

MARYLAND'S FFY 2006 (2006 – 2007) STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN/ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Overview of Development of FFY 2006 State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report

The attached documents are the Maryland State Department of Education's (MSDE) FFY 2006 (2006 – 2007) State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). The SPP has been revised to reflect additional indicators included during FFY 2006 and revised data as noted. The APR provides the data and information relative to FFY 2006 results, as applicable.

The MSDE identified staff from across the six branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (hereafter referred to as the Division) to form internal teams that correspond to the 20 Part B Indicators. Each team gathered, analyzed, interpreted data, and reviewed available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data across cluster areas identified by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The APR includes information on progress or slippage for each indicator. Draft information and data from the APR for each Indicator were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

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

Maryland's SPP/APR was disseminated to the public. The SPP/APR is available on the MSDE website, and disseminated to all local school systems and public agencies in the state, to members of the SESAC, and to all local special education citizens' advisory committees (SECACs). The SPP/APR is also made available to various media, consistent with MSDE dissemination of other written material. Upon OSEP approval of the FFY 2006 SPP/APR, copies will be sent to local superintendents of schools, local directors of special education in each local school system and public agency, Parents' Place of Maryland, Inc., Families Involved Together, Inc., and IDEA Partnership Team members.

MSDE has developed a website with our partners at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE) that includes statewide and local performance data on all applicable indicators. The website can be accessed at <http://www.mdideareport.org>. In addition to the complete SPP and APR, the website includes State and local results for all applicable indicators and tools for comparing local performance in relation to the targets. Progress and slippage are shown through a combination of charts and graphs populated on the website.

On October 10, 2007 the Division preliminary SPP/APR data on the activities of each indicator and progress and/or slippage in a presentation entitled, "The State of the State" at the annual Special Education Leadership Conference. Attendees at this conference included IDEA Part B local directors of special education, Part C local lead agencies, SESAC members, and SICC members. MSDE also participates in the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) IDEA Partnership. On November 9, 2007 the Assistant State Superintendent for the Division presented the current status of the progress and preliminary SPP State data in "The State of the State" at the monthly meeting of all local school system superintendents.

Stakeholder input regarding revision and implementation of the SPP/APR was gathered on March 5, 2007, September 17, 2007, November 6, 2007 and January 15, 2008 when the Division staff met with the SESAC. At those meetings, data was shared concerning the current status of SPP/APR Indicators. On March 5, 2007, there was information shared about the overall SPP/APR as well as Indicator 5 LRE. On September 17, 2007, information about local determinations, Indicators 5 LRE, 8 Parent Involvement, and 15 General Supervision were discussed. On March 5, 2007, information was presented about Indicators 1 Graduation, 2 Dropout, 13 Post-Secondary Transition, 14 Post-secondary Outcomes, 15 General Supervision, 16 Complaint Timelines, 17 Hearing Timelines, 18 Resolution

Sessions, and 19 Mediation. On January 15, 2008, updates were provided for Indicators 3 Assessment, 4 Suspension and Expulsion of Students with Disabilities, 8 Parent Involvement, 9 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity), 10 Disproportionality (Identification/ Race/Ethnicity and Disability Category), and 20 Timely and Accurate Data.

In addition to information submitted in the SPP/APR, the following documents are attached:

- Table 6, Report of the Participation and Performance of Students with Disabilities on State Assessments (Indicator 3);
- Table 5, Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal (Indicator 4);
- Copies of the parent survey(s) used to collect data for Indicator 8;
- December 15, 2005 OSEP permission for MSDE to use data generated by the Maryland Longitudinal Transition Study (MDLTS) as the baseline for Indicator 14; and
- Table 7, Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (Indicators 16-19).

The reader may wish to refer to Maryland's revised FFY 2005 – 2010 State Performance Plan when reviewing the information included in Maryland's FFY 2006 Annual Performance Report. Both of these documents will be available at: <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org>

Maryland's FFY 2006 Part B SPP contains:

Indicator 7, pages 4-14: Progress data and improvement activities;

Revised Indicator 8, pages 15-18: To reflect census collection; and

Indicator 14, pages 19- 24: Information specific to initial baseline data, state targets and improvement activities.

Maryland's FFY 2006 Part B APR contains actual target data and other responsive APR information for **Indicators: 1** (pages 25-27), **2** (pages 28-29), **3** (pages 30-36), **4A** (pages 37-40), **5** (pages 41-43), **8** (pages 44-47), **9** (pages 48-49), **10** (pages 50-54), **11** (pages 55-58), **12** (pages 59-61), **13** (pages 62-64), **15** (pages 65-67), **16** (pages 68-69), **17** (page 70), **18** (page 71), **19** (pages 72-73), and **20** (pages 74-81). Maryland was notified by OSEP, in correspondence dated November 16, 2007, that States need not report on Indicator 6 for FFY 2006.

As a follow-up to Maryland's FFY 2005 SPP/APR, MSDE is required to address the issues raised in OSEP's June 15, 2007 letter to MSDE. For "...any additional information the State must include in the FFY 2006 APR or, as needed, the SPP...to address the problems OSEP identified..." the following information is submitted:

Indicator 4A: Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

For the issue raised related to Indicator 4A in Maryland's FFY 2005 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, the onsite reviews scheduled for the two remaining local systems were conducted. Based on those meetings and subsequent reviews, one local school system revised its policies, procedures and practices. The policies, procedures and practices were revised in June 2007 and staff training for administrators was conducted before the school year began. One local school system, in collaboration with MSDE, completed the review. MSDE determined that the policies, procedures and practices complied with the requirements of IDEA. Therefore, no changes were made.

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 compliance with the IDEA for any local school system identified with significant discrepancies have been completed for FFY 2006 and are compliant with the requirements of IDEA.

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

For the issue raised related to Indicator 8 in Maryland's FFY 2005 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, MSDE provided a copy of the two surveys used with the February 1, 2007 SPP/APR submission. Another set of the FFY 2005 (2005-2006) surveys are attached to this submission. MSDE is now utilizing the short form of both surveys and copies of the new forms are included in the FFY 2006 SPP/APR submission.

MSDE engaged in multiple attempts to resolve OSEP's sampling concerns via email, conference call, and with the assistance of the Mid-South Regional Resource Center. OSEP staff did not provide sufficient explanation nor description of the problems with the sampling plan. Accordingly, MSDE chose to conduct a census-based approach. The new methodology is incorporated into a revised SPP and targets.

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

For the issue raised related to Indicator 13 in Maryland's FFY 2005 SPP/APR, the number of students with IEPs that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services was 14,326 of a total number of 17,473 youth, 16 years of age and above, $[14,326 \div 17,473 \times 100]$ resulting in 82% compliance.

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

For the issue raised related to Indicator 20 in Maryland's FFY 2005 SPP/APR, in FFY 2005 MSDE collected additional data for Indicator 13 to ensure the accuracy of the data collected and reported. Data consistent with the measurement for FFY 2005 is included in Indicator 13 within the APR.

A revised data collection form for Indicator 13 was issued to local school systems on July 18, 2007. The revised form requests the data be reported in a manner consistent with the required measurement. Additionally, MSDE staff responsible for coordinating the collection and reporting of data worked collaboratively with the staff responsible for collecting, analyzing and reporting data for Indicator 13 to ensure compliance with the required measurement. For detailed information, please refer to Indicator 13.

Please contact Dr. Carol Ann Baglin, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services at 410-767-0238 or at cbaglin@msde.state.md.us for information related to Maryland's SPP/APR.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to this Indicator.

Revisions for this indicator were reviewed by the SESAC and the SICC (birth-five focus). Both the SESAC and the SICC reviewed the results of the FFY 2005 data collection for Maryland’s Early Childhood Accountability System, discussed proposed activities to continue statewide implementation and made recommendations for changes or modifications to the system.

NOTE: FFY 06 activities, updates and progress data are addressed in a section titled “*Updates to Maryland’s Early Childhood Accountability System for FFY 2006.*” This section follows immediately after “Discussion of Activities Completed for FFY 2005.”

Monitoring Priority: Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and

early literacy):

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

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

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

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

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

ECAS for Preschool:

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

- The ECAS has two child performance data measurement points:
 - Status at Entry – “New” to preschool special education services; 3, 4 and 5 year old children with disabilities who begin receiving preschool special education services through an initial IEP. The first reporting of Status of Entry data to OSEP is due in February 2007; data to be reported will include the percentage of children entering at the level of same-aged peers, and the percentage of children entering at a level below same-aged peers, for each of the three outcomes.
 - Progress Data at Exit: The first Progress at Exit data collection will occur for children for whom Status at Entry data was collected in FFY 05, who exited from the preschool program during the 2006-2007 school year (FFY 06), and who participated in the preschool program for at least six months.

Implementation Plan:

Phase 1 and Phase 2 of Statewide Data Collection System

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

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

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

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

Plan for Phased-In Statewide Data Collection

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

Data Collection, Phase 1 (FFY 2005):

- Of Maryland’s twenty-four local school systems, seven districts have been identified as representative of the State utilizing census data for preschool-aged children, size (population) of school district, and geographic locations.
- In accordance with OSEP requirements for Indicator #7, all jurisdictions with an average daily enrollment of 50,000 or more students, include five jurisdictions of Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Montgomery County, and Prince George’s County.
- Including two additional jurisdictions enables Maryland to comply with the requirements for geographic representation. The two local school systems are: Allegany County and Charles County.

- The seven identified representative local school systems will initiate Status At Entry data collection on ***all*** three, four and five year olds newly identified, i.e., all children receiving special education and related services under an initial IEP during the FFY 2005 data collection period. NO SAMPLING WILL BE USED BY THESE LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS. THIS IS A CENSUS COLLECTION.

Data Collection, Phase 2 (FFY 2006):

- All twenty-four Maryland local school systems will be participating in data collection for the Maryland ECAS as of FFY 2006. This includes the seven jurisdictions initiating Status At Entry data collection in Phase 1, and the remaining seventeen jurisdictions not participating in Phase 1.
- ***All*** three, four and five year olds newly identified (i.e., with initial IEPs) will be included in data collection in all twenty-four local school systems for Phase 2. NO SAMPLING WILL BE USED. THIS IS A CENSUS COLLECTION.
- The local school systems initiating Status At Entry data collection in Phase 1 will be collecting their second set of Status At Entry data for children newly identified (i.e., with initial IEPs) during the FFY 2006 time period.
- The seven Phase 1 local school systems will begin collecting Progress At Exit data for ***all*** children for whom there is a FFY 2005 Status at Entry measure and who have participated in preschool special education for at least six months. Note: Progress at Exit data may be collected when children “age-out” of preschool special education, i.e., they continue under an IEP at age 6, or they no longer require special education and related services due to meeting all of their IEP goals and objectives.

ECAS Web-Based Data Entry Tool

In partnership with the JHU/CTE a web-based data entry system for collecting, aggregating, and reporting outcome data was designed and implemented:

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

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Maryland
State

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be reported in the APR due February 1, 2010. For FFY 2005, the results of the first collection of Status At Entry data are reported in the table below.

Status At Entry*:

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

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

*Phase 1 representative local school systems: Allegany, Anne Arundel, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Charles, Montgomery, Prince George's

Discussion of Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

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

Updates to Maryland’s Early Childhood Accountability System for FFY 2006

Discussion of Activities Completed for FFY 2006:

- The Early Childhood Accountability System was implemented statewide. Status at Entry data was collected for a total of 3,525 three, four and five year olds.
- The seven local school systems initiating Status At Entry data collection in Phase 1 (FFY 2005) collected their second set of Status At Entry data for children newly identified (i.e., with initial IEPs).
- Phase 1 local school systems began collecting Progress At Exit data for **all** children for whom there was a FFY 2005 Status at Entry measure and who participated in preschool special education services for at least six months.
- Revisions to procedures and protocols for the 3, 4, and 5 year old levels of the WSS were completed and disseminated by the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services to all twenty-four local school systems as a part of professional development sessions. Revisions included information on appropriate modifications, accommodations and supports for children with disabilities.
- The ECAS professional development plan was updated for FFY 2006. Training on the WSS continued to be conducted in collaboration with the MSDE Division for Early Childhood Development.
- Technical assistance on the ECAS web-based data entry system was provided to designated key contacts (i.e., members of local school system teams trained in FFY 2005) on request through webinars, phone calls, emails, and on-site visits.
- Maryland established a protocol for determining and reporting levels of progress in accordance with the 5 categories of progress identified by OSEP. Development of the protocol for three through five year olds was facilitated by staff from the JHU/CTE and was coordinated with Part C staff in the development of the protocol for children ages birth to three.

Discussion of Progress Data:

For FFY 2006, the results of the first calculations of child progress data are reported in the table below. Exit measures were completed for children ages three through five who:

- Participated in preschool special education services for at least six months from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007; and
- Had a Status at Entry measure.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	11	13.58%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6	7.41%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	4	4.94%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to	27	33.33%

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Maryland
State

same-aged peers		
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	33	40.74%
Total	N= 81	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	17.28%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	11	13.58%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	16	19.75%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	31	38.27%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	9	11.12%
Total	N= 81	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	11	13.58%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	8	9.88%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	7	8.64%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	29	35.80%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	26	32.10%
Total	N= 81	100%

Discussion of Progress Data

The percentage of children for progress level “a,” **“Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning”** greatly exceeded the anticipated percent of children who could fall within this level. Entry and Exit measures for all 81 children were reviewed and it was found that of the children represented in progress level “a” all clustered within one particular jurisdiction, Baltimore City Public Schools (BCPS). As part of improvement activities, further review of the data will be conducted with the BCPS to determine the reason(s) for children being rated significantly higher for Entry than for Exit. Avenues to be explored include quality and effectiveness of professional development provided to school and community-based staff on the Work Sampling System, accuracy of entering the data into the ECAS system, and linkages of IEP content with appropriate modifications and accommodations that support accessing the general curriculum. Based on findings, a plan for focused technical assistance to BCPS will be developed with BCPS staff and implemented with support from MSDE staff.

