



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

June 28, 2018

Honorable Karen B. Salmon  
Acting State Superintendent of Schools  
Maryland State Department of Education  
200 West Baltimore Street, 7th floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Dear Acting Superintendent Salmon:

I am writing to advise you of the U. S. Department of Education's (Department) 2018 determination under section 616 of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. The Department has determined that Maryland needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the *IDEA*. This determination is based on the totality of the State's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2016 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Your State's 2018 determination is based on the data reflected in the State's "2018 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (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 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 2018: Part B" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2018, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD and reflected in the RDA Matrix for your State.) In making Part B determinations in 2018, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments;
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2016-2017) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

[www.ed.gov](http://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.*

- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

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

- (1) actions related to the correction of findings of noncompliance are in the "OSEP Response" section of the indicator; and
- (2) any other actions that the State is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find all of the following important documents saved as attachments to the Progress Page:

- (1) the State's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD document;
- (3) a spreadsheet entitled "2018 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated the State's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) a document entitled "Dispute Resolution 2016-17," which includes the *IDEA* section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, the State's 2018 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's 2018 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three *IDEA* Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2015, 2016, and 2017), and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2018 determination.

The State's determination for 2017 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with section 616(e)(1) of the *IDEA* and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State address the areas in which the State needs assistance and require the State to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State as a high-risk grantee and impose Special Conditions on the State's *IDEA* Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the

following website: <https://osep.grads360.org/#program/highlighted-resources>, and requiring the State to work with appropriate entities. In addition, the State should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/newccp/index.html>. The Secretary directs 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. We strongly encourage the State to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which the State received a score of zero. Your State must report with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, 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.

As required by IDEA section 616(e)(7) and 34 CFR §300.606, your State must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

States were required to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. OSEP appreciates the State's ongoing work on its SSIP and its efforts to improve results for students with disabilities. We have carefully reviewed your submission and will provide feedback in the upcoming weeks. Additionally, OSEP will continue to work with your State as it implements the third year of Phase III of the SSIP, which is due on April 1, 2019.

As a reminder, your State 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 the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the State's submission of its FFY 2016 SPP/APR. In addition, your State must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the *IDEA*;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, your State must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the next several days, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) will be accessible to the public;
- (2) includes the State's determination letter and SPP/APR, and all related State and OSEP attachments; and
- (3) can be accessed via a URL unique to your State, which you can use to make your SPP/APR available to the public. We will provide you with the unique URL when it is live.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ruth E. Ryder", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

---

Ruth E. Ryder  
Acting Director  
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Director of Special Education

# Maryland

## 2018 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

### Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination<sup>1</sup>

Percentage (%)	Determination
76.67	Needs Assistance

### Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	14	58.33
Compliance	20	19	95

### 2018 Part B Results Matrix

#### Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	91	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	87	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	23	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	85	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	31	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	84	1

#### Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	91	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	87	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	35	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	93	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	19	0
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	90	1

#### Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	18	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma <sup>1</sup>	71	1

<sup>1</sup> 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 2018: Part B."

## 2018 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator <sup>2</sup>	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015	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	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	98	Yes	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.72	Yes	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	98.86	Yes	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	95.24		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	82.44		1
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Special Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

<sup>1</sup> Graduated with a regular high school diploma as defined under the *IDEA* Section 618 State-reported data: These students exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect prior to June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards, such as a certificate or general educational development credential (GED).”

<sup>2</sup> The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/14803>

## APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

**DATE:** February 2018 Submission

Please see below the definitions for the terms used in this worksheet.

### 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	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in May

**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.

FFY 2016 APR-- (Maryland)

**Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data**

<b>APR Indicator</b>	<b>Valid and Reliable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1</b>	1	1
<b>2</b>	1	1
<b>3B</b>	1	1
<b>3C</b>	1	1
<b>4A</b>	1	1
<b>4B</b>	1	1
<b>5</b>	1	1
<b>6</b>	1	1
<b>7</b>	1	1
<b>8</b>	1	1
<b>9</b>	1	1
<b>10</b>	1	1
<b>11</b>	1	1
<b>12</b>	1	1
<b>13</b>	1	1
<b>14</b>	1	1
<b>15</b>	1	1
<b>16</b>	1	1
<b>17</b>	1	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	19
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2016 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	24.00



