Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 05 (2005-2006)

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

On October 18, 2006, DSE/EIS presented "The State of the State" at the annual Special Education Leadership Conference based upon the preliminary data or information on preliminary activities for each SPP Indicator. This conference is attended by local directors of special education, local preschool partners, local Special Education Citizen Advisory Committee (SECAC) members, and the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) members. On November 3, 2006, the Assistant State Superintendent for DSE/EIS 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 superintendents.

On November 30, 2006 and January 18, 2007, DSE/EIS staff met with the SESAC. Please refer to the SPP for information regarding the composition of the SESAC. At those meetings, data was shared concerning the current status of SPP/APR Indicators. The indicators were reviewed with the FFY 2005 data to compare it to the baseline and the targets. The Committee reviewed strategies, commented on progress or slippage, and made recommendations for change. The type(s) of information discussed is summarized in the table below.

SPP Indicator	Discussion with SESAC 11/30/06	Discussion with SESAC 1/18/07
#1 Graduation	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities	
#2 Dropout	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities	
#3 Assessment		Current Data (with revisions to reporting approach) and Status of Improvement Activities.
#4A Suspension/ Expulsion (SWD/ General Education Peers)	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.	
#4B Suspension/ Expulsion (Race/ ethnicity)	Baseline Data, Required Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities	
#5 LRE		Current Data, Revised Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.
#6 Preschool LRE	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities	Alerted SESAC to change in Data Definitions and potential need to revise targets and improvement activities for future FFY.
#7 Preschool Outcomes	Overview of Phase in of Data Collection.	Discussion of Sampling Plan and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#8 Parent involvement	Overview of Process.	Discussion of Baseline Data, Sampling Plan, and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#9 Disproportionality (Identification)	Baseline Data, Required Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities.	
#10 Disproportionality (Category)	Baseline Data, Required Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities.	

#12 Early Childhood Transition	Current Data and Status of Improvement Activities.	Gathered feedback regarding additional Improvement Strategies.
#13 Post-Secondary Transition		Discussion of Baseline Data, Validation Activities, and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#14 Post Secondary Outcomes		Discussion of Sampling Plan (Census) and Proposed Improvement Activities.
#15 General Supervision	Overview of components to General Supervision System.	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Corrective Action Plans, and Improvement Activities.
#16 Complaint Timelines	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.	
#17 Hearing Timelines	Current Data, Required Targets, and Status of Improvement Activities.	
#18 Resolution Sessions	Current Data, Rigorous Targets, and Proposed Improvement Activities.	
#19 Mediation	Current Data, Rigorous Targets, and Revision of Improvement Activities	
#20 Timely Accurate Data		Discussion of Current Submission and Improvement Activities.

Additional information regarding public input for specific indicators is included with the discussion of indicators, as appropriate.

The Annual Performance Report (APR), includes revised Improvement Activities, where appropriate, to address limited progress or slippage as it relates to previously defined measurable and rigorous targets. The revised targets and/or Improvement Activities include timelines and needed resources. The following existing Indicators have additional or revised Improvement Activities and/or targets, as appropriate:

- Indicator #1 Graduation;
- Indicator #2 Dropout;
- Indicator #3 Assessment;
- Indicator #4A Suspension/ Expulsion (Students with Disabilities/General Education Peers);
- Indicator #5 LRE;
- Indicator #6 Preschool LRE;
- Indicator #12 Early Childhood Transition;
- Indicator #15 General Supervision;
- Indicator #19 Mediation; and
- Indicator #20 Timely Accurate Data submission.

Upon OSEP approval of the revised SPP and APR, copies will be sent to local superintendents of schools, local directors of special education in each local school system (LSS) and public agency (PA), Parents' Place of Maryland, Inc., Families Involved Together, Inc., SESAC members, and IDEA Partnership Team members. Additionally, the public will have access to the SPP/APR that will be posted on the MSDE web site at marylandpublicschools.org. From this site the public will also have access to a

report on the performance of each LSS/PA in the state on the targets in the State's Performance Plan (SPP).

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.

Maryland defines the graduation rate as the percentage of students who receive a Maryland high school diploma during a 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. Maryland uses this measurement for all students.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005 *(2005-2006)*	83.24% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.*

*This intermediate goal has been established by the Maryland State Board of Education for all students.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Statewide Percentage	Special Education Percentage	Regular Education Percentage
Baseline 2004 – 2005	74.80	85.60
2005 – 2006	76.77	86.21
Progress (Slippage)	1.97	0.61

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

There was progress in the percentage of students with disabilities graduating from high school with a diploma in FFY 2005. That progress was a graduation rate increase of 1.97%. Additionally, the graduation rate for students with disabilities improved at a faster rate than their non-disabled peers to account for a narrowing of the achievement gap for this indicator.

The discussion of improvement activities for Indicators #1 and #2 have been combined, when appropriate. When an improvement activity is applicable to Indicator #1 only, it will be so indicated. The following improvement activities directly contributed to this progress:

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Participate in the MSDE review of LSS Bridge to Excellence Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to lead to improving the graduation rate of students with disabilities along with achieving the annual measurable target for the dropout rate. **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	During October 2006, DSE/EIS participated on Department-wide teams for all 24 LSS and addressed issues concerning graduation and drop-out rate for SWD. All 24 plans were approved by the State Board of Education. This activity occurs annually.	DSE/EIS Staff DSFSS Staff LSS Staff
Monitor LSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities in increasing the number of students who complete their educational programs. **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	Focused monitoring occurred in two school systems during the reporting period. Technical assistance was provided in other systems engaged in self-assessment for this area.	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Collaborate with the Divisions of Career Technology and Adult Learning (CTAL) and Student, Family, and School Support (DSFSS) in the development of a career awareness instructional framework to be infused into the Voluntary State Curriculum **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	This activity was completed in May 2006 and included representation from DSE/EIS, DSFSS, CTAL and LSS special education staff.	DSE/EIS Staff DCTAL Staff DSFSS Staff LSS Staff Community College Staff
Participate in MSDE professional development on the usage of the career awareness instructional framework. **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	This is an ongoing activity that occurs with local special education staff.	DSE/EIS staff DCTAL Staff DSFSS Staff LSS staff
Award discretionary grants to LSS to increase graduation rate of SWD. Work with the two LSS to develop best practices that can be sustained after the grant period.	Discretionary grants were awarded to two LSS in August of 2006 and program and financial reports were reviewed in accordance with Department procedures.	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisions April 5, 2007)

Page 4__

Develop a companion document to the Maryland High School Diploma and the Certificate of Program Completion. The *Exit Document* meets the IDEA 2004 summary statement requirement. The *Exit Document* provides useful information on the student's course of study and academic success as well as assistance the student may need as the move toward their post school goals. **(Applicable to Indicator #1 only)**	The Maryland Exit document went live in April of 2006 and was utilized for SWD in all LSS. Additional enhancements will be implemented beginning in February 2007.	DSE/EIS Staff
Provide Professional Development to LSS staff on the use of the online computer program used to generate the *Exit Document.* **(Applicable to Indicator #1 only)**	There were four statewide trainings in February and March 2006. Additional technical assistance targeted with specific local school systems has been provided on an as needed basis.	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
The *Exit Document* was given to students who completed their educational programs in 2006. **(Applicable to Indicator #1 only)**	This activity was completed in June 2006 and will recur annually.	LSS staff
Co-sponsor a statewide transition conference that included breakout sessions on increasing graduation rates of students with disabilities. **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	The conference occurred in November 2006 and was attended by 485 professional, parents, and students with disabilities.	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices that assure the provision of services, supports, aids accommodations, and interventions assure access to and participation in general curriculum and assessments, and promote high school graduation with a Maryland high school diploma. **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	In 2005-2006, targeted monitoring including review of policies and procedures occurred in two local school systems.	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Provide technical assistance on the identification and implementation of appropriate strategies and practices to improve the graduation rate of students with disabilities. **(Applicable to Indicator #1 only)**	All 24 school systems participated in training on this issue. Training options included one statewide meeting and two regional meetings (replicated four times each).	DSE/EIS Staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisions April 5, 2007)

Page 5__

Participate on the Maryland High School Assessment Taskforce**(Applicable to Indicator #1 only)**	This is an ongoing activity aligned with Maryland's existing accountability framework.	DSE/EIS staff LSS Staff

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for

Revisions for Indicator #1, if applicable, are included following Indicator #2.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1

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.