Progress Data Methodology

MSDE Part C and Part B Preschool staff worked jointly with consultants from JHU/CTE to establish a Birth through Five Framework for reporting child progress. For Part B Preschool, MSDE extracted entry and exit data from the ECAS database on children who entered preschool special education services from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007, participated in services for at least six months, and exited the system during 2006-2007. Using the Intervention Efficacy Index (Bagnato and Neisworth) and the Proportional Change Index (Wolery), sample child Entry and Exit data were tested and analyzed to determine how each approach affected reporting on the OSEP levels of progress. MSDE and the JHU/CTE consultants reached agreement that with the use of one statewide assessment, the WSS, an approach based on a modified Proportional Change Index would yield child outcomes progress data that was both reasonable and accurate for the preschool population.

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

Considerations and Overarching Formulas

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

$$\text{WSSav} = \frac{\text{sum of indicator values for an outcome}}{\text{number of indicators}}$$

$$\% \text{ change} = \frac{\text{Exit WSSav} - \text{Entry WSSav}}{\text{Entry WSSav}}$$

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Formulas for each reporting category are as follows:

a) % of children who did not improve functioning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOT captured by categories D or E
AND Exit WSSav > Entry WSSav
AND % change \geq 30%

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

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

Exit WSSav \geq 2.5
AND Entry WSSav < 2.5

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

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

Exit WSSav \geq 2.5
AND Entry WSSav \geq 2.5

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline Data will be discussed as part of the APR to be submitted February 1, 2010.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	

SPP Template – Part B (3)

2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

In the next reporting period, MSDE will continue training, technical assistance, and quality assurance activities to ensure that the State's 3-5 Child Outcomes system will produce valid and reliable data. Proposed activities include:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
MSDE and BCPSS will develop and implement a plan for focused technical assistance addressing professional development, data entry, progress reporting and other issues related to measuring child outcomes identified as part of TA planning and activities.	2007-2008	MSDE JHU/CTE WSS Professional Development Consultant
MSDE and JHU/CTE staff will coordinate annual update of ECAS data entry system, including incorporating new data collection and reporting features. Note: On April 1, 2008, the first annual update of the data entry system, ECAS - Version 2, was released and a statewide training session for local school system (LSS) and state operated program (SOP) staff was conducted.	2007-2011	MSDE JHU/CTE LSSs/SOPs
MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS), and the Division of Early Childhood Development (DECD) will jointly develop and coordinate implementation of the annual plan for Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR) and ECAS Professional Development. For the 2008-2009 school year, planning and conducting of a 3-day training-of-trainers institute for the purpose of building LSS/SOP staff capacity to provide training and technical assistance to staff, including related services personnel, and community-based providers will be included as a part of this annual PD plan.	2007-2011	MSDE LSSs/SOPs Other external consultants
MSDE will post technical assistance and on-line professional development resource materials on the 3-5 Child Outcomes System on the Early Childhood Gateway.	2007-2011	MSDE JHU/CTE
MSDE will review ECAS Child Outcomes data with LSS/SOP preschool special education coordinators	2007-2011	MSDE LSSs/SOPs

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Maryland
State

to identify and resolve issues related to the accuracy and reliability of WSS ratings entered for Status-at-Entry and Progress-at-Exit at the individual child level.		
---	--	--

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has developed and submitted a Request for Consultant Services that will allow the State to collect data on the number and percent of parents participating in Part B (ages 3 through 21) who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. In accordance with the advice of the Office for Special Education Programs (OSEP), MSDE is now using a census based approach to gather data from all twenty-four (24) school systems annually. The surveys were distributed to parents by school based providers and returned to through a postage paid envelope to MSDE. MSDE utilized members of the Maryland Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), local Special Education Citizens' Advisory committees (SECACs), and our Partners for Success/ Family Support Network Centers to encourage parents to respond to the survey. The completed surveys were scanned and analyzed by an independent vendor and the results are reported below. The vendor utilized Rausch measurement techniques and related data analysis methods to accurately assess the data collected through the survey.

Survey Selection

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) used survey items for Indicator 8 that were developed and screened for statistical validity through the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) under the Leadership of Dr. W. Alan Coulter, Project Director. MSDE utilized the required scale for the Part B Survey and the reduced item version for Preschool parents developed by NCSEAM in April 2007. This survey is considered to be a reliable instrument from which to collect the data. Copies of the survey utilized by MSDE for this administration are attached to this submission.

MSDE is gathering and analyzing data on both a statewide basis and disaggregated by local school system. One of the difficulties inherent in disaggregating data in this manner is obtaining a statistically valid and reliable representation of our state's population. MSDE also conducted a second mailing targeted for students with disabilities educated in nonpublic schools to ensure that this population was included in our results. Since this is the first year that MSDE is using a census

based approach, refinements in data collection activities will be implemented in future survey administrations.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

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

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

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

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

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

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Maryland
State

year after year to participate. MSDE has already noted they will use a rotating sample of local school systems.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>27% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>32% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>29% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>34% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>30% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>35% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>32% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>37% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>33% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>38% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
The SESAC will continue to meet to identify ways to improve response rate and review policies, procedures and practices that address parental involvement.	January 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members
MSDE and SESAC (and the selected vendor) will review the results from the survey each year and adjust sampling approach to ensure that valid and reliable results are generated. Areas typically considered will include race/ethnicity and type of disability. Initial vendor recommendations for improving response rates will be implemented in the Spring of 2007.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members Selected Vendor
Utilize the local SECACs to identify priorities and barriers to parental involvement within their communities.	February 2007 - annually	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members SECAC members
Utilize the SESAC to identify priorities and barriers to parental involvement within their communities with a focus on items within one standard deviation of the NCSEAM standard.	February 2007 - annually	DSE/EIS staff SESAC Members SECAC members
Review results from surrounding states and share effective strategies identified in Maryland and gather effective strategies from other state.	March 2007 – ongoing	DSE/EIS staff MSRRC staff OSEP State Contact
Support new family training modules developed in collaboration with Parent’s Place of Maryland and Partner’s for Success Centers around the state that address improving Parental	December 2006-ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Partner’s for Success Centers, Parent’s Place of Maryland
Review the work of NCSEAM as it relates to target setting and improvement activities and adjust targets and improvement strategies, as appropriate.	February 2007 - ongoing	DSE/EIS staff NCSEAM staff and publications
Utilize IDEA Partnership team to review analysis of data and provide input on parent modules.	December 2006-ongoing	DSE/EIS staff IDEA Partnership team

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In correspondence, dated December 15, 2005, MSDE received permission from OSEP to use the data generated by the Maryland Longitudinal Transition Study (MDLTS) as the baseline for the percent of youth in competitive employment, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both. A copy of this correspondence is attached. The MDLTS is a companion to the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 funded by the USDE and conducted by SRI Inc. The state level study will be identical to the national study, with a few exceptions in sample construction and the timing of initial data collection activities. The MDLTS was begun in December 2000. The MDLTS is investigating the number of domains that influence student achievement and post school outcomes. The domains include student characteristics, family characteristics, school characteristics and policies, school programs, and non-school factors.

The sampling approach for the MDLTS had two goals:

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

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

SRI Inc. will report to MSDE in January 2006 the data that will be submitted as baseline. The data will

address the post school outcomes of study participants as of August 2005. The report will contain data on the number of young adult participants enrolled in postsecondary education, the number employed, and the number who had dropped out and earned a GED. The Division will release a Request for Proposal (RFP) to provide a “Comprehensive Design and Implementation of a System to Collect, Validate, Aggregate, Analyze, and Report on Postsecondary Outcomes.” Division will consult with the National Center on Postsecondary Outcomes during the development of the RFP.

Nature of RFP includes:

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

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

Gathering Baseline Data

The baseline data for this indicator will be submitted as part of the Maryland SPP on February 1, 2008. On December 15, 2005 MSDE received permission from OSEP to use data generated by the Maryland Longitudinal Transition Study (MDLTS) as the baseline for the percent of youth in competitive employment, enrolled in post-secondary education, or both. The MDLTS is a companion to the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 funded by the USDE and conducted by SRI Inc. SRI Inc. reported to MSDE in January 2006 the data that will be submitted as baseline. The data will address the post school outcomes of study participants as of August 2005. The report will contain data on the percentage of young adult participants enrolled in post secondary education and the percentage of young adult participants employed.

Maryland’s Census Plan for Subsequent Data Collection

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

MSDE will use the following recommended definitions:

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

Chronology of Activities used to Gather Information from Exited Students

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2006-2007):

On December 15, 2005 MSDE received permission from OSEP to use data generated by the Maryland Longitudinal Transition Study (MDLTS) as the baseline for the percent of youth in competitive employment, enrolled in postsecondary education, or both. The MDLTS is a companion to the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 funded by the USDE and conducted by SRI Inc. MDLTS began in January 2000 with 1000 students, 14 to 18 years of age. The data that will be used as the baseline for the State Performance Plan Indicator 14 will address the postsecondary outcomes of the study participants as of August, 2005.

The MDLTS began in the year 2000 with 1,200 students with disabilities, 13 to 17 years of age. Nine local school districts are participating in the Study. Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Montgomery County and Prince George's County represent the school systems with more than 50,000 students enrolled. Harford and Allegany Counties represent local school systems with mid size enrollments. Garrett and Kent Counties represent rural local school systems. There are also three private schools

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Maryland
State

involved in the study. There are two waves to the MDLTS. Wave 1 examined the students while they were in school. Wave 2 began in year 2005 is examining the young adults after exiting school with a Maryland High School Diploma, a Maryland High School Certificate of Program Completion, or who exited by dropping out. Wave 1 investigated the domains that influence student achievement, including student characteristics, family characteristics, school characteristics and policies, school programs and nonschool factors. SRI International utilized the following strategies to gather data:

parent interviews & surveys	school program surveys
family interviews & surveys	school background surveys
direct student assessments	student transcript reviews
teacher interviews & surveys	students interviews & surveys

Wave 2 is examining student outcomes and their lives out-of-school. Characteristics of out-of-school youth, engagement in postsecondary education, work or preparation for work, household circumstances, leisure activities, social involvement, and citizenship are the specific areas being examined. The following strategies were used to gather data for this part:

parent interviews & surveys	transcript reviews	student interviews & surveys
-----------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------

A total of 202 young adults participated in the 2005 Wave 2 investigation. Of the 202 youth, 161 were youth who exited school with a diploma or a certificate and 41 youth had dropped out.

Post-School Activity	Number of Youth	Percent of Youth
Employment Only	90	44.6%
Postsecondary Education Only	8	4.0%
Both Employment and Postsecondary Education	50	24.7%
Not Engaged	54	26.7%
TOTAL	202	100%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The out-of-school youth with disabilities that are the focus of this report have just entered the adult world. A total of 148 (73.3%) youth with disabilities are engaged by employment, attending postsecondary school, or a combination of both. Fifty (24.7%) youth with disabilities are engaged in both employment and postsecondary education. Employment is the most common form of engagement with 140 study participants (69.3%) working for pay in full or part-time jobs since leaving high school.

The MDLTS found that the engagement for youth with disabilities has little to do with their demographic characteristics. School leavers who are younger are less likely to be engaged than youth who are older. Youth from the wealthiest households are more likely to be engaged than youth from middle-income households.

Although rates for engagement are relatively high for this group of Wave 2 respondents, the number of youth who are not engaged is alarming. A total of 54 (26.7%) youth with disabilities are not engaged in any productive activity. Some in this group are incarcerated. Some in this group may be finding barriers to engagement, or may not know how to advocate for themselves, or may have set expectations too high for them.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>44% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>4% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>24% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed and enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>44% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>4% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>24% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed and enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>46% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>6% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>26% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed and enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>47% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>7% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>27% percent of youth who had IEPs and no longer in secondary school are competitively employed and enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

MSDE is a principal partner in the Maryland Interagency Transition Council. The Council was established by a Governor’s Executive Order. The council is chaired by the Secretary for the Department of Disabilities and the following agencies and stakeholders are members:

SPP Template – Part B (3)

- Department of Education, including the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, Division of Career Technical Education and Adult Learning, Division of Rehabilitation Services, Division of Student, Family, and School Support;
- Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, including Mental Hygiene Administration, and Developmental Disabilities Administration;
- Department of Labor;
- Department of Disabilities;
- Department of Human Services; and
- Family and other interested individuals/stakeholders.

The Maryland Interagency Transition Council collaborates on the following initiatives:

- Continuation of an annual transition conference. The 2007 conference had two strands: one for professionals and one for parents and families.
- Development of an action plan that is based upon the statewide resource mapping that was completed in 2006. The action plan will assist youth with disabilities to reach the following goals: youth with disabilities will have the resources needed to be successfully employed after exiting school; and youth with disabilities will have the resources needed to be successful in postsecondary education and/or training.
- Sponsor and conduct the annual Youth Leadership Forum for high school students with disabilities. The youth who attend the Forum gain self advocacy skills and develop personal action plans that they use as they pursue their postsecondary goals. Each participant is matched with a mentor who has a disability.
- Continue to work closely with Department of Rehabilitation Services to provide seamless transition for exiting students. In 2007, DORS assigned counselors to be transition specialist. Every high school in Maryland has a specific counselor assigned to it.
- Continue to include adult service provider staff involved in LSS professional development as explained in Indicator 1 and 2.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	83.24% of youth with IEPs will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 75.61%

The data provided for Indicator 1 of the SPP/APR is taken from the Maryland Report Card. This is the official data reporting source for Maryland Public Schools. The Maryland Report Card can be found at <http://mdreportcard.org/>

The current credit requirements for a Maryland High School Diploma is located in the FFY 2006 revised SPP, Indicator 1, page 6. The FFY 2006 revised SPP may be located at <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org>

The Graduation Rate is calculated as the percentage of students who received a Maryland high school diploma during the reported school year. This is an estimated cohort rate. It is calculated by dividing the number of high school graduates by the sum of the dropouts for grades 9 through 12, respectively, in consecutive years, plus the number of high school graduates. The measurement for students with IEPs is the same as for all youth.

Statewide Percentage	Special Education Percentage	General Education Percentage
FFY 2004	77.56%	85.47%
FFY 2005	76.77%	86.21%
FFY 2006	75.61%	86.10%
Increase (Slippage)	(1.16%)	(0.11%)

Maryland did not meet the target set by the Maryland State Board of Education for FFY 2006. The graduation rate for students with disabilities was 75.61% (n = 4,175 divided by 5,522) and the graduation rate for their nondisabled peers was 86.10%.