618 Data				
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/LRE Due Date: 4/5/2017	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/1/17	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/1/17	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/1/17	1	0	1	2
State Assessment Due Date: 12/13/17	1	0	1	2
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/17	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/17	1	1	1	3
			<b>Subtotal</b>	19
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total</b> (Subtotal X 1.14285714) =	21.71

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	24.00
B. 618 Grand Total	21.71
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	45.71
Total N/A in APR	0
Total N/A in 618	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>48.00</b>
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.952
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	95.24

\* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 1.14285714 for 618

# How THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

---

UNDER SECTION 616(D) OF THE  
*INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT* IN 2018:  
**PART B**

REVISED 06/22/18



## INTRODUCTION

---

In 2018, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) is continuing to use both results and compliance data in making a determination for each State under section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). We considered the totality of the information we have about a State, including information related to the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments; the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently-administered (school year (SY) 2016-2017) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); exiting data on CWD who dropped out and CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma<sup>1</sup>; the State's Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2016 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR); information from monitoring and other public information, such as Department-imposed Special Conditions on the State's grant award under Part B; and other issues related to State compliance with the *IDEA*. Below is a detailed description of how the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) evaluated States' data using the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix.

The RDA Matrix consists of:

1. a **Compliance Matrix** that includes scoring on SPP/APR 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 the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
5. the State's **Determination**.

The scoring of each of the above evaluation criteria is further explained below in the following sections:

- A. 2018 Part B Compliance Matrix and Scoring of the Compliance Matrix
- B. 2018 Part B Results Matrix and Scoring of the Results Matrix
- C. 2018 RDA Percentage and 2018 Determination

---

<sup>1</sup>When providing exiting data under section 618 of the *IDEA*, States are required to report on the number of students who exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those students without disabilities. As explained in 34 CFR §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect prior to June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the State's academic standards, such as a certificate or a general educational development credential (GED)."

## A. 2018 PART B COMPLIANCE MATRIX

---

In making each State's 2018 determination, the Department used a Compliance Matrix, reflecting the following data:

1. The State's FFY 2016 data for Part B Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (including whether the State reported valid and reliable data for each indicator); and whether the State demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance it had identified in FFY 2015 under such indicators;
2. The timeliness and accuracy of data reported by the State under sections 616 and 618 of the *IDEA*;
3. The State's FFY 2016 data, reported under section 618 of the *IDEA*, for the timeliness of State complaint and due process hearing decisions;
4. Longstanding Noncompliance:

The Department considered:

- a. Whether the Department imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2017 *IDEA* Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2018 determination, and the number of years for which the State's Part B grant award has been subject to Special Conditions; and
- b. Whether there are any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 or earlier by either the Department or the State that the State has not yet corrected.

### Scoring of the Compliance Matrix

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

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

In the attached State-specific 2018 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for each of Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13<sup>2</sup>:

- Two points, if either:
  - The State's FFY 2016 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95%<sup>3</sup> compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 5% compliance)<sup>4</sup>; or
  - The State's FFY 2016 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 90% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 10% compliance); and the State identified one or more findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015 for the indicator, and has demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for the indicator. Such full correction is indicated in the matrix with a "Yes" in the "Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015" column.<sup>5</sup>
- One point, if the State's FFY 2016 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 25% compliance), and the State did not meet either of the criteria above for two points.
- Zero points, under any of the following circumstances:
  - The State's FFY 2016 data for the indicator reflect less than 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect greater than 25% compliance); or
  - The State's FFY 2016 data for the indicator were not valid and reliable;<sup>6</sup> or
  - The State did not report FFY 2016 data for the indicator.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> A notation of "N/A" (for "not applicable") in the "Performance" column for an indicator denotes that the indicator is not applicable to that particular State. The points for that indicator are not included in the denominator for the matrix.

<sup>3</sup> In determining whether a State has met the 95% compliance criterion for Indicators 11, 12, and 13, the Department will round up from 94.5% (but no lower) to 95%. In determining whether a State has met the 90% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round up from 89.5% (but no lower) to 90%. In addition, in determining whether a State has met the 75% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round up from 74.5% (but no lower) to 75%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 5% compliance criterion for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, the Department will round down from 5.49% (but no higher) to 5%. In determining whether a State has met the 10% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round down from 10.49% (but no higher) to 10%. In addition, in determining whether a State has met the 25% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round down from 25.49% (but no higher) to 25%. The Department will also apply the rounding rules to the compliance criteria for 95% and 75% for: (1) the timeliness and accuracy of data reported by the State under sections 616 and 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the State's FFY 2016 data, reported under section 618 of the IDEA, for the timeliness of State complaint and due process hearing decisions.