Maryland defines the dropout rate as the percentage of students dropping out of school in grade 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students includes those 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 through 12 served by schools. Students who re-enter school during the same year in which they dropped out of school are not counted as dropouts. The computation is the same for all students.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.81% or less.

The Maryland intermediate dropout rate goal for FFY 2005 (2005-2006 school year) is 3.81% for all students.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Maryland Dropout Rate

Statewide Percentage	Special Education Percentage	Regular Education Percentage
Baseline 2004 – 2005	5.50	3.50
2005 - 2006	5.65	3.38
Increase (Slippage)	(0.15)	0.12

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 7__

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Maryland experienced a slippage of 0.15% in the dropout rate for students with disabilities during the 2005-2006 school year. However, there were 12 LSS that met or exceeded the intermediate State goal of 3.81% and an additional 6 LSS that fall within two percentage points of the intermediate goal. DSE/EIS placed Dropout Prevention as a priority for discretionary grants to LSS for FFY 2005. Grants were awarded to 5 LSS. The programs that were developed using the grants were based upon nationally recognized researched based promising practices. One of the school systems utilized the *Check and Connect Program*. The program operated in 3 high schools. While the LSS had an increase in the dropout rate of 0.32, the *Check and Connect Program* proved successful in many areas such as attendance and credit completion. A second school district using the same program experienced much of the same success. This small rural school system has decided to continue the program for the 2006-2007 school year using local funds. Other activities to improve upon the slippage are included in the Activities Discussion.

Improvement activities applicable to Indicator #2 delineated under Indicator #1 are incorporated by reference.

Improvement Activity	Activities Completed	Resources
Provided technical assistance to LSS to increase their capacity in preventing students from dropping out. **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	All 24 school systems participated in training on this issue. Training options included one statewide meeting and two regional meetings (replicated four times each).	DSE/EIS Staff LSS Staff
Provided technical assistance to LSS in the use of local student data in identifying at-risk students. Publications from the National Center on Dropout Prevention for Students with Disabilities(NCDP-SD) were used	Training occurred in four large local school systems and one rural school system during the 2005-2006 school year.	DSE/EIS Staff LSS staff NCDP-SD Staff
Provided technical assistance on linking proper transition planning to dropout prevention.	This issue was addressed during one regional meeting and two statewide training activities during the 2005-2006 school year	DSE/EIS Staff
Award discretionary grants to LSS for dropout prevention for SWD. Work with the two LSS to develop best practices that can be sustained after the grant period.	Discretionary grants were awarded to two LSS in August of 2006 and program and financial reports were reviewed in accordance with Department procedures.	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff

Developed a Promising Practices Guide on Dropout Prevention highlighting programs that have been successful in local Maryland school systems. The team that attended the National Forum developed the Guide. Assistance to the team has been provided by staff from NCDP-SD.	This guide was shared with LSS at the statewide transition coordinators meeting January 23, 2007.	DSE/EIS Staff NCDP-SD Staff DSFSS Staff LSS Staff
Track local initiatives that promote dropout prevention for SWD.	This is an ongoing activity tied to the Promising Practices Guide.	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Additional Improvement Activity	Timeline/Resources	Justification
Participated in the 2006 National State Education Agency Forum on Dropout Prevention. The team that participated included staff from the MSDE Division of Students, Families, and School Support (DSFSS) and LSS staff. A team of 6 attended the forum. **(Applicable to both Indicator #1 and Indicator #2)**	May 2006 and ongoing DSE/EIS Staff DSFSS Staff LSS Staff	In order to combat identified slippage, additional technical assistance yielded promising practices that can be utilized in Maryland. The forum also provided a national context to improving results under this indicator.
Provide technical assistance to LSS to increase their capacity in preventing students from dropping out based on the information and strategies gathered at the National State Education Agency forum on Dropout Prevention (Applicable to both Indicator #1 and #2).	Ongoing DSE/EIS Staff DSFSS Staff LSS Staff	Ensuring that information and strategies from the forum reach the district and building level, where needed.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets remain unchanged in the context of both the State Performance Plan and Maryland's existing accountability framework.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

Maryland's statewide assessment results reported under Indicator 3 is the assessment used to meet the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements. Maryland's academic performance data for reading and mathematics for all students and student subgroups, including students with disabilities is located on the State website -- www.mdreportcard.org. Performance data can be reviewed as a statewide data display, countywide data or by individual school level data. Each of the access points provides disaggregated data for student subgroups in reading and mathematics and includes trend data. Indicator 3 reported for the FFY 2005-2006 testing cycle shows that Maryland's 24 local school systems continue to exceed the State standard for Adequate Yearly Progress in reading, in math and in combination. Maryland uses 5 as a minimum group size for all AYP subgroup accountability decisions and this is the smallest group size for all states.

Participation of students with disabilities for the 2005-2006 State testing continues to exceed the 95% standard for all tested Grade levels -- 3 through 8 and for the Grade 10/end-of-course assessments. All Maryland students with disabilities participate in either the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) or the Alternate MSA using alternate achievement standards. Maryland does not administer out of grade level testing. There is also an appeals process for a modified-MSA, a test that will be developed after federal guidance is provided. The appeals process allows for adjustments to school level performance for a designated group of schools and does not change individual student performance levels. Maryland performance standards are divided into three levels of achievement:

- **Advanced** is a highly challenging and exemplary level of achievement indicating outstanding accomplishment in meeting the needs of students.
- **Proficient** is a realistic and rigorous level of achievement indicating proficiency in meeting the needs of students.
- **Basic** is a level of achievement indicating that more work is needed to attain proficiency in meeting the needs of students.

Proficiency levels while exceeding a two-year rate of growth (baseline versus 2006 testing) in reading of regular education students in every grade level falls short of meeting State targets known as the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO). The exception is Grade 3 reading where the special education student subgroup met the State target AMO in 2005 and 2006 and Grades 4 and 10 in math. The rate of growth (baseline versus 2006 testing) in mathematics for students with disabilities exceeds the growth rate of regular education students in all assessed grades. Grade level performance of the tested grades for 2005-2006 on both the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) and the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA) show that students with disabilities continue to make progress although they are not meeting state proficiency standards except for Grades 3 and 4 in reading and Grades 4 and 10 in mathematics.