The graduation rates for students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers dropped for FFY 2006. Students with disabilities had a slippage of 1.18% from FFY 2005 when the graduation rate was 76.77%.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

The graduation rate slippage of nondisabled students for FFY 2006 was 0.11% from 86.21% for FFY 2005.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

Explanation of Slippage:

The slippage of 1.18% may not indicate a downward trend at this time. As the graduation requirements increase, trends may develop.

The following factors may have contributed to the slippage:

- The method used to calculate the graduation rate does not take into consideration the number of students with disabilities who take advantage of additional years to meet graduation requirements.
- In FFY 2006, 9.2% of students with disabilities exited from high school with a Maryland High School Certificate of Program Completion. This was a 4% increase over FFY 2005.
- The Division asked those local school systems that were being considered for participation in the Maryland School Completion Project to complete a survey on students who dropped out of school during FFY 2005. Six local school systems completed the survey. We learned that the number of students with disabilities dropping out of school in grade 12 is close to and in some cases greater than the number of students dropping out in grade 9. Not having the number of credits needed for graduation was the reason given by several students who dropped out in grade 12. The Maryland School Completion Project (MSCP) is being conducted in collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities. MSCP is described in the Improvement Activities Section of Indicator 2.

While there was an overall slippage in the graduation rate of students with disabilities, there were local school systems that had made progress:

- Four local school systems had higher graduation rates for students with disabilities than students in regular education; and
- Twelve local school systems had increases in the graduation rate for students with disabilities.

During FFY 2005 there were two findings of noncompliance related to documentation of graduation rate. The findings remain uncorrected as of the date of the submission of this SPP/APR on February 1, 2008. Both findings are in the local school system under a court ordered consent decree. MSDE has instituted enforcement actions and the local school system receives intensive oversight by the Intensive Management and Capacity Building and Intervention Team (IMCIT). See Indicator 15 for additional details.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

Improvement Activities:

MSDE will continue to place emphasis on providing technical assistance and professional development to local school systems as they increase their capacity to assist students to successfully earning diplomas.

In June, 2007, MSDE participated in a technical assistance activity provided by the OSEP funded technical assistance centers. The 2-day session was conducted by the Post Secondary Outcome Center, the Secondary Transition Center, and the Dropout Prevention Center and was held at MSDE.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- The Maryland team consisted of the Division's transition and data staff, local school system transition coordinators, and the Division of Rehabilitation Services counselors.
- The technical assistance teams provided strategies for linking improvement activities for SPP/APR Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 which include:
 - Gathering and using data when developing improvement activities.
 - Utilizing evidence based strategies and interventions.
 - Collaborating across organizations for continuous improvement.
 - Conducting professional development that stresses the importance of data collection that leads to improved decision making.
- The above listed strategies are being shared by the MSDE transition specialist in quarterly meetings with local transition coordinators and to individual local school system staff. **(This activity is applicable to Indicators 1, 2, & 13)**
- Maryland is developing a new formula for graduation rate that is based on the recommendation from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in collaboration with the National Governors Association (NGA). The NGA/ CCSSO recommended graduation rate calculation will allow for 5 or more years of high school attendance. Specifically the placement of the student with disabilities into the cohort in which that student is expected to graduate. The Division is preparing guidance for local school systems that will address the transition planning needed for 5 year educational programs. **(This activity is applicable to Indicators 1, 2, 14, & 14)**
- MSDE increased the number of discretionary grant awards that address Indicators 1 & 2. There were a total of 8 grants awarded. This is an increase of 3. **(This activity is applicable to Indicator 1, 2, & 14)**
 - Two local school systems have developed afterschool programs that focus on the development of the soft skills needed for employment and are providing summer employment opportunities.
 - Three local school systems are utilizing the researched based Check & Connect program to assist at-risk students to attend school on a daily basis.
 - One local school system is developing afterschool activities that will assist students to be proficient with the high school assessments.
 - Two local school systems are developing seamless transition activities that link students with adult support agencies during the students last year in school.
- MSDE expects to award Adequate Yearly Progress grants that support promising practices to accelerate the performance of students with disabilities at the elementary and middle school level. High schools will be eligible for a separate grant designed to increase the number of students with disabilities that pass Maryland's High School Assessments in Algebra/Data Analysis, English, Biology, and Government.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.81%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 4.98%

The data provided for SPP/APR Indicator 2 is taken from the Maryland Report Card. This is the official reporting source for Maryland Public Schools. The Maryland Report Card can be found at <http://mdreportcard.org/>

The Dropout Rate as the percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students who leave school for any reason, except death, before graduation or completion of a Maryland approved educational program and who are not known to enroll in another school or state-approved program during the current school year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer and students dropping out of evening high school and other alternative programs. The dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of students in grades 9 – 12 served by the school.

Maryland did not meet the target set by the Maryland Board of Education. Students with disabilities had a dropout rate of 4.98% (n = 1,551 divided by 31,159). This was a minimal decrease of 0.66% from the FFY 2005 rate of 5.64% and their nondisabled peers experienced a decrease of 0.02% from 3.38% in FFY 2005 to 3.36% in FFY 2006

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

Maryland made progress in this Indicator. Overall there was a 0.66% decrease in the number of students who dropped out during school year 2006 – 2007. Specific progress was made in the following areas:

- Eight local school systems had lower dropout rates for students with disabilities than students in regular education.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- Twelve local school systems experienced a decrease in the number of students with disabilities who dropped out from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006.

MSDE will continue to place emphasis on appropriate transition planning. Transition planning provides students with purpose for staying in school. It also provides them with connection to school staff. Research demonstrates that the lack of connection with school staff is one of the predominant reasons given for dropping out.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Improvement Activities:

In addition to the improvement activities that are described in Indicator 1, Maryland public schools are participating in a dropout prevention demonstration project.

- MSDE began the Maryland School Completion Project in May 2007. This is a demonstration project in partnership with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD).
 - The project is being conducted in four schools within in two local school systems.
 - Currently staff members from the individual schools and the local school systems are participating in professional development provided by the NDPC-SD. The professional development addressed:
 - Use of data to identify at-risk students. This directly links to SPP/APR indicator 1.
 - External factors that cause students to dropout
 - Behavior issues
 - Instruction strategies
 - Research based interventions
 - Development of school based plans.
 - The implementation of dropout interventions will begin in the spring of 2008.
 - NDPC-SD will conduct on-site professional development for the staff in the four participating schools.
 - NDPC-SD staff will assist in data analysis and intervention selection.
 - Non-participating school systems will be invited to meet with the demonstration participants for the purpose of professional development. This activity will begin during the second year. **(This activity is applicable to Indicator 1, 2, and 14)**

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3 and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State})] \times 100$.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

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

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.

- C. Proficiency rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

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

APR Template – Part B (4)

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target																								
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	<p>A. 33% of the State’s local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with disabilities will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the content area AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Grade</th> <th style="width: 35%;">Mathematics AMO</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>66.53%</td> <td>61.82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>66.33%</td> <td>72.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>58.89%</td> <td>66.59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>51.84%</td> <td>68.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>49.81%</td> <td>66.75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>48.45%</td> <td>63.73%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10 [end of course]</td> <td>38.60% Algebra Data Analysis</td> <td>52.17% English</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	66.53%	61.82%	4	66.33%	72.05%	5	58.89%	66.59%	6	51.84%	68.50%	7	49.81%	66.75%	8	48.45%	63.73%	10 [end of course]	38.60% Algebra Data Analysis	52.17% English
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																							
3	66.53%	61.82%																							
4	66.33%	72.05%																							
5	58.89%	66.59%																							
6	51.84%	68.50%																							
7	49.81%	66.75%																							
8	48.45%	63.73%																							
10 [end of course]	38.60% Algebra Data Analysis	52.17% English																							

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Please refer to Table 6 attached.

- A. 38% or 9 of 24 local school systems met AYP objectives for progress for the students with disabilities subgroup during FFY 2006 (2006-2007). For all students, including students with disabilities, all of Maryland’s 24 local school systems met the minimum “N” subgroup size of ≥ 5 .

FFY	Met AYP for Students with Disabilities in Mathematics	Met AYP for Students with Disabilities in Reading	Met AYP for Students with Disabilities in Both Mathematics & Reading
2006-2007	12 of 24 districts 50%	9 of 24 districts 38%	9 of 24 districts 38%
2005-2006	14 of 24 districts 58%	5 of 24 districts 21%	5 of 24 districts 21%
2004-2005	9 of 24 districts 38%	10 of 24 districts 42%	7 of 24 districts 29%

B. Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities in Mathematics: 98.8%

Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities in Reading: 98.9%

Below incorporates tables B.a, B.b, B.c, B.d, B.e & Overall Percentage of Participation. Format for the table was adapted from NCEO’s *Part B SPP/APR Indicator Analysis*, 08/01/07 as an example of well-presented data for Indicator 3.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Statewide Assessment 2006– 2007 FFY 2006		Mathematics Assessment							Total #
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Algebra EOC ¹	
a	Children with IEPs	7387	7902	7958	8133	8263	8300	7188	55131
b	IEPs in Regular Assessment with No Accommodations	2200	1900	1749	1537	1722	1668	2769	13545
c	IEPs in Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4632	5339	5618	5903	5619	5587	3592	36290
d	IEPs in Alternate Assessment Against Grade-level Standards	Maryland does not yet have an alternate assessment that tests children against grade level standards.							
e	IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	498	615	542 ²	601	756	814	795	4621
f	Overall (b+c+d+e) Participation %	7330 99.2%	7854 99.4%	7909 99.4%	8041 98.9%	8097 98%	8069 97.2%	7156 99.6%	54456 98.8%
Children included in 'a' but not included in the other counts above.									
State Approved Exemptions		57	48	49	92	166	231	32	675

Statewide Assessment 2006 – 2007 FFY 2006		Reading Assessment ³							Total #
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	English EOC	
a	Children with IEPs	7390	7905	7962	8135	8271	8302	6862	54827
b	IEPs in Regular Assessment with No Accommodations	2148	1848	1711	1544	1732	1731	2442	13156
c	IEPs in Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4690	5400	5664	5904	5633	5546	3593	36430
d	IEPs in Alternate Assessment Against Grade-level Standards.	State does not yet have an alternate assessment that tests children against grade level standards.							
e	IEPs in Alternate Assessment Against Alternate Standards	498	615	542	601	756	814	795	4621
f	Overall (b+c+d+e) Participation %	7336 99.3%	7863 99.5%	7917 99.4%	8049 98.9%	8121 98.2%	8091 97.5%	6830 99.5%	54207 98.9%
Children included in 'a' but not included in the other counts above.									
State Approved Exemptions		54	42	45	86	150	211	32	620

¹ EOC = End of Course assessment at the high school level.

² Subset results were invalid for one Alt-MSA student in grade 5 resulting in only 541 students with performance results.

³ Subset results were invalid for four grade 5 students and one grade 7 student. There were six LEP exempt students, including three grade 4 students and three grade 5 students.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

C. PROFICIENCY RATE - OVERALL PERCENTAGES FOR 2006-2007⁴

Statewide Assessment 2006 – 2007 FFY 2006		Mathematics Proficiency							
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Algebra EOC	Total #
a	Children with IEPs	7387	7902	7958	8133	8263	8300	7188	55131
b & c	IEPs in Regular Assessment With & Without Accommodations	3629	4424	3637	2762	1857	1539	2047	19895
	See Above	Maryland does not have performance levels for children using accommodations or those not using accommodations. Results for b & c are above.							
d	IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade-level Standards								
e	IEPs in Alternate Assessment Against Alternate Standards	400	495	443	491	619	657	624	3729
f	Overall (b+c+d+e) Proficiency %	54.97%	62.63%	51.59%	40.46%	30.58%	27.22%	37.33%	43.38%

Target met for Grade 3 reading. Progress made in other performance areas, but AMOs not met.

Statewide Assessment 2006 – 2007 FFY 2006		Reading Proficiency							
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	English EOC	Total #
a	Children with IEPs	7390	7905	7962	8135	8271	8302	6862	54827
b & c	IEPs in Regular Assessment With & Without Accommodations	4185	4807	3743	3305	2368	2193	1873	22474
	See Above	Maryland does not have performance levels for children using accommodations versus those not using accommodations. Results for b & c are above.							
d	IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade-level Standards	Maryland does not yet have an alternate assessment that tests children against grade level standards.							
e	IEPs in Alternate Assessment Against Alternate Standards	400	483	447	490	627	657	619	3723
f	Overall (b+c+d+e) Proficiency %	62.50%	67.30 %	52.97%	47.1%	36.8%	35.22 %	36.49%	48.34%

⁴ The FFY 2006 proficiency levels are based on Adequate Yearly Progress data and include results from the regular and alternative Maryland School Assessments. Previous submissions reported performance data. Data is aligned with Table 6 submitted as an attachment and can also be located on the State's report card website – www.mdreportcard.org.

Overall Proficiency Percentages

FFY 2004 Baseline, FFY 2005 Data, FFY 2006 Actual Data and FFY 2006 Targets

Maryland School Assessment (MSA)

Grade Level	Mathematics				Reading			
	Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	Actual Data FFY 2006 ⁵	Target FFY 2006	Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	Actual Data FFY 2006	Target FFY 2006
3	51.2	53.0	54.97	66.53	52.7	57.5	62.50	61.82
4	48.8	54.9	62.63	66.33	57.1	58.5	67.30	72.05
5	38.8	41.9	51.59	58.89	46.6	48.9	52.97	66.59
6	25.7	30.9	40.46	51.84	36.1	36.9	47.15	68.50
7	22.6	26.6	30.58	49.81	32.2	36.3	36.88	66.75
8	21.7	23.3	27.22	48.45	31.3	30.8	35.22	63.73
Grade 10/EOC	23.4 Algebra Data Analysis	31.0	37.33	38.60	22.3 English	26.1	36.45	52.17

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Indicator 3A - Maryland met its target for Indicator 3A. The target for Indicator 3A was to increase the number of local school systems making AYP from a baseline of 29% (or 7 of 24 local school systems) for the FFY 2006. Results showed that 38% of local school systems (9 of 24) met AYP in special education for BOTH reading and math. This was progress for two local school systems despite dramatic increases in State AMOs. Twelve of 24 local school systems (50%) made AYP for the special education subgroup in mathematics while nine of 24 local school systems (38%) made AYP for the special education subgroup in reading. Thus, for meeting AYP for both reading and mathematics local school systems exceeded the overall State AYP target for students with disabilities. This is especially commendable since the N size for student accountability in Maryland is 5 or more for students with disabilities.

