiate a series of PL for the development of coaches' capacity. Initial training provided via a 2 day in-person workshop followed by bi-weekly job-embedded collaborative opportunities for ongoing learning and networking.
- o Define the roles and responsibilities of the Instructional Coach, School Principal, and School Leadership Team in support of SSIP/SPDG improvement actions and the implementation of instructional coaching with fidelity.
- o Collaborate with UofK, Debriefscape to establish a prototype of an analytical observational toolkit for math and SEL aligned with the Maryland Practice Profiles supporting coaches working with SSIP/SPDG elementary teachers using a tailored dashboard of PL resources including video sampling.

...continued in "Additional information about this indicator"...

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Full implementation using the resources and professional learning protocols developed using of the practice profile methodology to define specific evidence-based practices for core mathematics, specially designed instruction (SDI) mathematics, and embedded social-emotional learning. Utilizing the Maryland Coaching Guide, State and district level personnel will implement systemic instructional coaching support to address the specific instruction practices necessary for improved student outcomes in elementary mathematics (Maryland Practice Profiles for core content and SDI with embedded SEL).

Outcomes:

- Conduct Stakeholders Advisory Group and Focus Groups for continued collaboration and board ownership of systems change. [Governance]
- Operationalize the implementation of EBP in mathematics, SDI mathematics, and SEL. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance and Data Informed Decisions]
- Application of professional learning and coaching framework across learning environments. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance]
 - o Content focus
 - o Active learning
 - o Sustain connections within professional learning and coaching activities.
 - o Coherence including the use of data analytics.
- Embedded EBP Math in SDI and SEL university level coursework. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance]
- Demonstrate continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics across SSIP districts as evidenced in the SiMR data. [Data Informed Decisions and Governance]
- Gather and report student data in mathematics achievement and SEL competence. [Data Informed Decisions]
- Analyze and summarize student performance data by grade, school, and district to target improvement. [Data Informed Decisions and Governance]

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

MSDE received, a State Personnel Development Grant specifically designed to address the SiMR, with highly structured strategies, fidelity measures, and PL/Coaching model that can be consistently applied across 2 school districts to improve student learning and demonstrate connections between teaching with evidence-based practices (both specially designed mathematics instruction and social-emotional support strategies). Organizational structures needed to accompany professional learning have been identified, such as: systems for using student data to analyze intervention needs, design of an integrated system of math and SEL supports that include the necessary, ongoing collaborative planning using continuous improvement cycles, and school schedules that allow for collaborative planning time and direct instruction in the needed dose and intensity for learners with disabilities.

The FFY 2022 SSIP implementation plan emphasized the development of specific practice profiles targeting improvement actions to address SiMR:

- o Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practice Profile.
- o Evidence-based Mathematics SDI Practice Profile

- o Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework Practice Profile.
- o Instructional coaching protocol
- o Quality Indicators for Partnering with Families in School-based Implementation, and Home Support of Specially Designed Mathematics Instruction. The FFY 2022 SSIP incorporates the use of the practice profile methodology by defining specific evidence-based practices for core mathematics, specially designed instruction (SDI) mathematics, and embedded social-emotional learning to be .
- Consistency and validity of assessing the impact of professional learning activities inclusive of job-embedded coaching supports were noted data quality challenges with SSIP implementation. To address these challenges the FFY 2022 SSIP implementation plan has identified three measures to reliably assess personnel capacity, implementation of EBPs with fidelity and improved student outcomes:
 - o Individual Participant Survey Response Data using a 1 – 5 Rating Scale of Quality, Usefulness, Relevance (OUR) and Knowledge gained (QUR-K). Administered following each professional learning experience including asynchronous, remote, and in-person events.
 - o Benchmarking Survey administered three times per year to track professional growth and inform ongoing support needs (Beginning of School Year (Aug/Sept), Mid-year (Jan), and End of School Year (June)).
 - o Coaching Implementation Fidelity tool to identify the impact of professional learning and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes. (In-development)
- o Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practice Profile.
- o Evidence-based Mathematics SDI Practice Profile
- o Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework Practice Profile.
- o Instructional coaching protocol
- o Quality Indicators for Partnering with Families in School-based Implementation, and Home Support of Specially Designed Mathematics Instruction.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

- Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practice Profile aligned with the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for Mathematics and the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Practice Guide. Tier 1 Interventions and effective evidence-based core instructional practices supporting elementary students at risk for or with disabilities. This profile serves as a rubric of best practices in intervention research with easily comprehensible instructional teacher practices related to the following EBP:
 - o Explicit (Systematic) Instruction
 - o Mathematical Language
 - o Representations
 - o Number Lines
 - o Word Problems
 - o Fact Fluency
 - Evidence-based Mathematics SDI Practice Profile for accelerating learner progress with the adaptation of instruction based on the individual characteristics of learner, with consideration of the cognitive load in the teaching process and cognitive energy required for learning. <https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/srs/cresource/q1/p01/#content> This profile focuses on accelerating progress to narrow the achievement gap for students with disabilities. The EBPs have been shown to improve student learning of academic content. The practices are specific to SDI in mathematics:
 - o Systematic prompting and feedback
 - o Self-regulation support for learning and behavior
 - o Peer assisted instruction
 - o Manipulative-based instructional sequences
 - o Contextualized instruction
 - o Modified schema-based instruction
 - o Learning and communication accessibility
 - Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework Practice Profile incorporating four of the five tenets of everyday SEL instruction designed by Nancy Frey, Dominique Smith, and Douglas Fisher. The SEL practices identify the SEL tenets (improvement targets), the learner competencies (student) , and the proficiencies to be demonstrated by the teachers. These include the following:
 - o Identity and Agency
 - o Emotional Regulation
 - o Cognitive Regulation
 - o Social Skills
- In addition to the EBPs the State developed frameworks to integrate research, evidence-based practices, and quality improvement actions.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

- Intended Impact to SiMR
- Maryland’s Practice Profiles for mathematics (core & SDI), SEL, and instructional coaching were designed by a Design Team of local, State, and National experts with review and input from the Stakeholder Advisory Group over the course of a yearlong development process. Implementation science (NIRN) strategies using the practice profile methodology and fidelity measures were used to define the EBP by targeting the inclusion of research or best practices, alignment of competencies with a theory of change, and the recognition of “what works” through the experience of communities, practitioners, and key stakeholders. The benefits of practice profiles included:
- Greater specificity and an operationalized model for consistent implementation of improvement actions resulting in changes to policies and practices at State, District and School-level. .
 - Facilitated development and implementation of effective training protocols, coaching, and fidelity assessments related to systemic procedures and practices.
 - Refined the organizational and systems supports necessary to install and facilitate consistent and effective practices across implementing teachers. Established clearly defined protocols for implementation and sustainability over time.
 - Promoted the use of continuous improvement as an essential function of the practice.
 - Develop common expectation for tracking outputs and outcomes relative to fidelity and provide rationale for facilitating actions or subsequent change. The standards and expectations targeted in Maryland’s Practice Profiles align with Maryland’s College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics and identify the specific instructional practices required to improve mathematics learning outcomes for elementary students with disabilities. With full implementation the impact to the SiMR should be demonstrated by marked improvement of student performance on formative and summative measures inclusive of State assessment data and outcomes on local benchmarks.
 - Increased achievement in mathematics for children with disabilities over 3 years (MCAP data)

- School-wide decrease in achievement gap in mathematics (Universal Screener)
- Increased social emotional competence (SEL assessment tool)
- Improved implementation of professional learning (QUR & E)

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

During the FFY 2022 SSIP implementation, a revised baseline was established.

Baltimore County Public Schools

Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 12.5% in grade 3, 9.0% in grade 4, and 6.4% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 21 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

Howard County Public Schools

Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 16.1% in grade 3, 13.8% in grade 4, and 12.1% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 36 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

SSIP/SPDG Sites

Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 5.56% (7 SWD of 126 SWD assessed).

All students in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 19.93% (165 students of 828 students assessed).

Achievement Gap = 14.37 percentage points

BCPS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 1.96% (1 SWD of 51 SWD assessed).

HCPSS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 8% (6 SWD of 75 SWD assessed).

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

N/A

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Full implementation in the pilot LEAs using the resources and professional learning protocols developed using of the practice profile methodology to define specific evidence-based practices for core mathematics, specially designed instruction (SDI) mathematics, and embedded social-emotional learning. Utilizing the Maryland Coaching Guide, State and district level personnel will implement systemic instructional coaching support to address the specific instruction practices necessary for improved student outcomes in elementary mathematics (Maryland Practice Profiles for core content and SDI with embedded SEL).