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

<sup>5</sup> A "No" in that column denotes that the State has one or more remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction. An "N/A" (for "not applicable") in that column denotes that the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015 for the indicator.

<sup>6</sup> If a State's FFY 2016 data for any compliance indicator are not valid and reliable, the matrix so indicates in the "Performance" column, with a corresponding score of 0. The explanation of why the State's data are not valid and reliable is contained in the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2016 SPP/APR in GRADS360.

<sup>7</sup> If a State reported no FFY 2016 data for any compliance indicator (unless the indicator is not applicable to the State), the matrix so indicates in the "Performance" column, with a corresponding score of 0.

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

In the attached State-specific 2018 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data<sup>8</sup>:

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

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

In the attached State-specific 2018 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for timely State complaint decisions and for timely due process hearing decisions, as reported by the State under section 618 of the *IDEA*:

- Two points, if the State's FFY 2016 data were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the State's FFY 2016 data reflect at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the State's FFY 2016 data reflect less than 75% compliance.
- Not Applicable (N/A), if the State's data reflect less than 100% compliance, and there were fewer than ten State complaint decisions or ten due process hearing decisions.

## Scoring of the Matrix for Longstanding Noncompliance (Includes Both Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance and Special Conditions)

In the attached State-specific 2018 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Longstanding Noncompliance component:

- Two points, if the State has:
  - No remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2014 or earlier; and
  - No Special Conditions on its FFY 2017 grant award that are in effect at the time of the 2018 determination.

---

<sup>8</sup> OSEP used the Part B Timely and Accurate Data Rubric to award points to States based on the timeliness and accuracy of their sections 616 and 618 data. A copy of the rubric is contained in the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2016 SPP/APR in GRADS360. On the first page of the rubric, entitled "Part B Timely and Accurate Data-SPP/APR Data," States are given one point for each indicator with valid and reliable data and five points for SPP/APRs that were submitted timely. The total points for valid and reliable SPP/APR data and timely submission are added together to form the APR Grand Total. On page two of the rubric, the State's section 618 data is scored based on information provided to OSEP on section 618 data timeliness, completeness, and edit checks from EDFacts. The percentage of Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data is calculated by adding the 618 Data Grand Total to the APR Grand Total and dividing this sum by the total number of points available for the entire rubric. This percentage is inserted into the Compliance Matrix.

## HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

- One point, if either or both of the following occurred:
  - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2014, FFY 2013, and/or FFY 2012, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2016 SPP/APR in GRADS360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
  - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2017 Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2018 determination.
- Zero points, if either or both of the following occurred:
  - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2011 or earlier, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2016 SPP/APR in GRADS360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
  - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2015, 2016, and 2017) *IDEA* Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2018 determination.



## B. 2018 PART B RESULTS MATRIX

---

In making each State's 2018 determination, the Department used a Results Matrix reflecting the following data:

1. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD participating in regular Statewide assessments;
2. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD participating in regular Statewide assessments;
3. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD scoring at basic<sup>9</sup> or above on the NAEP;
4. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD included in NAEP testing;
5. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD scoring at basic or above on the NAEP;
6. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD included in NAEP testing;
7. The percentage of CWD exiting school by dropping out; and
8. The percentage of CWD exiting school by graduating with a regular high school diploma.

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

### Percentage of CWD Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments

This is the percentage of CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who took regular Statewide assessments in SY 2016-2017 with and without accommodations. The numerator for this calculation is the number of CWD participating with and without accommodations on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2016-2017, and the denominator is the number of all CWD participants and non-participants on regular and alternate Statewide assessments in SY 2016-2017, excluding medical emergencies. The calculation is done separately by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading). (Data source: EDFacts SY 2016-17; data extracted 4/17/18)

### Percentage of CWD Scoring at Basic or Above on the NAEP

This is the percentage of CWD, not including students with a Section 504 plan, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who scored at or above basic on the NAEP in SY 2016-2017. (Data Source: Main NAEP Data Explorer; data extracted 4/10/18)