Indicator 3B - Participation of students with disabilities for the 2006-2007 State testing, continues to exceed the 95% standard for all tested Grade levels -- 3 through 8 and Grade 10/end-of-course assessments. All Maryland students with disabilities are expected to participate in either the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) or the Alternate MSA (Alt-MSA) using alternate achievement standards.

Indicator 3C – It’s important to note that changes in the percentage of local school systems meeting AYP for students with disabilities in reading, in math and in both reading and math continues to present ongoing challenges with the area of mathematics showing the most progress at this point. Performance rates although showing progress at nearly every grade level for students with IEPs in reading and mathematics across all assessed grades did not make sufficient progress to meet all of the Maryland performance targets. Targets were met in Grade 3 reading as well as each of the assessed grades improving performance over FFY 2005 performance. Also, Maryland students with IEPs continue to make

⁵ The table compares three years of proficiency data for Maryland. Proficiency includes those students with IEPs performing at the proficient and advanced levels combined.

greater rates of growth in all assessed grades in reading and in math when compared with the rates of growth for the performance of students without IEPs across many of the assessed grade levels.

In FFY 2006 there was an increase in the proficiency/advanced levels for the Alt-MSA test takers when compared to last year's Alt-MSA results. In mathematics, 466 additional students scored proficient while in reading 609 additional Alt-MSA test takers reached proficiency. This may be attributed to the improved understanding and additional technical assistance at the local level about how to use the scoring rubric. Professional development materials that explained and illustrated errors in artifact submission were created. Professional development on these artifacts was provided to Alt-MSA facilitators and nonpublic school representatives. These staff subsequently disseminated these materials during professional development sessions to test examiners in local school systems.

Part of the progress being seen in academic performance of students with disabilities may be due to Maryland's extensive system-wide strategic planning enacted through the State's *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act* that requires each of the 24 local school systems to develop and implement 5-year Master Plans with Annual Updates for the next four years. This has resulted in the general education and special education leadership collaborating on how to improve the performance of all of the *No Child Left Behind* student subgroups. Use of funds as well as use of other district resources has been targeted to reading and mathematics performance of all students, especially subgroups that may be keeping individual schools from making Adequate Yearly Progress. The Division has an extensive technical review rubric and process specific to the indicators of best practices in special education that is used with a team of internal reviewers who then participate in each of the consensus panels that review the Master Plans and Updates.

Two of the larger and lowest performing school systems in Maryland remain in the NCLB improvement status of Corrective Action and are subject to ongoing review and support from MSDE leadership in the area of student performance, especially those who receive Free or Reduced Price Meals (FARMS) and/or, have IEPs. One local school system under a court-ordered Consent Decree also has an Internal Management and Capacity Improvement Team assigned to work within the local school system to specifically improve special education services and student performance.

The Maryland targets for performance for students with disabilities on statewide assessments are the same for all students and student subgroups. Therefore, there are no anticipated changes in Annual Measurable Objectives, Adequate Yearly Progress guidelines, or standards for participation rates other developments such as the improved outreach and professional development on use of the State Content Standards to guide instruction are expected to continue to support further academic progress for students with disabilities. Although there has not been slippage when performance is compared to baseline results by grade level in reading and/or in mathematics for the special education student subgroup as seen in the tables in the previous section, increased efforts to improve student performance will continue. Maryland continues as a Reading First state and this has provided significant professional development and instructional materials in the area of early reading development. These research-based practices are contributing to progress being seen in Grade 3 reading performance on state assessments for students with disabilities as well as appear to be driving the selection of reading intervention materials and practices for secondary students.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing. The resources remain unchanged. New activities are listed below.

MSDE will develop a Mod-HSA assessment for the FFY 2007 State assessment. The Mod-HSA appeals process for high schools is expected to end after the administration of the FFY 2007 State assessments.

MSDE will participate in the ongoing enhancement of the State's www.md.k12 website with publications such as "Getting Results" which documents Maryland schools successes with improvement initiatives for students with disabilities.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

MSDE will continue to review/revise the www.mdreportcard.org for reporting assessment and other local school system data to enhance readability, as appropriate.

MSDE will annually award AYP discretionary grants that support promising practices to accelerate the performance of students with disabilities at the high school level to increase the number of students with disabilities that pass Maryland's High School Assessments.

MSDE will promote the ongoing use of State-developed on-line High School Assessment (HSA) courses to support special education students in passing the algebra/data analysis, English 10, government, and biology end-of-course exams.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

- Indicator 4:** Rates of suspension and expulsion
- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

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

Measurement:
A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	No more than five (5) or 20.83% of the local school systems and public agencies show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with nondisabled students.

Response to OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to Maryland, as follows:

As a follow-up to Maryland’s FFY 2005 SPP/APR, MSDE is required to address the issues raised in OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to MSDE. For “...any additional information the State must include in the FFY 2006 APR or, as needed, the SPP...to address the problems OSEP identified...,” the following information is submitted:

For the issue raised related to Indicator 4A in Maryland’s FFY 2005 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, the onsite reviews scheduled for the two remaining local systems were conducted. Based on those meetings and subsequent reviews, one local school system revised its policies, procedures and practices. The policies, procedures and practices were revised in June 2007 and staff training for administrators was conducted before the school year began. One local school system, in collaboration with MSDE, completed the review. MSDE determined that the policies, procedures and practices complied with the requirements of IDEA. Therefore, no changes were made.

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 compliance with the IDEA for any local school system identified with significant discrepancies have been completed for FFY 2006 and are compliant with the requirements of IDEA.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: Five (5) or 20.83%

Maryland identifies local school systems with significant disproportionality by comparing the percentage of students with disabilities suspended to the percentage of students without disabilities suspended. If the

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

percentage of suspensions among students with disabilities is twice that of the percentage of suspensions among students without disabilities the local school system is identified as significantly disproportionate.

Maryland met the target set for FFY 2006 (2006-2007) as follows:

Single Suspensions Summing to Longer than 10 Days

Actual number: 2 of 24 local school systems (8.3%)

Multiple Suspensions Summing to Longer than 10 Days

Actual number: 3 of 24 local school systems (12.5%)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

Explanation of Progress that occurred for FFY 2006:

Number and Percentage of Disproportionate Local School Systems				
	FFY 2006 2006-2007		FFY 2005 2005-2006	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single Suspension Events Longer than 10 days	2	8.3%	2	8.3%
Multiple Suspension Events Longer than 10 days	3	12.5%	9	37.5%

A review of the suspension data between 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 shows a significant reduction in the percentage of local school systems identified as significantly disproportionate due to multiple suspensions and maintained a low number for single suspension events longer than 10 days.

Multiple Suspensions Summing to Longer than 10 Days by Local School System and Public Agency

For multiple suspension events longer than 10 days, three local school systems (12.5%) were identified as significantly disproportionate in 2006-2007, an improvement from nine local school systems (37.5%) identified in 2005-2006. This represents a decrease of 66% from nine (9) in 2005-2006 to three (3) in 2006-2007.

The three local school systems that are disproportionate in multiple suspensions summing to longer than 10 days for the 2006-2007 school year were also disproportionate for the 2005-2006 school year for multiple suspensions. In each system, however, there was a reduction in the percentage of the disproportionate suspension of students with disabilities. For multiple suspensions summing to more than 10 days, the ratios of students with disabilities suspended compared to nondisabled students suspended declined from 3.23 to 2.25 (LSS # 1), from 2.70 to 2.46 (LSS# 2), and from 3.86 to 3.14 (LSS# 3).

The table below compares the three local school systems that were disproportionate in the number and percentage of students with disabilities who experienced multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days to the number and percentage of nondisabled students who experienced multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days.

Number and Percentage of Students with Disabilities Suspended			Number and Percentage of Nondisabled Students Suspended			
	# of Disabled Students	# Suspended for more than 10 Days	Percent	# of Nondisabled Students	# Suspended for more than 10 Days	Percent
LSS #1	2,087	21	1.01%	15,437	69	0.45%
LSS #2	5,509	119	2.16%	34,211	301	0.88%
LSS #3	17,198	92	0.53%	121,471	207	0.17%

Single Suspensions Summing to Longer than 10 Days by Local School System and Public Agency

For single suspension events longer than 10 days, in FFY 2005 two local school systems (8.3%) were identified as disproportionate. In FFY 2006 the percentage of local school systems and public agencies that are disproportionate remained the same, two local school systems (8.3%).

The table below compares the two local school systems that were disproportionate in the number and percentage of students with disabilities who were suspended for a single suspension longer than 10 days to the number and percentage of nondisabled students who were suspended for a single suspension longer than 10 days.

Number and Percentage of Students with Disabilities Suspended			Number and Percentage of Nondisabled Students Suspended			
	# of Disabled Students	# Suspended for more than 10 Days	Percent	# of Nondisabled Students	# Suspended for more than 10 Days	Percent
LSS #1	13,961	371	2.66 %	69,397	860	1.24%
LSS #2	4,744	27	0.57%	44,537	76	0.17%

Local school system # 1 was not disproportionate in extended suspensions during FFY 2004 or FFY 2005. During FFY 2004 suspensions of students with disabilities was significantly below (248 or 1.66%) the number and percentage of extended suspensions for nondisabled students (1,277 or 1.74%). For FFY 2005, extended suspensions of students with disabilities slightly exceeded (213 or 1.46%) the number and percentage of extended suspensions for nondisabled students (990 or 1.40%).

In FFY 2005 local school system #1, under a court ordered consent decree, was identified as having three elementary schools with a higher than 18% suspension rate. In FFY 2006 these schools were mandated by State regulation to implement a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school-wide behavior management system or an alternative behavioral modification program developed in collaboration with MSDE. With technical assistance from MSDE, 34 elementary and middle schools in that system have implemented the PBIS initiative. With assistance from MSDE, the local school system reviewed and revised discipline policies, procedures and practices. MSDE has reviewed and approved the revised policies, procedures and practices.

In FFY 2006 local school system #2 identified as disproportionate in extended suspensions was also disproportionate in extended suspensions in FFY 2005. That local school system developed, implemented and completed a CAP that has been verified by MSDE. The local school system targeted the two high schools with the most disproportionate extended suspensions for focused technical assistance. The Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports initiative was expanded from 15 (21%) to 34 (48%) schools in the local school system.

Public agencies selected for monitoring were based on data and resulted in 5 systemic findings. The identified noncompliance was related to applicable State procedures of an IEP team that must occur following after students are removed for more than 10 school days. Upon a review of the findings, MSDE determined that increased technical assistance would be provided to all public agencies on the disciplinary removal of students with disabilities after 10 days and the responsibility for the provision of

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

FAPE. Statewide technical assistance and monitoring will continue. If noncompliance is identified, it will be addressed through a CAP. See Indicator 15 for additional details.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007.

Not Applicable.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7. The LRE data for this APR is from Maryland’s annual child count collected the last Friday in October and reported in the 2006 *Maryland Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables*. The document is posted on the MSDE website under the Division of Accountability and Assessment, Staff and Student Publications. The data in the report is considered to be accurate, reliable and valid for the purpose of reviewing LRE.⁶ In a letter dated July 2, 2007, OSEP informed the MSDE that the State has satisfied Special Conditions related to LRE. MSDE continues to closely monitor LRE.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day⁷;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2006 (2006 – 2007)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 60.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. B. 16.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. C. 7.42% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

⁶ Due to ongoing monitoring of student records, OSEP Table 3 is continually subject to revision.

⁷ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

October 2006 Child Count = 95, 946

	Number	Percent
A.	58,483	61.64%
B.	15, 380	16.21%
C.	7,491	7.90%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

5A - The October 2006 Child Count showed that 61.64% of students who receive services outside the regular class for less than 21% of the day met the State’s FFY 2006 target of 60.11%. This data represents progress and has steadily increased since 2003. All four local school systems that were below the State’s target in the last APR remain below the State’s target this year and three of the four have made progress. Each local school system, including these four, completes an annual *Self-Assessment* document which includes a review of data on Indicator 5. The completion of this document requires the local school system to collect, analyze and submit improvement activities if the LRE data are significantly below the State’s target.

5B - Similarly, 16.21% of students who receive services outside the regular class greater than 60% of the day met the State’s target of 16.61%. This data represents progress and has decreased since 2003 to its present level. All four local school systems that were below the State’s target in the last APR remain below the State’s target this year, but three of the four have made progress by decreasing the percentage of students served in this placement. Each local school system, including these four, completes an annual *Self-Assessment* document which includes a review of data on Indicator 5. The completion of this document requires the local school system to collect, analyze and submit improvement activities if the LRE data are significantly below the State’s target.

5C - The State’s separate facilities placement data was 7.90% and did not meet the State’s target of 7.42% by 0.48%. Due to a decrease in the State’s overall child count, the October 2006 data reported in this APR demonstrated no appreciable change even though the number of students in such placements decreased by 271. Analysis of the data by placement type within the category also remain relatively unchanged. Five local school systems had data that was below the target or significantly below the target compared to four during the last reporting period representing slippage. Four of the five are the State’s largest school systems. One of the five is a local school systems is under a court ordered consent decree. From July 1, 2005 though June 30, 2007, there were 14 due process hearing requests filed by parents seeking more restrictive or separate facilities placements by these local school systems. The local school systems prevailed in 12 of the cases. There were six State complaints filed seeking more restrictive placements in the same local school systems. No violations were identified in all but one case, which required corrective action. In addition, each local school system, including these five, completes an annual *Self-Assessment* document which includes a review of data on Indicator 5. The completion of this document requires the local school systems to collect, analyze and prepare improvement activities if the LRE data are significantly below the State’s target.