- Analyze and summarize student performance data by grade, school, and district to target improvement. [Data Informed Decisions and Governance]

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

YES

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

The FFY 2022 SSIP implementation plan emphasized the development of specific practice profiles targeting improvement actions to address SiMR. With full implementation the projected outcomes include:

- Conduct Stakeholders Advisory Group and Focus Groups for continued collaboration and board ownership of systems change. [Governance]
- Operationalize the implementation of EBP in mathematics, SDI mathematics, and SEL. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance and Data Informed Decisions]
- Application of professional learning and coaching framework across learning environments. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance]
 - o Content focus
 - o Active learning
 - o Sustain connections within professional learning and coaching activities.
 - o Coherence including the use of data analytics.
- Embedded EBP Math in SDI and SEL university level coursework. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance]
- Demonstrate continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics across SSIP districts as evidenced in the SiMR data. [Data Informed Decisions and Governance]
- Gather and report student data in mathematics achievement and SEL competence. [Data Informed Decisions]

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2022, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

During the FFY 2020 APR Clarification Period, a second Part B SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey was disseminated to Part B stakeholders. This Survey was intended to obtain stakeholder feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, since assessment data were not available prior to March 2020 (after the initial APR submission period), as well as for Indicators 5 and 6, since the state was not aware that it was required to reset its baseline for these Indicators for FFY 2021. Stakeholder feedback was obtained through April 22, 2022 and targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback. After all surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

In preparation for its FFY 2022 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2022, December 2022, May 2023, June 2023, and September 2023. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2022.

For FFY 2022, the state is proposing a revision to its Indicator #17 SSIP baseline and targets to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG. Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during Collaborative Teams. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

Monthly SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief.

Quarterly SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core math, specially designed instruction math, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching.

Quarterly Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, SESAC, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Math, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives.

Monthly school-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports.

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

The Maryland State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is established in accordance with the provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Part C). The mission of the SICC is to advise and assist the lead agency (Maryland State Department of Education) in administering, promoting, planning, coordinating, and improving the early childhood intervention and education system of services. General meetings provide SICC members, families, partners, and concerned citizens the opportunity to provide comments regarding Maryland's system of early intervention and

preschool special education services.

On December 1, 2022, the Blueprint Accountability and Implementation Board (AIB) adopted its Initial Blueprint Comprehensive Implementation Plan. The Implementation Plan outlines recommendations for MSDE to convene a Blueprint Special Education Workgroup to discuss and make recommendations on instruction and services for students with disabilities.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

During the FFY 2021 reporting cycle, the State's Theory of Action was refined to align and extend the Maryland ESSA State Plan with a focus on capacity need (evidence-based specially designed math instruction), an improvement model inclusive of professional learning and coaching within a data-informed continuous improvement cycle, and a school organizational structure aimed at effective ITSS structures with collaborative planning time. The SiMR does not change but the participant local educational agencies have changed.

For the FFY 2022 reporting cycle, the State revised the baseline data to align with specific needs relative to the newly participating LEAs in order to demonstrate improvement in mathematics performance because of improved state support, technical assistance, infrastructure development, and professional learning outcomes aligned with the State SPDG.

Upon review of the baseline data, projected improvement targets were developed with input from stakeholder advisory groups during quarterly meetings. The projected targets represent an improvement rate of approximately two percentage points annually with an emphasis on a continued pattern of improved achievement outcomes for students with disabilities.

Collaborative teams are integral to SSIP planning and implementation of improvement actions. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. A climate of trust, respect, and openness is required to build and sustain collaboration over time, building a commitment to systemic change, common goals, and interdependence. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:

- SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief. Monthly collaboratives. October 11, 2022 - November 17, 2022 - January 4, 2023 - Feb 13, 2023, March 16, 2023, April 5, 2023 , May 9, 2023, May 31, 2023 , June 20, 2023 , July 10, 2023, August 10, 2023, October 20, 2023, November 20, 2023, December 6, 2023

- SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core mathematics, specially designed instruction mathematics, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching. Quarterly meetings. October 12, 2022 - Feb 22, 2023 - May 31, 2023 - June 22, 2023 - July 7, 2023, August 24, 2023, September 6, 2023 , November 29, 2023, December 6, 2023

- Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, Maryland Special Education State Advisory Committee, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Mathematics, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives. Quarterly meetings. October 14, 2022 - March 8, 2022 - June 7, 2023 - October 30, 2023 - December 13, 2023

School-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports. Monthly meetings. Feb 7, 2023 - Feb 14, 2023 - March 20, 2023 - April 17, 2023 - May 12 - June 23, 2023 - July 19, 20, & 21, 2023 , August 24, 2023 , September 7, 2023, October 25, 2023, November 13 and 14, 2023, December 15, 2023 .