For the 2005-2006 submission, MSDE has revised the State Performance Plan (SPP) to present: 1) the revised AYP description for local school systems (LSS) and the AYP data for LSS for the 2004-2005 school year that was not available at the time of last year's SPP submission; 2) the Grade 10 participation and proficiency levels that were not available at the time of submission last year; 3) an improved description of the Alternate MSA; 4) a revised modified MSA appeals process to show that the number of students who have had successful appeals impact ONLY the local school system proficiency levels and not individual student performance so that relevant tables now report "0's" for proficiency levels; 5) state testing for Grade 10/ end-of-course is now Algebra/Data Analysis in mathematics and English 2 for reading; and 6) a revised discussion of baseline data on participation to reflect changes in how the mod-MSA appeals process is reported.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 10__

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 = [(# of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)) divided by the (total # 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) divided by (a)] times 100);
        c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);
        d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
        e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (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) divided by (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) divided by (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) divided by (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) divided by (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) divided by (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) divided by (a)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	A. 29% of the State's local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities. B. 95% of students with disabilities will participate in the Statewide assessment system. C. Student with disabilities will meet the content area AMO as follows:

Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO
3	56.96%	50.91%
4	56.71%	65.35%
5	47.15%	57.05%
6	38.08%	59.50%
7	35.47%	57.25%
8	33.75%	53.36%
10	29.80 %	45.30%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Please refer to Table 6 attached.

A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup

A. 21% or 5 out of 24 districts met AYP objectives for progress for students with disabilities during 2005-2006.
For all students, including students with disabilities, all of Maryland's 24 LEAs met the minimum "N" subgroup size of $\geq$ 5.

LEAs Making AYP for Students With Disabilities (SWD)	Met AYP for SWD in Reading	Met AYP for SWD in Math	Met AYP for SWD in Both Reading and Math
2005-2006	5 of 24 districts **21%**	14 of 24 districts **58%**	5 of 24 districts **21%**
2004-2005	10 of 24 districts **42%**	9 of 24 districts **37.5%**	7 of 24 districts **29%**

B. a. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7575	7576
4	8057	8069
5	8521	8524
6	8611	8605
7	8559	8578
8	8811	8792
10/ End of Course	8762	7178
Total	**58,896**	**57,322**

B. b.   **Number of Children with IEPs in a Regular Assessment with No Accommodations**

Grade	Math	Reading
3	2252	2152
4	2029	2022
5	1844	1770
6	1906	1913
7	1797	1751
8	1843	1996
10/End of Course	2745	2134
Total	**14416**	**13738**

B. c.   **Number of Children with IEPs in a Regular Assessment with Accommodations**

Grade	Math	Reading
3	4752	4853
4	5511	5530
5	6113	6190
6	5989	5977
7	5975	6040
8	6055	5883
10/End of Course	5238	4265
Total	**39633**	**38738**

B. d.   **Number of Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards ***

Grade	Math	Reading
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
10/ End of Course	0	0

*Maryland had been approved by USDE to use a modified MSA appeals process pending release of Federal regulations and guidance on the actual modified assessment. For 2005-2006, 1197 appeals were granted out of 1898 appeals in reading and/or math submitted. Results impact eligible schools in terms of making AYP and do not change individual student performance.

B. e.   **Number of Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Achievement Standards**

Grade	Math	Reading
3	571	571
4	517	517
5	564	564
6	716	715
7	787	787
8	913	913
10	779	779
Total	**4847**	**4846**

Overall Percentage -- Participation

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

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

Math (b+ c+ d+ e) / a x100 = Percentage							
	b	c	d	e	Total	A	Percent
Grade							
3	2252	4752	0	571	7575	7575	100%
4	2029	5511	0	517	8057	8057	100%
5	1844	6113	0	564	8521	8521	100%
6	1906	5989	0	716	8611	8611	100%
7	1797	5975	0	787	8559	8559	100%
8	1843	6055	0	913	8811	8811	100%
10/End of Course	2745	5238	0	779	8762	8762	100%

Reading (b+ c+ d+ e) / a x100 = Percentage							
	b	c	d	e	Total	A	Percent
Grade							
3	2152	4853	0	571	7576	7576	100%
4	2022	5530	0	517	8069	8069	100%
5	1770	6190	0	564	8524	8524	100%
6	1913	5977	0	715	8605	8605	100%
7	1751	6040	0	787	8578	8578	100%
8	1996	5883	0	913	8792	8792	100%
10/End of Course	2134	4265	0	779	7178	7178	100%

C.   Proficiency Rate

C. a.   Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7575	7576
4	8057	8069
5	8521	8524
6	8611	8605
7	8559	8578
8	8811	8792
10/ End of Course	8762	7178
Total	**58,896**	**57,322**

C.b. **Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Regular Assessment with No Accommodations** (Maryland began collecting data on accommodations for the 2005-2006 assessment.)

Grade	Math	Reading
3	1809	1662
4	1832	1814
5	1407	1500
6	1089	1263
7	852	1185
8	683	1036
10 /End of Course**	___	___
Total	7672	8460

** The number of students proficient in Grade 10/end of course testing have not yet been disaggregated for students with accommodations and students with no accommodations. Aggregated results for all Grade 10/ end of course test takers with IEPs have been included in the summary tables below**.**

C.c. **Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Regular Assessment with Accommodations**

Grade	Math	Reading
3	1849	2346
4	2271	2594
5	1797	2318
6	1105	1473
7	861	1405
8	737	1069
10/ End of Course**	___	___
Total	8620	1205

** The number of students proficient in Grade 10/end of course testing have not yet been disaggregated for students with accommodations and students with no accommodations. Aggregated results for all Grade 10 or end of course test takers with IEPs has been included in the summary tables below**.**

C.d. **Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards. ***

Grade	Math	Reading
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
10	0	0
Total	0	0

* Maryland is using a USDE approved appeals process pending the release of Federal regulations and guidance for the development of the actual modified assessment. Results from the appeals process impact individual school results in terms of meeting AYP and do not change individual student performance levels.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 15__

C.e. **Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Alternate Assessment against Alternate Achievement Standards.**

Grade	Math	Reading
3	357	350
4	325	320
5	373	357
6	470	442
7	565	531
8	634	611
10	539	503
Total	**3263**	**3114**

Overall Percentage for Proficiency = (b + c + d + e)/ a x 100 ******

Math (b+ c+ d+ e) / a x100 = Percentage*							
	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
Grade							
3	1809	1849	0	357	4015	7575	53.0%
4	1832	2271	0	325	4428	8057	54.9%
5	1407	1797	0	373	3577	8521	41.9%
6	1089	1105	0	470	2664	8611	30.9%
7	852	861	0	565	2278	8559	26.6%
8	683	737	0	634	2053	8811	23.3%
10/End of Course **	___	___	0	539	2719	8762	31.0%

Reading (b+ c+ d+ e) / a x100 = Percentage *							
	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
Grade							
3	1662	2346	0	350	4358	7576	57.5%
4	1814	2594	0	320	4728	8069	58.5%
5	1500	2318	0	357	4175	8524	48.9%
6	1263	1473	0	442	3178	8605	36.9%
7	1185	1405	0	531	3121	8578	36.3%
8	1036	1069	0	611	2716	8792	30.8%
10/End of Course **	___	___	0	503	1513	7178	21.1%

*   Math and Reading proficiency for Grades 3 and 4 show a discrepancy of one student at each grade level. This can be attributed to the point in time that the data was reported.

**   The number of students proficient in Grade 10/end of course testing have not yet been disaggregated for students with accommodations and students with no accommodations. Aggregated results for all Grade 10 or end of course test takers with IEPs has been included in the summary tables above**.**

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 16__

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Maryland failed to meet its target for Indicator 3A but exceeded its target for Indicator 3B. The target for Indicator 3A was to increase the number of LEAs making AYP from a baseline of 29% (or 7 of 24 LEAs) for the FFY 2006. Results showed that only 21% of LEAs (5 of 24) met AYP in special education for BOTH reading and math. This was a slippage of 2 school systems that suggests that dramatic increases in State AMOs have made meeting State standards more difficult and that LEAs have failed to accelerate learning for students with disabilities to meet this challenge. One positive note is that 58% of LEAs (14 of 24) did make AYP for special education in mathematics. Thus for math only, LEAs exceeded the overall AYP target for students with disabilities.