MSDE identified eleven systemic findings of noncompliance as a result of monitoring and 137 through dispute resolution procedures. The MSDE includes a broad number of related requirements in this area. Of the 11 systemic findings, all were based on requirements unrelated to specific LRE decision making requirements the previously identified basis of the Special Conditions. Dispute resolution data was also based on a broad array of specific requirements not specifically related to those requirements having to do with LRE decision making. Of the 148 findings all but two of the findings have been corrected as of the date of the submission of this FFY 2006 SPP/APR on February 1, 2008. The two outstanding findings of noncompliance are in the local school system under a court ordered consent decree in which intensive

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

oversight by the IMCIT and enforcement actions are ongoing. See Indicator 15 for additional details. Separate facilities placements are recommended by IEP teams and the State does not substitute its judgment for the judgment of the IEP team. In addition, advocacy at either end of the placement continuum is strong in the State.

When local school systems request support from the State to build or expand separate facilities the State requires the local school system to submit a comprehensive plan that provides information regarding the location of the special education program and documentation of the need for expansion. The plan must include a review of separate school facility data and plans for expanded inclusion with regular education programs, within regular education facilities, to ensure integration of students with disabilities with nondisabled peers. Compliance information about how IEP teams will meet LRE decision making requirements including the application of supplementary aids and services when determining student placement must also be included along with a review, and revision, if appropriate, of LRE policies, procedures and practices in support of a continuum of services.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006:

The State will maintain its current LRE targets.

MSDE will continue to emphasize the continuum of services and the use of supplementary aids and services. To ensure the accuracy of the data, the State will review separate facility placement coding, program location and student schedules.

To maintain compliance with LRE, MSDE will continue to monitor LSS for compliance with LRE decision making requirements and the consideration of supplementary aids and services to enable students with disabilities to participate successfully in the LRE. Any finding of noncompliance requires the local school system or public agency to prepare and implement a Corrective Action Plan.

When requesting to build or expand separate placement facilities, MSDE directs local school systems to complete a comprehensive plan.

The annual *Self-Assessment* of local school system performance on SPP indicators will continue to include a review of LRE data and direct a local school system or public agency with data below the State's target to prepare improvement activities or an improvement plan.

In the local application for federal funds, MSDE may direct the use of Part B funds to the LRE indicator(s) in which a local school system or public agency needs assistance.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator7.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Measurement:

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

Response to OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to Maryland, as follows:

As a follow-up to Maryland’s FFY 2005 SPP/APR, MSDE is required to address the issues raised in OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to MSDE. For “...any additional information the State must include in the FFY 2006 APR or, as needed, the SPP...to address the problems OSEP identified...,” the following information is submitted:

For the issue raised related to Indicator 8 in Maryland’s FFY 2005 SPP/APR, MSDE provided a copy of the two surveys used with the February 1, 2007 SPP/APR submission. Another set of the FFY 2005 (2005-2006) surveys are attached to this submission. MSDE is now utilizing the short form of both surveys and copies of the new forms are included in the FFY 2006 SPP/APR submission.

MSDE engaged in multiple attempts to resolve OSEP’s sampling concerns via email, conference call, and with the assistance of the Mid-South Regional Resource Center. OSEP staff did not provide sufficient explanation nor description of the problems with the sampling plan. Accordingly, MSDE chose to conduct a census-based approach. The new methodology is incorporated into a revised SPP and targets.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MSDE has developed and submitted a Request for Consultant Services that will allow the State to collect data on the number and percent of parents participating in Part B (ages 3 through 21) who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. In accordance with the advice of OSEP, MSDE is now using a census based approach to gather data from all twenty-four local school systems annually. The surveys were distributed to parents by school based providers and returned to through a postage paid envelope to MSDE. MSDE utilized members of the Maryland SESAC, local SECACs, and our Partners for Success/Family Support Network Centers to encourage parents to respond to the survey. The completed surveys were scanned and analyzed by an independent vendor and the results are reported below. The vendor utilized Rausch measurement techniques and related data analysis methods to accurately assess the data collected through the survey.

Survey Selection

The MSDE used survey items for Indicator 8 that were developed and screened for statistical validity through the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) under the Leadership of Dr. W. Alan Coulter, Project Director. MSDE utilized the required scale for the Part B Survey and the reduced item version for Preschool parents developed by NCSEAM in April 2007. This survey is considered to be a reliable instrument from which to collect the data. Copies of the survey utilized by MSDE for this administration are attached to this submission.

MSDE is gathering and analyzing data on both a statewide basis and disaggregated by local school system. One of the difficulties inherent in disaggregating data in this manner is obtaining a statistically valid and reliable representation of our state’s population. MSDE also conducted a second mailing targeted for students with disabilities educated in nonpublic schools to ensure that this population was included in our results. Since this is the first year that MSDE is using a census based approach, refinements in data collection activities will be implemented in future survey administrations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>27% of the parents of school-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>32% of the parents of preschool-aged children receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Target	Actual Number	Actual Percentage
School Age – 27%	1,589	45%
Preschool – 32%	1,509	58%

Preschool results: The questionnaire for parents of preschool children was revised this year in accordance with recommendations from NCSEAM. Like the questionnaire for parents of school-aged children, this questionnaire had 25 core questions. Anchors, per those provided by NCSEAM, were used in the Rasch analysis to calculate the Indicator. This analysis is based upon 1509 respondents.

Demographic data obtained on the parent questionnaire reveal the following:

- The largest percentage of children are age three (41%) and slightly more than three quarters of the children are either age three or age four (77%).
- The age when the largest percentage of children were identified for Early Intervention or Special Education is age two (33%). Nearly two thirds (61%) of the children were identified between the ages of two and three.
- Most of the children of the respondents are white (60%) with another 23 percent being Black or African American.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- The primary exceptionality/disability for nearly half the children is speech or language impairment (49%). This far surpasses the second most frequently cited exceptionality/disability, developmental delay (27%).

School-age results: Questionnaires were processed from three batches received from MSDE. Thousands of forms and 1,589 were used in this analysis. This amount exceeds the number of forms required to provide a statistically relevant State. The remaining forms will be processed and analyzed in the immediate future. Additional data will be reported publically and submitted in next year's APR. It is not anticipated that this additional data will significantly change the States reported results.

As with the preschool population, almost all the respondents lived in Maryland (98%). Distributions for the other demographics reveal:

- Slightly less than half the children are in grades 1-5 (45%)
- Dividing the ages of the children in three year increments yields almost the same percentage in each group, varying from 21 percent to 29 percent.
- Nearly two-thirds (62%) of the children were identified for Early Intervention or Special Education before age 6.
- Two-thirds of the children are white (66%) with another 25% being Black or African American.
- The primary exceptionality/disability for slightly more than half the children is either specific learning disability (31%) or speech or language impairment (24%).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing. These activities will continue for FFY 2007:

- The SESAC will continue to meet to identify ways to improve response rate and review policies, procedures and practices that address parental involvement.
- MSDE and SESAC (and the selected vendor) will review the results from the survey each year and adjust sampling approach to ensure that valid and reliable results are generated. Areas typically considered will include race/ethnicity and type of disability.
- Initial vendor recommendations for improving response rates were implemented in the Fall of 2007.
- The local SECACs will also identify priorities and barriers to parental involvement within their communities.
- SESACs will identify priorities and barriers to parental involvement within their communities with a focus on items within one standard deviation of the NCSEAM standard.
- MSDE supported new family training modules developed in collaboration with Parent's Place of Maryland and Partner's for Success Centers around the state that address improving Parental Involvement. This year we developed 1) Individualized Education: An Overview of the Special Education Process and 2) Effective Partnership in Special Education: Advocating in Harmony. MSDE remains committed to identifying effective practices from other states.

Explanation of Progress/Slippage:

The data provided for Indicator #8 of the APR is taken from the FFY 2006 school-age and preschool parent surveys. Maryland exceeded the target for FFY 2006. Using the calculation stated above, the number and percentage of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 58% for preschool aged students and 45% for school-aged counterparts. The number of

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

responses analyzed as of the APR submission is comparable to the amount generated from the sample utilized for baseline data from the FFY 2005 submission. Additional data is being analyzed by MSDE and its independent vendor in February 2008 to utilize responses received by MSDE after the due date, because it is important that every parent's feedback is considered even if received late.

In FYY 2005 MSDE identified 28 findings of noncompliance in 11 local school systems, as a result of dispute resolution procedures, related to the provision of prior written notice. In FFY 2006 twenty-five of the findings were corrected within one year and the remaining three findings were completed by December 31, 2007. See Indicator 15 for additional details.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Improvement Activities: Three new activities have been added to enhance parent involvement and to increase the response rate of among African-American and Hispanic parents.

- MSDE has added a new strategy to enhance parent involvement. MSDE has expanded the use of facilitated IEP meetings across the state. Facilitated IEP meetings are now available in ten of twenty-four school systems located in the North, Central, South, Eastern and Western parts of our state. this is an ongoing activity.
- In order to increase response rate among African American parents, MSDE will work with the SESAC annually to identify additional public awareness strategies targeted toward this group of parents.
- MSDE will piloted a Spanish version of the parent surveys, in Maryland in jurisdictions with greater than 5% Hispanic enrollment, to enhance the response rate among the Hispanic community. MSDE will work with the SESAC and SECACs within the jurisdictions on an ongoing basis.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of local school systems and public agencies with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1410(a) (3) (C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	0% of local school systems are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FYY 2006: 0%

Data Source and Definition of "disproportionate representation"

Maryland determines the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification through an analysis of data from the Maryland Student Services Information System, using the measuring criteria, "n", cited below, and the analysis of the results of on-site and off-site monitoring, local school systems' and public agencies' self-assessments, Due Process Complaints and written State complaints.

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

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

The MSDE identifies local school systems with weighted risk ratios of 1.5 or higher for each particular racial and ethnic group as significantly disproportionate for over-identification, and a weighted risk ratio of .05 or lower for each particular racial and ethnic group as significantly disproportionate for under-representation. The application of the weighted risk ratio is limited to local school systems that have more than 20 students of a particular racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability. When there

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

are 20 or fewer students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability, the following criteria are applied to measuring discrepancy:

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

Based on the totality of the analyses of data from the MSDE Student Services Information System, using the measuring criteria “n” cited above, and the analysis of the results of on-site and off-site monitoring, local school systems’ self-assessments, Due Process Complaints and written State complaints, MSDE met the target for this Indicator. No local school systems were identified with disproportionate representation of any racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

MSDE disaggregated and analyzed the Maryland Student Services Information System data using both the weighted risk ratio and the .20 Index to reduce the risk of overlooking potential or actual disproportionality.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Maryland continued to meet the established target for Indicator 9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006

Improvement Activities:

- MSDE will annually work with and provide technical assistance to all local school systems identified based solely on the analysis of data as having a significant under-representation of racial and ethnic groups identified for special education and related services, to review and, as appropriate, revise policies, procedures and practices related to Child Find to ensure that families of children who may potentially require special education and related services are aware of and encouraged to access Child Find.
- In 2007-2008, MSDE will release a guide to Response to Intervention, and providing technical assistance regarding interventions and strategies to prevent inappropriate identification of students.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	0% of local school systems are identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FYY 2006: 0%

Data Source and Definition of “disproportionate representation”

Maryland determines the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disabilities that is the result of inappropriate identification through an analysis of data from the Maryland Student Services Information System using the measuring criteria, “n”, cited below, and the analysis of the results of on-site and off-site monitoring, local school systems’ self-assessments, Due Process Complaints and written State complaints.

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

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

The MSDE identifies local school systems with weighted risk ratios of 1.5 or higher for a particular racial and ethnic group as significantly disproportionate for over-identification, and a weighted risk ratio of .05 or lower for each particular racial and ethnic group as significantly disproportionate for under-representation. The application of the weighted risk ratio is limited to local school systems that have more than 20

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

students of a particular racial and ethnic group classified as having a disability. When there are 20 or fewer students in a racial and ethnic group classified as having a specific disability, the following criteria are applied to measuring disproportionality:

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

MSDE determines the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification through an analysis of data from the Maryland Student Services Information System and the results of Due Process complaints, written State complaints, on-site and off-site monitoring. MSDE met the target for this Indicator. No local school systems were identified with disproportionate representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

MSDE disaggregated and analyzed the data using both the weighted risk ratio and the 0.20 index to reduce the risk of overlooking potential or actual disproportionality.

The number of local school systems with disproportionate representation of different racial and ethnic groups by specific disability categories based solely on data review is summarized in the four tables below. These tables are based on calculations for students, 6 to 21 years of age, in each category of disabling condition as defined for this Indicator. MSDE uses standardized data analysis to identify potential instances of inappropriate identification.

From FFY 2005 to FFY 2006 the percentage of local school systems reported significantly disproportionate in the over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the weighted risk ratio based solely on data remained constant - 0.0%. American Indian, Asian and Hispanic students.

For African American, Not Hispanic and White, and Not Hispanic students, changes in the number of local school systems identified as significantly disproportionate using the weighted risk ratio solely based on data are indicated in the table below.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

Over-representation Weighted Risk Ratio

Number of local school systems significantly disproportionate in the over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the weighted risk ratio

	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language Impairments	Multiple Disabilities	Other Health Impairments	Autism
<i>American Indian</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Asian</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>African American, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	12	13	6	3	1	2	0
Percentage	50%	54.1%	25%	8.3%	4.16%	8.3%	0.0%
<i>Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>White, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	2	6	2	3	4
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	25.0%	8.3%	12.5%	16.60%

0.20 index

Number of local school systems significantly disproportionate in the over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the 0.20 index

	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language Impairments	Multiple Disabilities	Other Health Impairments	Autism
<i>American Indian</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Asian</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.16%
<i>African American, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	11	14	9	5	1	7	0
Percentage	45.8%	58.3%	37.5%	20.8%	4.2%	29.2%	0.0%
<i>Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	1	0	3	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	4.16%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>White, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	2	5	3	3	4
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	20.8%	12.5%	12.5%	16.7%

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

Under-representation Weighted Risk Ratio

Number of local school systems significantly disproportionate in the under-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the weighted risk ratio based solely on data.