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

The average State percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 11.23%.

Statewide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 15.9% in grade 3, 10% in grade 4, and 7.8% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 22 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of all students across the State.

Baltimore County Public Schools

Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 12.5% in grade 3, 9.0% in grade 4, and 6.4% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 21 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

Howard County Public Schools

Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 16.1% in grade 3, 13.8% in grade 4, and 12.1% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 36 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

SSIP/SPDG Sites

Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 5.56% (7 SWD of 126 SWD assessed).

All students in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 19.93% (165 students of 828 students assessed).

Achievement Gap = 14.37 percentage points

BCPS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 1.96% (1 SWD of 51 SWD assessed).

HCPSS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 8% (6 SWD of 75 SWD assessed).

* Reflects a revised baseline as indicated in FFY 2021 reporting

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The following timelines have been adjusted to reflect ongoing implementation actions.

By the end of the 2024 implementation cycle, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will Identify and design

the EBPs associated with evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by Stakeholders' ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (1: very low – 5: very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.

By the end of the 2024 implementation cycle, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will define and establish the fidelity of implementation of EBP measures associated with specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (1: very low – 5: very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.

By the end of the 2024 implementation cycle, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will revise the specially designed math and SEL EBP process based on implementation fidelity and coaching input, as measured by a 4 out of 5 QUR rating on a 1 – 5 scale by teacher implementers.

By the end of the 2025 implementation cycle, University of Maryland faculty will have embedded EBP in math SDI and SEL practices in special education teacher preparation coursework, as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, and 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.

By the end of the 2026 implementation cycle, all general and special education elementary teachers participating in professional learning and coaching activities will demonstrate improved implementation of math and SEL EBPs as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

No new barriers are identified.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Data-Informed Decisions

Using data strategically to guide decisions and actions provides stakeholders with the evidence necessary for educators to address the high leverage problems of practice. Data enables policymakers to make objective decisions about education systems and provide states, locals and/or schools with information on program effectiveness; can provide teachers and administrators with information on student learning to influence instruction, programming, and professional development; and can be shared with students and families to help motivate and engage them in the learning.

- The FFY22 SSIP/SPDG supported a plan for continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics and SEL competencies using EBP aligned to implementation fidelity. The State took the following actions during this reporting period:

- o Hire external evaluators (A. Gaumer-Erikson and P. Noonan) to assist State efforts to define and implement a valid and usable data system to track learner outcomes and progress toward SiMR.

- o Collect and analyze baseline MCAP data.

- o Identify students' Mathematics Benchmark/Universal Screener outcome data for the Winter administration.

- The FFY22 SSIP implementation plan has identified measures to reliably assess personnel capacity, implementation of EBPs with fidelity and improved student outcomes:

- o Students' SEL Competency outcome(s) for the Fall and Spring Winter of each school year.

- o Participant Survey data relative to the impact of PL on personnel capacity and the implementation of EBPs with fidelity. In development.

- o Coaching Implementation Fidelity data to identify the impact of PL and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes. In development.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Brian Morrison

Title:

Branch Chief

Email:

brian.morrison@maryland.gov

Phone:

410-767-0863

Submitted on:

04/23/24 10:32:32 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Maryland 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
80.00%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	12	60.00%
Compliance	20	20	100.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	23%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	90%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	24%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	91%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	34%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	93%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	18%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	90%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	19	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	68	0

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	95.92%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	98.75%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.70%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	99.52%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=5% and <10% for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and >=90% and <95% for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

**Data Rubric
Maryland**

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Maryland

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	270
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	210
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	182
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	202
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	7
(1.2) Complaints pending.	4
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	2
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	56

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	389
(2.1) Mediations held.	184
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	120
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	43
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	64
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	35
(2.2) Mediations pending.	33
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	172

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	352
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	82
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	28
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	18
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	7
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	11
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	58
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	276

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	1
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	0
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	1

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Maryland

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



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

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Carey Wright
Interim Superintendent
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Interim Superintendent Wright :

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Maryland meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Maryland's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Maryland's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Maryland).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Maryland's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Maryland-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Maryland's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Maryland is required to take. The actions that Maryland is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Maryland's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600
www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



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

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Maryland's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Maryland's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Maryland's 2024 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless OSEP has imposed programmatic Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Maryland must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Maryland on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Maryland's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Maryland must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Maryland must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Maryland's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

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

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



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

cc: Maryland Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.