The State target for participation that applies to all students and student subgroups will continue to be 95%. The student subgroup of *equal to or greater than five* for all measures of student accountability in State assessments will remain. Improvement activities identified below appear to have contributed to the meeting of State targets for Indicator 3B. It is important to note that changes in the percentage of number of Maryland school systems meeting AYP for students with disabilities in reading, in math and in both reading and math continues to present an enormous challenge with the area of reading requiring the most effort at this point. Changes in eligibility for the AYP Discretionary Grants have been designed to encourage school systems to develop additional strategies that address district level performance for students with disabilities at the middle or high school levels when performance of students with disabilities at these levels was especially low. These and other discretionary grants will continue to provide funds for districts and eligible schools within those districts to increase targeted services to students with disabilities.

Indicator 3C, proficiency rates, although showing progress at nearly every grade level for students with IEPs in reading and math across all assessed grades did not make sufficient progress to meet all of the Maryland performance targets. Note that grade 8 reading is the only performance level that did not improve over FFY 04. Targets were met in Grade 3 reading and Grades 4 and 10 in math with each of the assessed grades improving performance over the baseline year. Also, Maryland students with IEPs made greater rates of growth in all assessed grades in reading and in math when compared with the rates of growth for the performance of regular education students across all assessed grade levels.

The decrease in Alt-MSA proficiency/advanced may be attributed to the increased rigor of the scoring rubric. Professional development materials that explained and illustrated errors in artifact submission resulting in condition codes were created. Professional development of the *Condition Code Packet* was provided to Alt-MSA Facilitators and non-public school representatives. These staff subsequently disseminated this during professional development sessions to test examiners in local school systems.

Further discussion of the number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards reveals that when FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 data are compared:

- The number of students scoring proficient/advanced decreases in all grades except Grade 8 reading and mathematics and Grade 10 mathematics.
- Grade 8 increased proficiency/advanced for 35 students in reading and 67 students in mathematics.
- Grade 10 increased proficiency for 2 students in mathematics.
- Grade 5 had the greatest decrease in both reading and mathematics; reading decreased by 152 students and mathematics decreased by 122 students

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 17__

FFY 2005 Targets and Performance for FFY 04 vs. FFY 05

MATHEMATICS

Grade	FFY 2005 TARGETS % and Met/Not Met		FFY 2005 Proficiency for Students with Disabilities In MATH ↑ indicates improvement over baseline year	FFY 2004 Proficiency for Students with Disabilities In MATH
3	56.96	NOT MET	53.0 ↑	51.2
4	**56.71**	**MET**	54.9 ↑	48.8
5	47.15	NOT MET	41.9 ↑	38.8
6	38.08	NOT MET	30.9 ↑	25.7
7	35.47	NOT MET	26.6 ↑	22.6
8	33.75	NOT MET	23.3 ↑	21.7
10/End of Course	29.8	**MET**	31.0 ↑	23.4

READING

Grade	FFY 2005 TARGETS % and Met/Not Met		FFY 2005 Proficiency for Students with Disabilities In Reading ↑ indicates improvement over baseline year	FFY 2004 Proficiency for Students with Disabilities In Reading
3	**50.91**	**MET**	57.5 ↑	52.7
4	65.35	NOT MET	58.5 ↑	57.1
5	57.05	NOT MET	48.9 ↑	46.6
6	59.50	NOT MET	36.9 ↑	36.1
7	57.25	NOT MET	36.3 ↑	32.2
8	53.36	NOT MET	30.8 ↓	31.3
10/End of Course	45.30	NOT MET	26.1 ↑	22.3

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 DSE/EIS 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. Any shortcomings specific to special education services or practices that become

apparent through this review process are then addressed through the clarification process that follows each of the panel reviews.

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 State Department of Education leadership in the area of student performance, especially those who receive Free or Reduced Price Meals (FARMs) and/or, have IEPs. One of the school systems also has an internal management and capacity improvement team assigned to work within the district 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. Once the USDE releases guidance for the development of the modified assessment against grade level standards, it is likely that overall performance for students with disabilities will improve and move closer to State targets. 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 two tables in the previous section, increased efforts will be made to improve student performance. Maryland continues as a Reading First state and this provides significant professional development and 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. Opportunities for collaboration with the general education divisions at MSDE responsible for school improvement, such as the NCLB/IDEA Partnership program offer ongoing federal and internal supports to help ensure that school systems continue to maximize use of funds, local expertise and other resources to improve student performance.

Additional outreach will continue, such as the Special Education/Superintendents of Instruction Annual Leadership Conference in which school system grantees that were effectively improving student performance through the use of the Strategic Instruction Model, progress monitoring, targeted reading and mathematics intervention programs and collaboration with general educators in their districts. And the DSE/EIS will continue to stay up to date on innovations in research and practice that are likely enhance the performance of students with disabilities. For example, a DSE/EIS branch chief has recently been appointed to the Advisory Board to the Center for Innovation & Improvement with priority topics for this year focusing on "restructuring" and "supplemental educational services." Both are likely to lead to improved practices in Maryland for at-risk students, especially those with disabilities.

Maryland -- along with the Johns Hopkins University's Center for Technology Education -- developed a web-based Individualized Education Program (IEP) that electronically links with the Maryland Content Standards and provides additional structure to the writing of the IEP. Each of Maryland's local school systems will use either the web-based Statewide Online IEP developed by DSE/EIS or use a private vendor web-based IEP no later than July 1, 2008. The use of this statewide version of the IEP is expected to continue to improve the specificity of academic indicators for each student and their alignment with State assessment limits, thus improving opportunities for instructional staff at the district and school levels to provide instruction that is more likely to bring about measurable changes in student performance.

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Participate in MSDE's review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to	This is an annual activity that continues to show	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 19__

review objectives and activities designed to improve the performance of students with disabilities that will lead to achieving AMO, AYP and established targets.	progress in terms of LSS activities specific to addressing performance needs of the NCLB special education student subgroup. The AYP targets were met this year. The grade level performance targets were met in math in grades 4 and 10 and in reading in grade 3. Overall, all of 2006 proficiency levels exceeded the FFY 2004 baseline results.	LSS staff
Collect data on students with disabilities with accommodations NEW	Initiated as data collection for the 2006 state testing, it is unclear how this information will impact student performance.	DAA staff Local Accountability Coordinators
Complete Mod-MSA appeals process	The Mod-MSA Appeals Process will continue to be included in the SPP and APR until MSDE receives federal guidance on the development of modified state assessments. Once provided the use of a modified assessment is expected to show student progress at both the NCLB AYP data and by grade levels. Currently, the appeals process in positively impacting the status of AYP for individual schools and at the LSS level.	DSE/EIS staff Consultants
Advise LSS and Special Placement Schools of actions taken by the State Board of Education and Department relative to Statewide assessments.	This activity is designed to improve student performance accountability for the non-public schools serving LSS-placed SWD. Aggregated results track back to LSS data and may ultimately impact AYP performance as well as individual student proficiency levels.	DSE/EIS staff DAA staff Office of Academic Policy State Board of Education