	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language Impairments	Multiple Disabilities	Other Health Impairments	Autism
<i>American Indian</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Asian</i>							
Number	0	5	1	2	1	2	0
Percentage	0.0%	20.8%	4.16%	8.3%	4.16%	8.3%	0.0%
<i>African American, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.16%	4.16%	0.0%	4.16%
<i>Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	3	0	1	4	2
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	4.16%	16.7%	8.3%
<i>White, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	8	0	1	0	0	1	0
Percentage	33.3%	0.0%	4.16%	0.0%	0.0%	4.16%	0.0%

0.2 Index

Number of local school systems significantly disproportionate in the under-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the 0.20 index

	Mental Retardation	Specific Learning Disabilities	Emotional Disturbance	Speech or Language Impairments	Multiple Disabilities	Other Health Impairments	Autism
<i>American Indian</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Asian</i>							
Number	0	5	1	2	0	2	0
Percentage	0.0%	20.8%	4.2%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%
<i>African American, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	2	0	2	4	2
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	16.7%	8.3%
<i>White, Not Hispanic</i>							
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

For FFY 2005 the percentage of local school systems reported significantly disproportionate in the under-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the weighted risk ratio based solely on data indicated 0.0%. American Indian group was disproportionate. All other racial/ethnic groups had some level of disproportionate representation based solely on data.

Again, based on the totality of the analyses of data described above, including the analysis of the results of on-site and off-site monitoring, local school systems' and public agencies' self-assessments, Due Process complaints and written SEA complaints no local school systems were identified with disproportionate representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

For the FFY 2005 school year the percentage of local school systems reported significantly disproportionate in the under-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories according to the .2 Index based solely on data indicated 0.0%. American Indian and White, Not Hispanic groups were disproportionate. One local school system (4.2%) was disproportionate in the under-identification of the African American group. Asian and Hispanic groups had some level of disproportionate representation based solely on data.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Maryland continued to meet the established target for Indicator 10.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006

Improvement Activities:

- MSDE will annually work with and provide technical assistance to all local school systems identified based solely on the analysis of data as having a significant under-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories to review and, as appropriate revise policies, procedures and practices related to Child Find to ensure that families of children who may potentially require special education and related services are aware of and encouraged to access Child Find.
- In Fall 2007 MSDE will release a guide to Response to Intervention, and providing technical assistance regarding interventions and strategies to prevent inappropriate identification of students based on race/ethnicity.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 06 (2006-2007)	100% of children were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate.

Actual Target Data for Indicator 11: 83%

Actual Measurement:

- 1a = **14,461** # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- 1b = **3,546** # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days
- 1c = **7,586** # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days
- 2a = **3,329** Number in 1(a) but not 1(b) or 1(c) = 2(a)
- 2b = **3,169** # eligibility determinations (found eligible and not eligible) completed ***beyond*** 60 calendar days
- 2c = **161** # not determined ***beyond*** 60 calendar days (Due to withdrawals, i.e., transfer, dropout; parent withdrew consent)
- AR = **699** # determined NOT eligible and eligible whose evaluations were NOT completed within 60 days, ***yet an Acceptable Reason for Delay provided***

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

NAR= 2,469

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

Adjusted Data:

AR= 699

Not Eligible and Eligible with Acceptable Reason for Delay

2c= 161

not determined **beyond** 60 calendar days (Due to withdrawals, i.e., transfer, dropout; parent withdrew consent)

Percent Adjusted = $[1b + 1c + AR + 2c] \div 1a \times 100$

$[3,546 + 7,586 + 699 + 161] \div 14,461 \times 100 = 83\%$

$11,992 \div 14,461 \times 100 = 83\%$

Section 1. Measurement			Section 2. Account for children included in 1a but not in 1b or 1c of Section 1.		
Number of children for whom parental consent was received (1a)	Number determined NOT eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 calendar days of parental consent. (1b)	Number determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 calendar days of parental consent. (1c)	Number in (1a) but not in (1b) or (1c) = (2a)		
			3,329		
			Number of eligibility determinations completed beyond 60 calendar days (2b)	Number of no determinations made (2c)	
			3,169	161	
	3,546	7,586	AR	NAR	161
14,461	11,132		699	2,469	161

FFY 2005 was the first time MSDE required this data from local school systems and public agencies. For FFY 2006 MSDE improved and clarified for local school systems and public agencies the procedures for collecting, reviewing, verifying data and reporting reasons for delay and range of day data. All local school systems and public agencies were able to determine for FFY 2006 the number of acceptable reason for delay (Student Not Available or Parent Requested Delay) for determination of eligibility which were not completed with in 60 calendar days. Local school system and public agencies were also able to determine administrative reasons evaluations were not completed due to withdrawals, i.e., transfer, dropout; parent withdrew consent. These administrative reasons were used to adjust the total number of evaluations completed within 60 days.

MSDE continues to apply a rule that if a local school system or public agency was unable to provide documentation for why an evaluation and eligibility determination did not occur within 60 calendar days of parental consent for evaluation, the delay is considered unacceptable. Revised forms/Excel spreadsheets address more discrete details in order to more closely examine reasons for delay and the range of days beyond 60 calendar days for each local school system and public agency for the FFY 2006 collection period (2006-2007). This data is utilized to individualize a local school system's or public agency's technical assistance needs.

Of all students identified within (1a) [14,461] a total of 11,992 or 83% of evaluations were completed within 60 calendar days of parental consent for evaluation. Local school systems and public agencies reported a total of 699 students as having "Acceptable Reasons for Delay" beyond the 60 days from date of parental consent or evaluation. An additional 161 evaluations were not completed because of student withdrawals, i.e., transfer, dropout, parent withdrew consent. An adjusted total of 2,469 (17%) students did not receive evaluations within 60 calendar days of the parent consent for evaluation.

The range of days beyond 60 calendar days from the date of parental consent for evaluation for all students cluster around the following ranges:

- 1 day to 15 days – 1,679 (53%)
- 16 to 45 days – 1,035 (33%)
- Beyond 45 days – 444 (14%)

The FFY 2005 baseline data was 77%. Thus, in FFY 2005 23% of evaluations were not completed within the 60 calendar days of parental consent. MSDE has improved by 6%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Improvement Activities

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

MSDE improvement activities included the development of a new Excel data collection form and improved instructions to accompany the form, along with technical assistance provided at regional data management meetings. This change has resulted in improved data collection and a 6% increase in progress toward reaching our target of 100%.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

Maryland did not meet the target of 100% established by OSEP for this Indicator, but did show a 6% improvement (83%) over FFY 2005 (77%). Division data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 2006. During FFY 2005 MSDE identified 19 findings of noncompliance as a result of dispute resolution procedures. Eighteen findings were completed within one year and the remaining finding was completed by December 31, 2007. See Indicator 15 for additional details. Support and technical assistance provided by Division staff to local school system staff will continue to be part of ongoing improvement activities to maintain accurate reporting of local data, and to address issues that surface as the web-based IEP is implemented and data is electronically captured and submitted on a more real-time, as opposed to one-time annual, basis. Local school systems and public agencies not meeting compliance are required to correct noncompliance within one year.

The following factors may have contributed to the progress:

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- Local school systems that did not come within 5% of the rigorous target received corrective action plans (CAP).
- MSDE instituted the Maryland Online IEP. The documentation for initial evaluations is contained in one section and an extensive process guide assists IEP teams in conducting appropriate documentation regarding initial evaluations and the required elements.

In the FFY 2006 collection period, MSDE reduced the number of students who were **not** evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate from 23% to 17% which is a 6% improvement. This is a small but significant gain for MSDE in closing the gap between 100% and 83% of students who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days of parental consent to evaluate.

In FFY 2005 MSDE reviewed local school system/public agency policies, procedures, practices to ensure children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated within 60 days in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.300. The review of policies, procedures, practices continued in FFY 2006 (2006-2007).

A review of the local school system and public agency performance toward meeting the state goal of 100% in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) indicated that five of 30 local school systems and public agencies (16%) demonstrated 100% compliance. Six of 30 (20%) demonstrated compliance of 95% to 99%. Eleven of 30 (36%) demonstrated 85% to 95% compliance. Of the 30 local school systems and public agencies, 22 of 30 (72%) demonstrated improvement.

Following the collection and verification of local school system and public agency data, MSDE worked with each local school system and public agency to review the Indicator 11 data to determine the summary numbers for the “Range of Days” and “Acceptable Reasons for Delay”. MSDE scheduled two groups of four regional Data Manager’s Technical Assistance Meetings in January, 2007 and June 2007, with local school system and public agency director of special education, and data managers. Staff involved in the collection, verification, and review of data has provided information to the Quality Assurance and Monitoring (QAM) Office on the local school systems and public agencies that did not meet compliance in order to advise local school systems and public agencies of their obligation to correct noncompliance within one year.

Recommendations were made to MSDE Leadership, Quality Assurance and Monitoring Office, Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), and data staff regarding procedures for collecting and reporting data for Indicator 11. Information and feedback provided to MSDE regarding improvement activities which should be considered for the collection of Indicator 11 data will be reviewed and considered by MSDE.

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

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006 (2006-2007)

Improvement Activities

- MSDE is continuing to research the feasibility of developing a web-based data entry system (integrated with MDSSIS.org) to report these data to MSDE. If MSDE decides to develop and implement a web based system, the earliest that would be completed would be FFY 2008 (2008-2009). The paper or Excel system will be utilized until that time.
- Regional data management meetings will be held February 2008 for: SSIS Data Managers, Directors of Special Education, QAM staff, and Preschool Staff to discuss and share the Excel form for input on proposed changes to fields in SSIS record layout and discuss the consideration of cumulative data collection using mdssis.org.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

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

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 95%

Students Referred by Part C and Determined Eligible for Part B

State Total of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	# of children determined eligible whose IEPs were developed and implemented by third birthdays	# of children determined eligible whose IEPs were Not developed and implemented by third birthday	# of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services	Percentage of children determined eligible whose IEPs were developed and implemented by the third birthday
2,476	2,050	128	58	95%

Of all students identified as referred by Part C to Part B for eligibility determination, a total of 2,178 were determined eligible for Part B. Local school systems and public agencies reported a total of 30 out of 128 students, or 23.4%, as having "Acceptable Reasons for Delay" beyond the third birthday for either eligibility determination or development and implementation of the IEP.

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

- 1 day to 15 days – 79 or 61.9%
- 16 to 45 days – 37 or 29.2%
- Beyond 45 days – 12 or 9.0%

Unacceptable reasons for delay included: Inclement weather; Paperwork error; Inconclusive testing results; Child not available (not parent failure)/child refusal; Staffing issue; and Other reason(s).

Students Referred by Part C and Determined **Not Eligible for Part B**

State Total of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	# of Not eligible determinations completed prior to third birthday	# of Not eligible determinations Not completed prior to third birthday	# of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation	Percentage of Not eligible determinations completed prior to third birthday
2,476	208	0	0	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

- Hiring of a new Part B 619 Monitoring and Technical Assistance staff position was completed. This staff specialist, located in the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program/Preschool Services Branch, began working with Part C and Part B monitoring staff within the Division to conduct joint monitoring of local Infants and Toddlers Programs and local school systems for compliance with respective Part C and Part B Early Childhood Transition indicator requirements. This staff specialist also works in concert with Part C and Part B staff to provide coordinated technical assistance, as identified through monitoring activities.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- Division data management and 619 program staff continued to work closely with local school system Part B data managers and preschool special education coordinators to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 2006. Regional meetings with local school system data and program staff were conducted with the purpose of further clarifying local data collection and reporting requirements. MSDE staff provided technical assistance to individual data managers and preschool coordinators on an as needed basis, either on request or based on need following a review of local data.
- Statewide and local Early Childhood Transition data was reported publicly for all local school systems.
- Revision was completed of the Division publication, “Stepping Ahead to Success”, designed for families of children preparing to transition from Part C to Part B. It is now available in downloadable form for all local Infants and Toddlers Program staff, families, early childhood community program staff, and local school system Part B 619 staff on the Early Childhood Gateway, a website developed through an existing partnership between the Division and the JHU/CTE.
- Division Part B 619 and Part C staff will continue to work together to complete revisions to the state Technical Assistance Bulletin on Early Childhood Transition and to post this as an additional downloadable resource on the Early Childhood Gateway.
- The Division will continue to work with local school systems and local Infants and Toddlers Programs through focused monitoring activities to ensure compliance with this indicator.

Explanation of Progress and Slippage

MSDE did not meet the target of 100% established by OSEP for this Indicator, but did show an 11.6% improvement (95%) over the FFY 2005 83.4% compliance. Division data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 2006. In FFY 2005 MSDE identified two findings of noncompliance from dispute resolutions. One of the two findings was corrected within one year. The one finding of noncompliance that has not been corrected is in the local school system under a court ordered consent decree that receives intensive oversight by the IMCIT. **Through a corrective action plan specific to C to B transition established for this local school system, Division compliance and program improvement staff provided technical assistance to local school system early childhood special education administrative staff focusing on implementation of local policies and procedures to ensure smooth transitions, and review of data collection activities and findings with local school system staff, including the local Part B data manager. Although not reaching full compliance within one year, this local school system made significant progress towards meeting compliance over the twelve month period (44.65% for FFY 2005 vs. 86.01% for FFY 2006).**

Support and technical assistance provided by Division staff to local school system staff will continue as part of ongoing improvement activities to maintain accurate reporting of local data, and to address issues that surface as the web-based IEP is implemented and data is electronically captured and submitted on a more real-time, as opposed to one-time annual, basis. Local school systems not meeting compliance are required to correct noncompliance within one year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Not Applicable.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006 – 2007)	100% of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.

Response to OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to Maryland, as follows:

As a follow-up to Maryland’s FFY 2005 SPP/APR, MSDE is required to address the issues raised in OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to MSDE. For “...any additional information the State must include in the FFY 2006 APR or, as needed, the SPP...to address the problems OSEP identified...,” the following information is submitted:

For the issue raised related to Indicator 13 in Maryland’s FFY 2005 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, the number of students with IEPs that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services was 14,326 of a total number of 17,473 youth aged 16 and above results in 82% compliance.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 94%

For FFY 2006, the IEPs of 20,383 out of 21,666 youth with disabilities aged 16 and above, included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services for a compliance rate of 94%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities from the previous APR and all SPP activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

Explanation of Progress from Baseline

Maryland did not meet the target of 100% established by OSEP for this Indicator, but did show a 12% improvement (94%) over the FFY 2005 (2005-2006) 82% compliance. Division data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 2006. In FFY 2005 MSDE identified one finding of noncompliance related to the failure to meet the transition requirements in student IEPs. The finding was corrected within one year of identification. See Indicator 15 for additional details. Support and technical assistance provided by Division staff to local school system staff will continue as part of ongoing improvement activities to maintain accurate reporting of local data, and to address issues that surface as the web-based IEP is implemented and data is electronically captured and submitted on a more real-time, as opposed to one-time annual, basis. Local school systems not meeting compliance are required to correct noncompliance within one year.