### Percentage of CWD Included in NAEP Testing

This is the reported percentage of identified CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who were included in the NAEP testing in SY 2016-2017. (Data Source: Nation's Report Card, 2018):

---

<sup>9</sup> While the goal is to ensure that all CWD demonstrate proficient or advanced mastery of challenging subject matter, we recognize that States may need to take intermediate steps to reach this benchmark. Therefore, we assessed the performance of CWD using the Basic achievement level on the NAEP, which also provided OSEP with the broader range of data needed to identify variations in student performance across States. Generally, the Basic achievement level on the NAEP means that students have demonstrated partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.

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

[www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading\\_2017/files/2017\\_Technical\\_Appendix\\_Reading\\_State.pdf](http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2017/files/2017_Technical_Appendix_Reading_State.pdf)

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

[www.nationsreportcard.gov/math\\_2017/files/2017\\_Technical\\_Appendix\\_Math\\_State.pdf](http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/math_2017/files/2017_Technical_Appendix_Math_State.pdf)

### Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Dropping Out

This is a calculation of the percentage of CWD, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by dropping out. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the exit reason category *dropped out* by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (*graduated with a regular high school diploma*, *received a certificate*, *dropped out*, *reached maximum age* for services, and *died*), then multiplying the result by 100. (Data source: EDFacts SY 2015-16; data extracted 5/31/17)

### Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma

This is a calculation of the percentage of CWD, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by graduating with a regular high school diploma. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the exit reason category *graduated with a regular high school diploma* by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (*graduated with a regular high school diploma*, *received a certificate*, *dropped out*, *reached maximum age* for services, and *died*), then multiplying the result by 100. (Data source: EDFacts SY 2015-16; data extracted 5/31/17.)

## Scoring of the Results Matrix

In the attached State-specific 2018 Part B Results Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Results Elements:

- A State's participation rates on regular Statewide assessments were assigned scores of '2', '1' or '0' based on an analysis of the participation rates across all States.. A score of '2' was assigned if at least 90% of CWD in a State participated in the regular Statewide assessment; a score of '1' if the participation rate for CWD was 80% to 89%; and a score of '0' if the participation rate for CWD was less than 80%.
- A State's NAEP scores (Basic and above) were rank-ordered; the top tertile<sup>10</sup> of States received a '2', the middle tertile of States received a '1', and the bottom tertile of States received a '0'.
- A State's NAEP inclusion rate was assigned a score of either '0' or '1' based on whether the State's NAEP inclusion rate for CWD was "higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board [NAGB] goal of 85 percent." "Standard error estimates" were reported

---

<sup>10</sup> The tertiles of a data set divide it into three equal parts.

## HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

with the inclusion rates of CWD and taken into account in determining if a State's inclusion rate was higher than or not significantly different from the NAGB goal of 85 percent.

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

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

Results Elements	RDA Score= 0	RDA Score= 1	RDA Score= 2
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessments (reading and math, separately)	<80	80-89	>=90
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<23	23-28	>=29
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<29	29-34	>=35
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<39	39-48	>=49
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<20	20-27	>=28
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma	<65	65-75	>=76
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Dropping Out	>22	22-15	<=14
Percentage of 4th and 8th Grade CWD included in NAEP testing (reading or math): 1 point if State's inclusion rate was higher than or not significantly different from the NAGB goal of 85%. 0 points if less than 85%.			

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

### C. 2018 RDA Percentage and 2018 Determination

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

## HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

<b>Meets Requirements</b>	A State's 2018 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, <sup>11</sup> unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2015, 2016, and 2017) <i>IDEA</i> Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2018 determination.
<b>Needs Assistance</b>	A State's 2018 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2015, 2016, and 2017) <i>IDEA</i> Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2018 determination.
<b>Needs Intervention</b>	A State's 2018 RDA Determination is Needs Intervention if the RDA Percentage is less than 60%.
<b>Needs Substantial Intervention</b>	The Department did not make a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention for any State in 2018.

<sup>11</sup> In determining whether a State has met this 80% matrix criterion for a Meets Requirements determination, the Department will round up from 79.5% (but no lower) to 80%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 60% matrix criterion for a Needs Assistance determination discussed below, the Department will round up from 59.5% (but no lower) to 60%.