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 20__

Provide professional development modules regarding IDEA 2004 changes	This activity did not occur until September 2006 following the release of the final federal regulations on August 14, 2006 and related OSEP Topical Briefs.	DSE/EIS staff DI staff Johns Hopkins University, Center of Technology and Education (JHU-CTE)
Provide professional development modules to LSS and PA on differentiation of instruction, interventions, the Voluntary State Curriculum	This continues to be a powerful collaboration between general and special educators at MSDE and within LSS. The impact of these trainings can be seen in the positive growth in student performance and the increased participation of general and special educators at the central office and school levels.	DSE/EIS staff DI staff JHU-CTE
Create revised Alt-MSA Handbook and Condition Code Packet. Provide technical assistance to local school systems and nonpublic schools on request	For 2006, Alt-MSA results showed a decline in the number of Alternative students proficient due to the increased rigor of the standards. The release of additional training materials is expected to impact Alt-MSA involved staff for the 2007 testing as the review standards continue to increase in rigor and additional information is given to teachers who implement the assessment.	DSE/EIS staff
Collaborate with general and special educators at the state, local and school levels. Participate in *Reading First* activities.	*Reading First* activities are believed to have impacted the performance of students with disabilities, especially at the primary grades. This will be an on going activity for Maryland for the next two grant years. Other collaboration between general and special educators will remain ongoing.	DSE/EIS staff DI staff JHU-CTE Office of Reading First at MSDE

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 21__

Provide technical assistance to local school systems regarding the instruction and achievement of students with disabilities	Technical assistance is impacting the performance of students with disabilities at specific schools and continues to result in fewer Maryland schools not making AYP ONLY due to special education.	DSE/EIS staff DI staff
Award discretionary achievement grants that support promising practices to accelerate the performance of students with disabilities (formerly known as capacity building grants, now referred to as discretionary grants)	Provided through discretionary grant initiatives and credited with improving student performance. Focus is on the alignment of the VSC, assessment standards and instruction provided to students in special education participating in the general education program. Promotes sharing of promising practices across LSS.	DSS/EIS staff LSS staff
Support local school system outreach on what was funded through the discretionary grants and is working to accelerate performance of students with disabilities.	Completed October 2006 for FFY 04 and FFY 05 grants and will be ongoing annually thereafter. Significant outreach and sharing of research based and other promising practices.	DSE/EIS LSS staffs
Participate in national and state research and policy organizations to ensure current information on what is working to improve performance for students with IEPs	New appointment to the Advisory Board for the Center for Innovation & Improvement. The Statewide Technology Advisory Council is also a new appointment.	Member of Statewide Technology Advisory Council and the National Center for Innovation & Improvement's Advisory Board
Develop and distribute a video of two middle schools using the Strategic Instruction Model that was funded through discretionary grants and through the State Improvement Grant.	These have been completed and continue to have impact on schools at the elementary, middle and high school levels through use at principal trainings and statewide conferences.	DSE/EIS staff Office of Academic Policy School-based staff from LSS
Expand the web-based statewide IEP system currently being piloted to	Significant impact on the development of IEPs	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 22__

increase development of quality IEP goals and objectives based on the student's present levels of academic performance, and aligned with the VSC indicators.	specific to Maryland's Content Standards is anticipated. This is expected to impact proficiency levels of students with disabilities .	
Develop and disseminate "A Guide to Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating the Use of Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment of Students with Disabilities"	This document was revised October 2006 to reflect changes in the State testing program and helps to maintain the validity of test results for students with disabilities.	DAA staff DSE/EIS staff Local Accountability Coordinators
Continue the development of the www.md.k12 website	Ongoing with a current focus on co-teaching and tools to support this. Information will be designed to fit with other DSE/EIS outreach efforts on co-teaching.	DSE/EIS staff Consultant
Develop and disseminate Technical Assistance Bulletins as needed	Designed to ensure that all stakeholders are current on a range of topic and issues that impact services to and performance of SWD. Must be ongoing to keep up with the many changes in regulations and procedures.	DSE/EIS staff
Participate in the national NCLB/IDEA Partnership to facilitate development of Title I and Special Education initiatives to accelerate student subgroup performance, including those with disabilities and FARMs. NEW	When the internal resources at MSDE are aggregated for special education, school improvement (Title I) and instruction, the potential impact is greater for SWD. This partnership is a federal initiative that MSDE has committed to with a focus currently on development of state standards for Response to Intervention (RtI).	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff (Title I)
Develop and disseminate a review of 5 elementary schools that serve diverse student populations and have shown significant progress in achievement for all students, including those with disabilities. To be known as the "Getting Results" document.	This document has recently been released for printing and will be mailed to key MD educational leaders, including special education, upon its publication. It is expected to increase local	DSE/EIS staff Selected principals from LSS

	understanding of the impact of school improvement initiatives on challenging schools, including for students with disabilities.	

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Improvement Activities	Timelines/Resources	Justification
Collect data on students with disabilities with accommodations	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July 1, 2005 and ongoing thereafter DAA staff Local Accountability Coordinators	Initiated as data collection for the 2006 state testing, it is unclear how this information will impact student performance.
Complete Mod-MSA appeals process	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July 1, 2005 – January, 2006 and ongoing DSE/EIS staff Consultants	The Mod-MSA Appeals Process will continue to be included in the SPP and APR until MSDE receives federal guidance on the development of modified state assessments. Once provided the use of a modified assessment is expected to show student progress at both the NCLB AYP data and by grade levels. Currently, the appeals process in positively impacting the status of AYP for individual schools and at the LSS level.
Provide professional development modules regarding IDEA 2004 changes	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July 2005 and September 2006 and as needed DSE/EIS staff DI staff Johns Hopkins University, Center of Technology and Education (JHU-CTE)	This activity was based on the release of the new federal regulations and related guidance for the Reauthorized IDEA.
Provide professional development modules to LSS and PA on differentiation of instruction, interventions, the Voluntary State Curriculum	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July, 2005 – June 30, 2006 and Ongoing DSE/EIS staff	This continues to be a powerful collaboration between general and special educators at MSDE and within LSS.

	DI staff JHU-CTE	The impact of these trainings can be seen in the positive growth in student performance and the increased participation of general and special educators at the central office and school levels.
<u>New Activity</u> Create revised Alt-MSA Handbook and Condition Code Packet. Provide technical assistance to local school systems and nonpublic schools on request	June 2005-June 2006 DSE/EIS staff	For 2006, Alt-MSA results showed a decline in the number of Alternative students proficient due to the increased rigor of the standards. The release of additional training materials is expected to impact Alt-MSA involved staff for the 2007 testing as the review standards continue to increase in rigor and additional information is given to teachers who implement the assessment.
<u>Revised Activity Statement</u> Collaborate with general and special educators at the state, local and school levels. Participate in *Reading First* activities.	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July, 2005 – June 30, 2006 and ongoing DSE/EIS staff DI staff JHU-CTE Office of Reading First at MSDE	*Reading First* activities are believed to have impacted the performance of students with disabilities, especially at the primary grades. This will be an on going activity for Maryland for the next two grant years. Other collaboration between general and special educators will remain ongoing.
Provide technical assistance to local school systems regarding the instruction and achievement of students with disabilities	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July 2005 - June 30, 2006 school year and ongoing DSE/EIS staff DI staff	Impact from this technical assistance is impacting the performance of students with disabilities at specific schools and continues to result in fewer Maryland schools not making AYP ONLY due to special education.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 25__