The following factors may have contributed to the progress:

- Local school systems that did not come within 5% of the rigorous target received corrective action plans (CAP).
- MSDE instituted the Maryland Online IEP. The documentation for transition planning is contained in one section and an extensive process guide assists IEP teams in conducting appropriate discussions regarding transition and the required elements.
- MSDE convened regional meetings for local school system transition coordinators. These meetings take place on a quarterly basis. The documentation of transition planning was an agenda item for each meeting that was held in FFY 2006.
- MSDE provided professional development on transition documentation for local school systems that received a CAP and for those that requested it. The professional development addressed the following issues that teachers expressed were causing the most confusion in meeting the requirements, such as:
 - Confusion over language in the IDEA regulations (example – measurable postsecondary goals);
 - As a teacher, can I be held responsible for a goal statement that will not be attained until after the child leaves school?; and
 - How do I state a transition service.
- MSDE co-sponsors the annual Transition Conference for the purpose of staff development, agency collaboration, and the sharing of information for professionals, families, students, and agencies.
- MSDE participates in regional and national Transition Communities of Practice.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

Improvement Activities:

MSDE will continue to provide technical assistance and professional development to local school systems as we work to meet the compliance goal of 100%. The following technical assistance and monitoring activities are planned:

- Local school systems with identified noncompliance will receive a CAP.
- MSDE will work with local school systems to plan and deliver professional development based upon the following:

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- A review of a random sampling of IEPs to verify accuracy of transition planning documentation;
 - The identification of patterns of non-compliance; and
 - The number of new secondary teachers hired.
- MSDE Divisions of Career Technology and Adult Learning, and Student, Family, and School Support will collaborate with to provide ongoing professional development for all staff on transition planning and documentation.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7. The MSDE has implemented an integrated system of general supervision to ensure the proper implementation of regulations. Data was collected through general supervisory activities that included onsite visits, record reviews, interviews, classroom visitations, data reviews, complaint investigation findings and due process hearing decisions. In a letter dated July 2, 2007, OSEP informed the MSDE that the State has satisfied Special Conditions related to compliance with LRE requirements.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in case later than one year from identification.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring systems will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 84.05%

The MSDE's rate of correction within one year was 84.05%. Through MSDE's continued efforts, an additional 29 of 37 findings of noncompliance were corrected by December 30, 2007. This increases the rate of correction for the extended time period to 96.55%.

The MSDE used the Indicator B-15 Worksheet to complete this report. 24 findings of noncompliance were identified through on-site monitoring activities and 209 through dispute resolution processes. Public agencies are selected for monitoring based on the *Self-Assessment*, dispute resolution, results of desk audits, verification of correction, areas of interest to the MSDE and a cycle, where appropriate. For indicators 11, 12 and 13, correction of noncompliance identified by data are not due until the next reporting period and will be reported in the next APR. The MSDE conducted an extensive analysis to align the data to comply with OSEP's changes to the Indicator 15 reporting system.

The findings of noncompliance include systemic, individual and school-based findings. The MSDE required all public agencies, which includes local school systems and State operated programs, to correct identified noncompliance through development and implementation of corrective actions identified in monitoring reports, letters of findings issued as a result of complaint investigations and due process hearing decisions. The MSDE increased its oversight of public agencies with findings of noncompliance. MSDE staff continually reviewed and monitored the status of correction through data reviews, desk audits of policies and procedures, phone conferences and provided on-site technical assistance visits designed to ensure correction and accuracy of reporting.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

With the exception of one finding of noncompliance relative to discipline in one local school system and six findings of noncompliance in one local school system under a court ordered consent decree, all remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 have been corrected.

The following chart represents the MSDE's rate of correction for all public agencies with findings of noncompliance identified July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 with correction due between July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007.

Part B Indicators by Clusters		General Supervision System	Number of Programs	Findings of Noncompliance	Corrected Within One Year
1.	Graduation	Monitoring	24	3	1
2.	Dropout				
13.	Secondary Transition	Dispute Resolution	1	1	1
14.	Postsecondary Outcomes				
3.	Statewide Assessments.	Monitoring	24	2	1
7.	Preschool Outcomes.	Dispute Resolution			
4.	Suspension Rate	Monitoring	24	5	4
		Dispute Resolution	6	17	13
5.	FAPE in the LRE, 6-21 ¹	Monitoring	27	11	9
6.	FAPE in the LRE, 3-5 ¹	Dispute Resolution	18	137	115
8.	Parent Involvement	Monitoring	24	0	
		Dispute Resolution	11	28	25
9.	Disproportionality by Race	Monitoring	24	0	
		Dispute Resolution		0	
10.	Disproportionality by Race/Disability	Monitoring	24	0	
		Dispute Resolution		0	
11.	60-day Timeline	Monitoring	24	0	
		Dispute Resolution	7	19	18
12.	Part C to Part B Transition	Monitoring	24	0	0
		Dispute Resolution	1	2	1
	Topical Areas ²	Monitoring			
		Dispute Resolution	5	7	7
Total				232	195
Percent correction within one year:			84.05%		

¹FAPE in the LRE includes a broad Number of related requirements that impact the number findings in this area.

²Topical areas include student records and behavior intervention (COMAR regulations)

The following chart represents the MSDE's rate of correction for all public agencies with findings of noncompliance identified July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 including 30 corrections through the date of the submission of the SPP/APR on February 1, 2008. Of the seven outstanding findings of noncompliance, six are in one local school system under a court ordered consent decree.

Findings of Noncompliance	Correction Through February 1, 2008	Percent Correction
232	225	96.98%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006:

In FFY 2005 MSDE reported its rate of correction as 31%. In this FFY 2006 APR, MSDE's rate of correction is 84.05%. An additional 30 findings were corrected prior to the date of the submission of the FFY 2006 SPP/APR on February 1, 2008. Of the seven outstanding findings of noncompliance, six are in one local school system under a court ordered consent decree. In the FFY 2005 APR, MSDE reported systemic data information. In FFY 2006, additional dispute resolution data was added. MSDE's data supports improvements to its system of general supervision. The MSDE has: an updated monitoring manual, mechanisms to coordinate monitoring practices and review data for accuracy; alternatives to on-site monitoring visits through the use of state level data reviews, desk audits and phone conferences to review policies and procedures and other source material; improved alignment of grant funds with areas in need of improvement; and technical assistance and monitoring practices to include enforcement actions.

One local school system did not correct 21 findings of noncompliance within the required timelines. This number represents more than half of the findings not corrected within the required timelines in the State. As a result, MSDE increased oversight that includes increased frequency of onsite meetings and contacts with school system staff to review status and provide technical assistance to ensure timely correction. As of the date of this report, all findings of noncompliance in this public agency due in this reporting period have been corrected. Preliminary data for the next reporting period indicates the public agency demonstrates substantial improvement in the rate of correction within required timelines.

The local school system under a court ordered consent decree made progress during the reporting year. Of MSDE's 11 systemic findings of noncompliance in this reporting period, the school system corrected three systemic findings within required timelines and two additional by December 30, 2007. Six findings of noncompliance remain uncorrected as compared with nine uncorrected findings reported in the FFY 2005 APR. Of 93 individual and school level findings, the school system corrected 100% within required timelines. The MSDE staff continues to provide intensive technical assistance and monitor the status of correction for the remaining areas of uncorrected noncompliance.

Of the two remaining findings of noncompliance that had not been corrected in other public agencies, one school based action has been closed since December 31, 2007 and one systemic action remains uncorrected. This system is under increased oversight and technical assistance in order to ensure correction as soon as possible.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Not6 Applicable

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	100% of all State complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 99% Please refer to Table 7.

MSDE resolved 89 State complaints within the 60-day timeline, and completed two complaints within a properly extended timeline. One complaint was completed outside the required timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

During this reporting period MSDE revised the State complaint procedures and developed a model form in accordance with the IDEA final regulations.

Complaint investigators continue to participate in professional development activities and to provide in-service activities for MSDE staff, public agency staff, and advocates regarding the requirements of IDEA 2004 and State special education law.

While MSDE did not meet the target, this reporting period represents the second consecutive year where one complaint investigation was not completed within timelines, and represents an improvement over previous performance (FFY 2005 – three late; FFY 2004 – Eleven late). This improvement continues despite the resignation of one complaint investigator, and the need to recruit, hire, and train another.

MSDE continues to implement the Improvement Activities and reports that six public agencies are now participating in the facilitated IEP meeting pilot project. This project and our collaboration with MSDE's Family Support Services Team in promoting early dispute resolution are part of our continuing goal to have disputes resolved at the local level, thereby reducing the number of State complaints.

MSDE has completed the Improvement Activity described as, "Review and revise, as appropriate, complaint resolution procedures to ensure consistency with IDEA 2004 and its implementing regulations."

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

MSDE is extending the following Improvement Activity timeline to "ongoing", as this activity is directly linked to our success in meeting timelines:

Recruit and retain qualified personnel needed to ensure complaint investigations are conducted within proper timelines.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision

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

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

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

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

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 100% Please refer to Table 7.

MSDE met the target. 22 hearing decisions were issued within timelines; 11 were issued within the 45-day timeline, and 11 were issued within a properly extended timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE continues to implement all Improvement Activities, and reports that the procedures MSDE put in place last year to monitor the timeliness of expedited due process hearing decisions have been successful.

There were 16 fewer fully adjudicated hearing decisions within this reporting period, compared to last year. While we understand the decline in the number of due process hearings is a nationwide trend, we also associate this reduction to MSDE's continuing efforts, through in-service trainings with public agency staff and advocates, to promote the use of early dispute resolution options such as mediation and resolution meetings.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Not Applicable.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	64 – 75% of all resolution meetings conducted will result in a settlement agreement.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 72% Please refer to Table 7.

MSDE met the target – of the 95 resolution meetings held, 68 resulted in a settlement agreement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE reports an 8% increase in the percentage of resolution meeting settlement agreements this year compared to last year. The number of settlement agreements is relatively unchanged - 68 during this reporting period, 69 in the FFY 2005 APR.

MSDE will continue to monitor use of resolution meetings by public agencies as a viable means for resolving disputes, and to promote the use of other early dispute resolution processes.

MSDE continues to implement the Improvement Activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

[If applicable]

Not Applicable.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	Maintain 75 – 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 68% Please refer to Table 7

MSDE reports that of the 172 mediations held, 117 resulted in agreements, which failed to meet our 75 – 85% target.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE reports slippage in the percent of mediations that resulted in a settlement agreement. In analyzing our data, we attribute this slippage to three factors. First, is the trend that public agencies are opting to use resolution meetings as the early dispute resolution option of choice when due process complaints are received. This leads to the second reason for the slippage, which is the success of resolution meetings; 72% of resolution meetings held have resulted in agreements. Finally, 34% of the mediations held that did not result in settlement agreements were regarding a request for more restrictive placements, which frequently is an issue that is difficult to resolve through mediation. Of the 319 due process complaints received, 284 were resolved without a hearing. This is an 89% resolution rate for due process complaints filed.

The MSDE received 95 fewer mediation requests during this reporting period compared to last year (FFY 2005 – 425 requests; FFY 2006 – 330 requests); showing a 22% decline in requests.

MSDE will continue to promote the use of early dispute resolution techniques whether the forum of choice is a mediation session, a resolution meeting, or in the early stages of disagreement, an IEP facilitator. We will analyze this data to ensure public agencies are offering early forms of dispute resolution. During this reporting period MSDE and the Office of Administrative Hearings, began developing a *Frequently Asked Questions about Mediation* document to assist in promoting the use of mediation to resolve disputes. This document was completed in October 2007, posted on the MSDE website, and distributed to public agency staff and advocacy groups. MSDE continues to implement the Improvement Activities.

MSDE's target continues to be in the 75 – 85% range noting that this is a difficult Indicator for the State to control.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /
Resources for FFY 2007:

Not Applicable.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to the Overview, pages 1-3, and prior to SPP Indicator 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>(Insert FFY)</i>	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and Submitted on or before due dates.

Response to OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to Maryland, as follows:

As a follow-up to Maryland’s FFY 2005 SPP/APR, MSDE is required to address the issues raised in OSEP’s June 15, 2007 letter to MSDE. For “...any additional information the State must include in the FFY 2006 APR or, as needed, the SPP...to address the problems OSEP identified...,” the following information is submitted:

For the issue raised related to Indicator 20 in Maryland’s FFY 2005 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, in FFY2005 the State collected additional data for Indicator 13 to ensure the accuracy of the data collected and reported. Data consistent with the measurement for FFY 2005 is included in the body of Indicator 13 within the APR.