Award discretionary achievement grants that support promising practices to accelerate the performance of students with disabilities (formerly known as capacity building grants, now referred to as discretionary grants)	Revised Timeline September 2005 and annually thereafter DSS/EIS staff LSS staff	Provided through discretionary grant initiatives and credited with improving student performance. Focus is on the alignment of the VSC, assessment standards and instruction provided to students in special education participating in the general education program. Promotes sharing of promising practices across LSS.
Revised Activity Description Support local school system outreach on what was funded through the discretionary grants and is working to accelerate performance of students with disabilities.	Revised Timeline October 2005 and annually thereafter DSE/EIS LSS staffs	Completed October 2006 for FY 05 and FY 06 grants and will be ongoing annually thereafter. Significant outreach and sharing of research based and other promising practices.
New Activity Participate in national and state research and policy organizations to ensure current information on what is working to improve performance for students with IEPs NEW	New Timelines/Resources October 2005 – September 2008 Member of: Statewide Technology Advisory Council and National Center for Innovation & Improvement's Advisory Board	New appointment to the Advisory Board for the Center for Innovation & Improvement. The Statewide Technology Advisory Council is also a new appointment.
New Activity Develop and distribute a video of two middle schools using the Strategic Instruction Model that was funded through discretionary grants and through the State Improvement Grant. NEW	New Timeline/Resources September 2005 – September 2007 DSE/EIS staff Office of Academic Policy School-based staff from LSS	These have been completed and continue to have impact on schools at the elementary, middle and high school levels through use at principal trainings and statewide conferences.
Expand the web-based statewide IEP system currently being piloted to increase development of quality IEP goals and objectives based on the student's present levels of academic performance, and aligned with the VSC indicators.	Revised Timeline July 2005 – June 2006 and ongoing DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE	All LSSs and PAs are expected to use the Statewide IEP form and format beginning July 1, 2007. Beginning July 1, 2008 all LSS and PA are to use either the MD Online IEP or a private vendor web-based IEP

		Significant impact on the development of IEPs specific to Maryland's Content Standards is anticipated. This is expected to impact proficiency levels of students with disabilities.
Develop and disseminate "A Guide to Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating the Use of Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment of Students with Disabilities"	Revise Timeline September 2005 – July 2006 and annually thereafter DAA staff DSE/EIS staff Local Accountability Coordinators	This document is reviewed annually and revised, as needed to reflect changes in the State testing program and helps to maintain the validity of test results for students with disabilities.
Continue the development of the www.md.k12 website	Revised Timeline July 2005 – June 2006 and ongoing DSE/EIS staff Consultant	Ongoing with a current focus on co-teaching and tools to support this. Information will be designed to fit with other DSE/EIS outreach efforts on co-teaching.
Develop and disseminate Technical Assistance Bulletins as needed	Revised Timeline July 2005 – June 2006 ongoing DSE/EIS staff	Designed to ensure that all stakeholders are current on a range of topic and issues that impact services to and performance of students with disabilities. Must be ongoing to keep up with the many changes in regulations and procedures.
New Activity Participate in the national NCLB/IDEA Partnership to facilitate development of Title I and Special Education initiatives to accelerate student subgroup performance, including those with disabilities and FARMs. NEW	New Timelines/Resources July 2005-September 2007 and Ongoing DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff (Title I)	When the internal resources at MSDE are aggregated for special education, school improvement (Title I) and instruction, the potential impact is greater for students with disabilities. This partnership is a federal initiative that MSDE has committed to with a focus currently on development of state

		standards for Response to Intervention (RtI).
<u>New Activity</u> Develop and disseminate a review of 5 elementary schools that serve diverse student populations and have shown significant progress in achievement for all students, including those with disabilities. To be known as the "Getting Results" document. NEW	<u>New Timelines/Resources</u> July 2005 and ongoing DSE/EIS staff Selected principals from LSS	This document has recently been released for printing and will be mailed to key MD educational leaders, including special education, upon its publication. It is expected to increase local understanding of the impact of school improvement initiatives on challenging schools, including for students with disabilities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

    A. 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; and

    B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(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.

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

See Maryland's SPP for Indicator 4B FFY 2005 measurement and information. FFY 2005 was the baseline year for Indicator 4B. Also please refer to Table 5, attached.

Definition: Maryland has identified local school systems (LSS) with a significant discrepancy in suspension rates. Two separate analyses of the suspension data at the State level and the local level have been performed to compare the percentages of children with disabilities suspended to the rates for non-disabled children. The first analysis compares the percentages of each population that had single "extended" suspensions greater than 10 days in duration. The second analysis compared the percentages of each population that had "multiple" suspensions summing to greater than 10 days in duration. The analyses of both extended suspensions and multiple suspensions used a "comparative ratio" approach in analyzing the percentages between the two populations. The percentage of students with disabilities was divided by the percentage of non-disabled students. If the resulting ratio was greater than one (1.00), this indicated that the students with disabilities were suspended at a higher rate than their non-disabled peers. A ratio of greater than or equal to 2 to 1 (2.00+) as the first criterion for flagging an LSS as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions. MSDE applied a rule that both groups needed to have at least 20 students in each cell to be identified by MSDE.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 29__

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	**A.** No more than six (6) or 25% of the LSS will show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students .

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

For the 2005-2006 school year, 8 local school systems (LSS) were determined to have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension experienced by children with disabilities, relative to non-disabled students, using the "comparative ratio" approach described above. This represents 33% of all LSSs in Maryland. The unit measured in this case was all students experiencing an out-of-school suspension greater than 10 days in length. These local school systems had comparative ratios between 2.02 and 4.32. The suspension data is reported according to the requirements of the revisions to Table V for 2005-2006.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Maryland has identified local school systems (LSS) with a significant discrepancy in suspension rates. In FFY 2005 Maryland did not meet the target for Indicator 4A. However, suspension data indicate that for the FFY 2005 (05-06 SY) eight (8) school systems (33%) were significantly disproportionate in the suspension of students with disabilities compared to nondisabled students. During FFY 2004 seven (7) school systems (29%) were identified as significantly disproportionate. Of the school systems significantly discrepant for the FFY 2005, four (4) of the local school systems identified in FFY 2004 were no longer discrepant in FFY 2005 in the suspension of students with disabilities compared to nondisabled students.   Three (3) of local school systems discrepant in FFY 2004 remained significantly discrepant in FFY 2005.

For the FFY 2004, SY 2004-2005 one mid-sized LSS was one (1) suspension below the group size to be considered significantly disproportionate.   Although that system did review and revise its policies, procedures and practices regarding suspension and expulsions and has a corrective action plan in place, there appeared to be continued misunderstanding of those revised policies, procedures and practices. Once this was determined by MSDE continuing monitoring of the Corrective Action Plan the LSS initiated professional development to ensure that the policies and procedures were implemented correctly and with fidelity. The LSS continues to have a CAP. Another local school system was discrepant in FFY 2003, was not identified in FFY 2004 but met the threshold for FFY 2005. The remaining three local school systems had never been previously identified.   This is indicative of the tremendous variances in the data from one year to another particularly in the smaller school systems. Variations in disproportionate suspension rates among local school systems may be attributed, in part, to the size of local school systems, as the larger school systems have proportionately larger subgroups and would be more likely to meet the group size requirement.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 30__

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities to provide safe learning environments and reduce the suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities. (Annually)	Staff from the DSE/EIS participated in the review of all 24 local school system Master Plans. As special education issues are an integral part of each systems' improvement strategies. Any concerns with suspension or expulsion were addressed by local school systems before the plans were presented to the State Board of Education for approval. All Master Plans have been approved.	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff LSS staff
Monitor LSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities to decrease the suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities and increase the usage of positive behavior interventions and supports.(Ongoing)	Onsite visits/monitoring of 70.8% (17) of local school systems was conducted to observe and/or discuss activities to decrease the suspension/ expulsion of students with disabilities. An additional 5 (21%) visits were conducted to LSS identified as significantly disproportionate to discuss activities conducted to address significant disproportionality. LSS that receive discretionary grants targeted to reduce disproportionality submitted required mid-term and final progress reports to determine the effectiveness of the interventions selected. On site visits are also completed to observe and discuss the interventions and assist LSS in identifying promising practices to support minority students with disabilities. A statewide meeting of grantees was held to provide an opportunity for sharing information and soliciting input.	DSE/EIS staff Consultant DSFSS staff LSS staff
Review of LSS student suspension records and report findings to LSS superintendent (Annually)	Reports were prepared and disseminated by the Division of Student, Family and School Support to Superintendents of local school systems and are posted on the MSDE website under Student Reports.	DSE/EIS staff Consultant DSFSS staff LSS staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices relative to suspension/expulsion. (Ongoing)	Of the eight (8) local school systems (LSS) identified with a significant discrepancy for multiple/extended suspension of students with disabilities greater than ten (10) school days, six (6) were required to revise LSS policies, procedures, and/or practices. The remaining two (2) local school systems are scheduled for onsite reviews and will be required to revise their policies, procedures and practices, if necessary. A review tool was developed for use by local school systems to assist them in this review.	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff LSS staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 31__

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Require the revision of LSS policies, procedures, and practices, as appropriate, when a significant discrepancy is identified in the rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities as compared to nondisabled peers. (Ongoing)	Corrective action plans include a description of how the LSS will review, and revise if necessary, policies, procedures, and practices related to suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities to ensure that the policies, procedures, and practices comply with federal and state requirements; what actions will be implemented to ensure that those policies, procedures, and practices are implemented accurately. This includes, but is not limited to review of IEPs, manifestation determinations, behavior improvement plans, suspension and expulsion records, and professional development provided to IEP teams and central office and building level administrators. Any policies, procedures or practices identified during the course of a complaint investigation or due process hearing that were noncompliant must be revised as part of the corrective action plan prior to the complaint or hearing requirements being met.	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff LSS staff
Provide technical assistance to LSS related to positive student behavior interventions. (Annually)	Technical assistance is provided directly to local school systems and school staff in the form of an annual Spring Forum for Administrators, Summer Institute, monthly State Leadership Team meeting, quarterly Coaches meetings, regional and LSS coaches and team meetings, and individual school level PBIS teams. In addition, a website pbismaryland.org houses a wide array of information on behavioral interventions and training modules, links to national behavior support sites, current research and data.	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Continue collaboration with Division of Student and School Services (DSFSS) to implement positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) within LSS. (Ongoing)	The PBIS State Management team includes a representative from the DSE/EIS. The team meets weekly to manage the overall implementation and expansion of PBIS statewide. They also collaborate in providing professional development to local school systems and PBIS teams. On March 23, 2006 staff from DSE/EIS presented with other members of the State Leadership Team at the 3rd National Annual Conference on Positive Behavior Supports on Maryland's State and School System Implementation Strategies, Successes, and Outcomes. The DSE/EIS annually allocates discretionary finds to address disproportionality, including PBIS initiatives.	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Identify and implement best practice relative to reducing/eliminating suspension of students with disabilities. (Ongoing)	Annually, MSDE co-sponsors a PBIS Summer Institute. The Institute proves a wide range of professional development provided by national, state, local, and school level presenters regarding best practices. Members of the PBIS State Management Team attended and presented at The National PBS Implementation Forum October 20 – 21, 2005 with 11 Maryland district teams represented. Representatives from 10 local school systems and the Maryland Association of Special Education Facilities (MANSEF).	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Provide professional development to LSS staff on issues related to suspension of students with disabilities (Ongoing)	During site visits to monitor disproportionality grants, focused monitoring, and meetings regarding early intervening services staff provides professional development regarding suspension of students with disabilities. PBIS Summer Institute presentations included presentations such as Diversity and Cognitive Styles, FBA/BIP for Autistic Youth, Cooperative Discipline. All onsite visits to LSS to review disproportionality include discussion of suspension policies, procedures and practices. . Professional Development is provided to local directors and supervisors of special education during quarterly directors' meetings. The Annual Special Education Leadership Conference held in October 2005 included sessions on Mining the Data to assist directors in the disaggregating and analysis of data regarding disproportionality.	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Improvement Activities	Timelines/Resources	Justification
Partner with a national technical assistance agency, National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) to provide assistance to local school systems identified as significantly disproportionate.	December 2006 – ongoing DSE/EIS staff, NCCRESt staff	The expertise available through NCCRESt greatly enhances the existing expertise at the State and local levels. It will provide an opportunity to network with other states and to bring additional promising practices to Maryland.
Require LSSs/PAs to review and revise, as appropriate, local 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 policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.	January 2007 – ongoing DSE/EIS staff	OSEP letter of March 20, 2006 requires MSDE to include this activity in the February 1, 2007 APR. Variance in the data from year to year presents the potential for additional local school systems to be identified as discrepant. Ensuring that local policies, procedures and practices are complaint with IDEA 2004 should increase the likelihood that local school systems will make appropriate decisions for suspensions and expulsions.
Increase the capacity of local school systems to identify trends, patterns and pockets of disproportionate suspension and expulsion practices through the provision of detailed data reports on suspension and expulsion for each local school system.	October 2006 – ongoing DSE/EIS staff LSS staff	When local school systems are able to disaggregate data in greater detail they have a greater ability to identify specific areas of concern and to plan and implement practices that reduce disproportionate suspensions and expulsions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please refer to narrative prior to Indicator 1.

Maryland's LRE performance data is collected annually for the October child count and reported in the "*Maryland Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables"*: posted on the MSDE website under the Division of Accountability and Assessment, Staff and Student Publications. The Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) performance data in this APR is from the October 28, 2005 edition of that document and is reported by ages 3-5 and 6-21 (Tables 12 and 16, Pages 17 and 21). The data in the report is considered to be reliable and valid for the purpose of reviewing LRE. The report permits the public and public agencies (PAs) to review data, refer to past documents to establish trends, and develop strategies for improvement. In addition to the performance data, OSEP has imposed "Special Conditions" on Maryland for failure to ensure individualized placement decisions are consistent with requirements and has been regularly providing OSEP with documentation demonstrating compliance. As such, Maryland's local directors of special education understand the nature of the Special Conditions and are charged with ensuring the individual nature of placement decisions and the provision of supplementary aids and services to enable students with disabilities to participate in general education settings which are a contributing factor in the maintenance and improvement of Maryland's LRE data.

This indicator, as well as Maryland's "Special Conditions", was reviewed by the Special Education State Advisory Committee. The Committee reviewed Maryland's 2005 performance data and compared it to the baseline and the target and noted progress and slippage. The Committee engaged in a lively discussion of LRE and determined the subject merited future discussion.

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 day[1];

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.

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.