A revised data collection form for Indicator 13 was issued to local school systems on July 18, 2007. The revised form requests the data be reported in a manner consistent with the required measurement. Additionally, MSDE staff responsible for coordinating the collection and reporting of data worked collaboratively with the staff responsible for collecting, analyzing and reporting data for Indicator 13 to ensure compliance with the required measurement. For detailed information, please refer to Indicator 13.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: **100%** Please refer to the OSEP Indicator 20 Rubric below:

APR Template – Part B (4) APR DATA

Maryland
State

INDICATOR	Timely - 5	CORRECT CALCULATIONS	FOLLOWED INSTRUCTIONS	SCORE
	5			
1. Graduation	1	0	1	2
2. Drop Out	1	0	1	2
3a. Assessment	1	1	1	3
3b. Assessment	1	1	1	3
3c. Assessment	1	1	1	3
4. a. Suspension Expulsion -SWD	1	1	1	3
5. LRE 6-21	1	1	1	3
6. LRE 3-5	1	1	1	3
7. Preschool Outcomes	1	1	1	3
8. Parent Involvement	1	1	1	3
9. Disproportionality - Sp. Education	1	1	1	3
10. Disproportionality - Disability Ctg.	1	1	1	3
11. Initial Evaluation	1	1	1	3
12. EC Transition	1	1	1	3
13. PS Transition	1	1	1	3
14. PS Outcomes	1	1	1	3
15. General Supervision	1	1	1	3
16. State Complaints	1	1	1	3
17. Due Process Hearings	1	1	1	3
18. Resolution Sessions	1	1	1	3
19. Mediations	1	1	1	3
			Total	66

618 STATE -REPORTED DATA

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Score
Table 1-Child Count	2	2	2	2	8
Table 2- Personnel	2	2	2	2 *	8
Table 3 -Ed. Environments	2	2	2	2	8
Table 4 - Exiting	2	2	2	2	8
Table 5 - Discipline	2	2	2	2	8
Table 6 - State Assessments	2	2	2	2	8
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution	2	2	2	2	8
Number of Cells Checked for APR	66			Total	56
2 X number cells checked for 618 data	56				

Total	122	
Total Possible Points	122	100% Complete in all areas

* Year to Year comparison received 12/4/2007 Response not yet submitted

618 STATE -REPORTED DATA

Table	Timely- Due Date	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests
Table 1-Child Count ⁺	2/1/2007	1/29/2007	Completed	Completed
Table 2- Personnel	11/1/2007	10/31/2007	Completed	Completed *
Table 3 -Ed. Environments ⁺	2/1/2007	1/29/2007	Completed	Completed
Table 4 - Exiting	11/1/2007	10/16/2007 (Ed Facts)	Completed	Completed
Table 5 - Discipline ⁺	11/1/2007	10/31/2007	Completed	Completed
Table 6 - State Assessments	2/1/2008	1/30/2008	Completed	Completed
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution	11/1/2007	10/31/2007	Completed	Completed

*Year to Year comparison received 12/4/2007 Response not yet submitted

⁺ Due to ongoing monitoring of student records, OSEP Tables 1, 3, and 5 are continually subject to revision.

The goal remains 100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

MSDE completed all activities with the exception of those marked annually or ongoing.

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

These collaborations include the following:

- When it was realized that the data collection form for Indicator 13 originally distributed at the June data managers meetings was not designed to accurately collect all data elements, the form was revised and sent to local school systems and public agencies on August 3, 2007. MSDE will collaborate with staff responsible for the collection of data for Indicator 13 to assure the correct form was used by each local school system and public agency.
- MSDE will distribute to staff responsible for each Indicator the OSEP Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric. Staff will be required to sign off that data collected from local school systems and public agencies is timely and accurate.
- MSDE continues to develop and refine the Part B Report Writer System. The system will be incorporated into mdssis.org as a means of maintaining static data sets to compare and contrast special education data. The process for comparison and contrast of special education data to other MSDE data will be completed during the 2007-2008 school year using the New Maryland's Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems. MSDE has implemented the use of a unique student identifier for each student. This is supported by a grant program from the National Center for Education Statistics and U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences.
- Local school systems complete cross-referenced documentation between special education data collection and other required state data submissions, including attendance, enrollment, suspension & discipline, and post-graduation data. Refer to Indicator 4 for additional details.

- Maryland measures academic progress on state assessments. Local school systems have the capacity to disaggregate MSA, HSA and Alt-MSA data for students with disabilities at the student level. The capability of online data analysis allows a user to view special education data side by side with general education data on the public MSDE State Report Card on the MSDE website. Each agency's data are linked at the State, school system, and school level. The md.k12 website is available to assist schools and other interested parties to analyze state assessment data and guide them in making data-based instructional decisions that support improved performance for all students. Refer to Indicator 3 for additional details.

Data on students with disabilities is located in different data collection sets. The access to newly collected disaggregate data on students with disabilities has allowed for the cross-referencing of data reports between different data sets. Presently relational links are being developed for:

- Maryland School Assessment (MSA) data relative to content areas, grade, and type of assessment in relationship to least restrictive environment data on students with disabilities. At present MSDE is testing the ability to match the Division's Special Services Information System data collection on students with disabilities (which generates least restrictive environment data) with the MSA data collection system. The links are presently based on several algorithms and direct matches and student identifiers. Please refer to Indicators 3 and 5 for additional information.
- Report of student participation and performance in Statewide assessments under NCLB. Please refer to Indicator 3 for additional information.
- Comparison of Section 618 data on students with disabilities exiting special education to general education data collections as compared to the number of students with disabilities exiting as high school graduates and dropouts. MSDE was able to complete this transaction electronically using the 2006-2007 Special Services Information System exit data and the 2006-2007 general education end of year attendance data. This process will be used to check the validity of data reported in Indicator 2. The MSDE compared the numbers of student who exited with diplomas, certificates, and dropouts in both data sets. A letter was sent to each local school system and public agency showing discrepancies in exit categories and explaining that with the implementation of the Unique Student ID these data sets are expected to match.
- Linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program data collection on children, birth to three years old, to Special Services Information System for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old. MSDE has added additional fields to the Special Services Information System to track the transition of children served under Part C into services for children under Part B at age 3. It was realized that the additional data fields did not provide the required cumulative data; therefore MSDE used Excel forms for the collection of data for Indicator 12 for the 2005-2006 school year. MSDE will continue to collect data on children served under Part C transitioning into Part B using Excel forms through the 2007-2008 school year. MSDE is researching the feasibility of utilizing a web-based data system to report these data. It is expected that this change will result in enhancements to the data system that would allow for collection of cumulative data through mdssis.org. MSDE will utilize the Unique Student ID to compare these data sets since Unique Student IDs will also be assigned to children 0-2 years old. Please refer to Indicator 12 for additional information.

Local school systems and public agencies special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students. Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), Adult Correction Education (ACE), and Maryland State Department of Education Juvenile Correctional Education Program (MSDE/JCEP) provide reports on data entry forms and do not currently have access an electronic web-based management system. ACE and MSDE/JCEP were trained to utilize the Maryland Online IEP and for security reasons they were unable to implement. DJS has begun using the Maryland Online IEP. Not later than July 1, 2008 ACE and MSDE/JCEP will be required to use a web-based IEP system.

The Special Services Information System presently functions as a centralized data submission for Section 618 data. Personnel data are collected annually in Excel spreadsheets. Section 618 data are submitted via a secure server file transfer of data from public agencies, including local school systems and public agencies. The public agencies include: Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), Adult Corrections Education (ACE), Maryland School for the Blind (MSB), and Maryland School for the Deaf (MSD) who monitor and verify their data collection systems at the local level. Most public agency special education data elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students.

Eight local school systems and five public agencies are using the Maryland Online IEP system and have data transmitted nightly to the Special Services Information System. Other local school systems utilize electronic file transfers twice a year to an MSDE secure server for web-based data submission of the annual child count, census data, and exit data. Personnel data continue to be collected annually in Excel spreadsheets.

Accuracy of the data is dependent upon the accuracy of the submitted school level data. Questions and discrepancies in the data are always verified by MSDE staff with the local school system and public agency. The local school system and public agency Special Services Information System Database Manager corrects errors and resubmits the entire data file to MSDE to ensure that corrections are made in both the database and the error file. The new mdssis.org system allows two methods of data submission:

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

Data on students with disabilities is submitted electronically from local school systems and public agencies. Each local school system and public agency is responsible for submitting data for each student using an electronic file transfer over a secure server website. Each of the data elements contained on the Special Services Information System records is required and must be accurately maintained. The database consists of two types of records: the Special Services Information System Student Record that contains student demographic information; and the Special Services Information System Service Record that contains information about the services provided to the student. Twice a year public agencies are required to submit an electronic file of Special Services Information System data. These data submissions are for the last Friday of October Census Data, including the annual child count, and the June 30 Exit data. Local school systems and public agencies using the Maryland Online IEP system are submitting data on a nightly basis. Local directors of special education are responsible for supervising the accurate and timely entry of data. The data manager within each local school system and public agency is responsible for accurate and timely data submissions of records through an electronic file transfer into the MSDE secure server.

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

- The Special Services Information System secure server is available 24 hours a day for file submissions. The secure server is backed up nightly and replicated off-site. Files posted are reviewed and edited daily.
- Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk.
- Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed.
- The Special Services Information System Manual Appendix provides detailed information for public agencies to build mechanisms within their systems for data accuracy.

MSDE runs edit reports of the files for the public agencies to correct and resubmit their files to MSDE.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- Upon receipt of the Special Services Information System data, each record is edited to be certain that the record is complete and valid codes have been used.
- MSDE generates a report of the total count of active or exited students (October and June collections respectively) for each Local School System/Public Agency.
- Each Local School System/Public Agency data manager receives a copy of the report for review and verification.

In the event that discrepancies are found, the local school system or public agency makes corrections and resubmits the entire file or utilizes the option to correct and resubmit error records. MSDE produces an updated summary report and return this to the local school system or public agency for review and signature. During the annual child count collection, MSDE produces two additional reports for the Superintendent's signature. One report lists students who have IEPs developed more than 13 months prior to the last Friday of October. The second report lists the number of students who have not had a re-evaluation for more than three years. Local school systems and public agencies utilizing the Maryland Online IEP are able to administer data on a daily basis, therefore error correction is more manageable.

To ensure validity, the MSDE Special Services Information System manual provides data standardization for definitions and provides system edits similar to those suggested system edits provided by WESTAT. Validity of the data and consistency with OSEP data instructions is ensured throughout the data collection process by a number of practices and safeguards including edits built into the data collection system such as data definition edits (what values are put in what fields), out-of-range edits, cross-field or relationship edits, and checks to ensure that all local school systems and public agencies submit data.

- MSDE regularly revises the Special Services Information System Manual according to State and/or Federal regulations. The Manual is distributed at Data Managers Meetings, placed on the MSDE web site, and sent to each local school systems and public agency electronically.
- MSDE produces the Census Publication and Related Tables from the data system which contains multiple tables and is posted on the MSDE web site. An additional internal report produced is the 5% Analysis Report which highlights any local school systems or public agencies with 5% or more population increases.
- MSDE uses the WESTAT Verification Reports to flag large changes in the data. Data is disaggregated to determine which local school systems and public agencies are involved. When disaggregated data is suspect MSDE contacts the local director of special education. Directors of special education and MSDE staff work together to validate the data. The local school systems or public agencies provide MSDE the reasons for large changes in data and that information is analyzed at MSDE and provided to WESTAT.
- MSDE annually conducts an audit that compares Special Services Information System to Exit Data from each local school system and public agency. The students are matched by using the student's social security number as the link between two data collections. The MSDE required local school systems and public agencies to explain/revise data following an analysis of the students who were described as exited in the Special Services Information System Exit Count and reported as receiving services in the next Special Services Information System Child Count Data. After reviewing, the local school systems and public agencies are required to provide to MSDE a letter of summary with an analysis of findings for each category. All student records referenced in the detailed report provided to the local school systems and public agencies may be included in a random audit of these records.
- MSDE periodically reviews records to support 618 data collections. MSDE annually monitors student records for IEPs that were more than 13 months prior to the last Friday of October and for students who have not had a re-evaluation for more than three years. Sampling is not used for the child count. However sampling may be used for monitoring purposes. Local School System/Public Agency data systems are student level systems and sampling may be required for audits and record reviews.

- MSDE Division of Budget and Management routinely audits local school systems and public agencies to determine whether: (1) students included on the State Aid for Special Education report are eligible; (2) applicable laws and regulations governing State Financial Assistance under Special Education Grant are complied with; and (3) accurate data is reported in claiming State funds.
- MSDE conducted an audit that compared Special Services Information System exit data to special education students in the end of year Attendance data file collected by general education. The MSDE compared numbers of students who exited with diplomas, certificates, and dropouts in both data sets. A letter was sent to each Local School System/Public Agency showing discrepancies and explaining that with the implementation of the Unique Student ID these data sets will be expected to match. On site record reviews may be necessary based on our findings using the Unique Student ID.

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

Each local school system and public agency reported all required special education data for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007). The submission dates were within the OSEP timeline requirements. MSDE will continue to provide technical assistance to local school systems and public agencies to facilitate timely accurate data submission. The validity and reliability of student level data are high. MSDE uses validation rules to ensure that Special Services Information System child count data records are error free. Validations include: Element level (e.g., dates within ranges), cross element level (e.g., grade X age relationship consistent with acceptable age range for each grade), and agency level (e.g., duplications between or among agencies, types of internal validation routines).

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

In the 2004-2005 school year the pilot of a web-based standardized Individualized Education Program (IEP) was initiated and data collection submissions were tested during the October 28, 2005 child count data submission. The validation comparisons of the Local School System/Public Agency web-based standardized IEP system parallel running of the Special Services Information System was completed during the 2005-2006 school year. The electronic submission of IEP records to Special Services Information System from local school systems and public agencies utilizing the Maryland Online IEP on a nightly basis began on November 2, 2006.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

- Since February 2007 and as an ongoing new activity the Quality Assurance Monitoring Branch has reviewed local school system and public agency policies, procedures, and practices to ensure valid, reliable, accurate, and timely data reporting. In February 2007, Division data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 2005. A review of local policies, procedures, and practices relative to valid, reliable, and accurate data collection along with support and technical assistance to local school systems and public agency staff will enable local school systems and public agencies to maintain and report accurate timely data.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Maryland
State

- By June 30, 2008, and as an ongoing activity MSDE will be using the Unique Student ID to more accurately match data across data sets creating a linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program data collection on children, birth to three years old, to Special Services Information System for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old
- Instructions for completing the 2006-2007 Excel forms for indicators 11, and 12 and results of 2005-2006 data collection were provided to Data Managers meetings in January 2007. It is anticipated that MSDE will continue to use Excel forms to collect data on children served under Part C transitioning into Part B through FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and Indicator 11 the percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days will also will continue to use Excel forms to collect data. In FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data for Indicator 12 maybe able to be collected through the online Statewide IEP this will be evaluated.
- The MSDE Division of Accountability and Assessment staff met with MSDE information technology staff and Center for Technology in Education staff in June 2006. At that meeting it was determined that the Special Services Information System Data Warehouse cannot be integrated into the MSDE existing infrastructure at this time. However, MSDE will continue researching additional hardware/software needed to integrate the system into MSDE existing infrastructure as an ongoing activity.
- The Division will distribute to staff responsible for each Indicator the OSEP Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric. Staff will be required to sign off that data collected for an indicator from a Local School System/Public Agency is timely and accurate. This new activity will be ongoing.