---

[1] 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	A. 57.75% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. B. 17.47% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. C. 7.67% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Actual Target Data for 2005

A. Children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day:

2005 Total Number Students With Disabilities, Ages 6-21	2005 LRE Data		2005 State Target	Status
	Number	**Percent**		
98,508	58,717	59.60%	57.75%	Target Met

B. Children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day:

2005 Total Number Students With Disabilities, Ages 6-21	2005 LRE Data		2005 State Target	Status
	Number	**Percent**		
98,508	16,613	16.86%	17.47%	Target Met

C. Children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements:

2005 Total Number Students With Disabilities, Ages 6-21	2005 LRE Data		2005 State Target	Status
	Number	**Percent**		
98,508	7,762	7.89%	7.67%	Target Not Met

2005 LRE Data	Home	Hospital	Public Day	Private Day	Public Residential	Private Residential	Total
Number	311	15	3,089	4,039	42	266	7,762
Percent	0.32%	0.02%	3.14%	4.10%	0.04%	0.27%	7.90%
% Change From Baseline	↑0.03%	0.00%	↓0.26%	↑0.25%	↑0.01%	↓0.04%	↓0.02%

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 36__

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for 2005:

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Participate in MSDE review of PA BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to educate students with disabilities in the general curriculum in learning environments that are conducive to learning through the provision of supplementary aids, services, supports, strategies, and accommodations.	The MSDE, DSE/EIS participated in the review of the legislatively mandated school system Master Plans. The Master Plans and subsequent updates address the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act and Maryland's Bridge to Excellence (BTE) in Public Schools Act. The focused review found that strategies in support of placing students in the LRE tended to address increased use of inclusion and co-teaching at the elementary and secondary school levels, as well as increased professional development specific to the use of curriculum and instruction. In addition, there was more hands-on collaboration and planning between general and special educators made possible, in part, by MSDE's AYP Grants supported by Part B funding.	DSE/EIS Staff DSFSS Staff LSS Staff
Include LRE data for students ages 6-21 in local school system report cards.	LRE data is included in the MSDE website under Special Education and is entitled: Special Education/Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables, October 28, 2005. The LRE data will also be publicly reported in the special education State and school system performance reports in the spring of this year.	DSE/EIS Staff IT Staff
Explore the impact of the State funding mechanism for students for whom nonpublic placement is sought. Review other arrangements made with public and private institutions to implement LRE placement options for students with disabilities such as memorandums of agreements or special implementation procedures for those arrangements. (34 CFR 300.118)	The funding mechanism for separate placements (Indicator 5C) is in Education Articles §§8-406 and 8-415, Annotated Code of Maryland. The role of the funding formula is not entirely clear. IEP teams recommending such placements do so for many reasons and have no, or limited, knowledge of the funding formula. LRE	DSE/EIS Staff Data/Finance PA Staff Other Agencies

	arrangements in public and private institutions are made, as necessary, to implement a student's IEP.	
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, and verify accuracy of data, training, technical assistance and other program development activities related to least restrictive environment.	All 24 local school systems have been monitored by the State in the implementation of LRE requirements. Because Maryland is under "Special Conditions," it has been reporting its results of these monitoring activities in scheduled reports to OSEP.	DSE/EIS Staff
Review and revise, as appropriate, the Statewide IEP to ensure all requirements related to LRE determination are included and include special provisions for preschool students. Utilize the implementation of the Statewide IEP to review application of IEP decision making requirements to determine the LRE.	LRE requirements are included in the Statewide IEP for both preschool and school-age students with disabilities. Full implementation of the use of the Statewide IEP begins July 1, 2007. Once the program is fully functional, MSDE will be able to monitor implementation of LRE decision making and recommendations for supplemental aids and services through desk audits.	DSE/EIS Staff
JHU-CTE Staff
Explore the use of a data mining program to disaggregate LRE data for preschool for use in improvement planning.	Data may be disaggregated using current programs by specifying reports.	JHU-CTE Staff
Continue the directed use of grant funds toward LRE initiatives.	Maryland continues to stimulate increases in LRE initiatives through the implementation of the federal grants program. All local school systems receive funds to improve, enhance, or maintain initiatives related to placement in the LRE.	DSE/EIS Staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices to assure the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions to assure access to and participation in general curriculum in the LRE.	The State's Monitoring For Continuous Improvement and Results includes the review of policies and procedures related to implementation of LRE requirements.	DSE/EIS Staff
LSS Staff
Provide technical assistance to identify best practices that promote provision of services in the LRE.	MSDE provides technical assistance as it relates to the implementation of corrective action plans in those public agencies where identification of noncompliance was identified in LRE decision making.	DSE/EIS Staff

Through these activities, Maryland exceeded its target for Indicators 5A and B, and, as a result, new targets have been set. Indicator 5C showed Maryland's separate setting category did not change

significantly and therefore did not meet the designated target (7.67%) by 0.22%. Some anomalies in the reporting of separate settings classification in the reported data may be contributing to data changes within the category, i.e. public day ($\downarrow 0.26\%$) vs. private day ($\uparrow 0.25\%$).

National baseline data for separate category placement during the period 2000 – 2004 appears to have stabilized around +/- 3.0%. Maryland's percentage, when ranked nationally, is +/- 7.0%, thus placing the State in the bottom quarter of the national list. An analysis of Maryland's 25 local school systems (LSS) 2005 performance data shows four LSSs, did not meet the target set by the State for placement in separate facilities. Two were below the target, and two were significantly below, one of these systems is under court oversight. The two that are significantly below the target currently have corrective action plans in LRE decision making due to identification of noncompliance with LRE requirements. The data show that these four school systems represent almost half of Maryland's school age special education population and proportionately represent approximately 70% of students with disabilities in such placements.

Although the data in this category hasn't changed significantly over the 2004 baseline and requires further scrutiny, Maryland continues to maintain a continuum of services that utilizes separate public and private day settings to serve students with disabilities more frequently than other states. Although the funding formula is assumed to be the fundamental basis for a higher than average number of such placements, this assumption is too elemental. Such placements are recommended by IEP teams for many reasons and the State does not substitute its judgment for the judgment of the team. If Maryland is to successfully address this category of placement, it first needs to study IEP team decision making and State and local practices to identify all contributing factors.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005:

Maryland's baseline data remains the same as was reported in 2004. Maryland exceeded its 2005 targets for indicators 5A and 5B and proposes to revise these targets by the same increment (+ 0.5%) as was employed in the SPP; the progression to FFY 2010 is defined in the chart below.

Maryland has reviewed and is satisfied with the progress of the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular school settings. A heightened awareness on the part of special education directors, the application of appropriate supplementary aids, services and supports, grant awards, and the increased oversight by the State will continue to move Maryland's LRE performance data in a positive direction.

Although Maryland did not meet the target for separate placement in 2005, Maryland is committed to the targets for Indicator 5C. Therefore these will remain the same as were defined in the SPP.

Revised Measurable and Rigorous Targets

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (2006-2007) (Revised 2/1/07)	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.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008) (Revised 2/1/07)	A. 60.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. B. 16.36% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. C. 7.17% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009) (Revised 2/1/07)	A. 61.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. B. 16.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. C. 6.92% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010) (Revised 2/1/07)	A. 61.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. B. 15.86% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. C. 6.67% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011) (Revised 2/1/07)	A. 62.11% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. B. 15.61% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. C. 6.42% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Proposed improvement activities, timelines and resources:

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justification
Continue to review LSS LRE data and monitor compliance with LRE decision making requirements by IEP teams.	July 2006 – June 2007 and ongoing QAM CIDP MITP/PS Staff	MSDE/DSE/EIS is under "Special Conditions" and will continue to monitor LRE to ensure correction of noncompliance and ongoing compliance. These activities will continue and be incorporated into MSDE/Elis's ongoing general supervisory system.
Advise the public agencies whose data is below the target of available sources of technical assistance including the provision of advice by experts, assistance in identifying and implementing professional development, designating and using special education professionals, and collaboration with higher education and national centers of technical assistance.	Develop such resources between March 1, 2007 and June 30, 2007. Disperse information, based on established criteria, beginning July 1, 2007 PASD Staff	For PAs in need of assistance based on performance data and other general supervisory information, MSDE/EIS provides the PA with such information as part of technical assistance to improve performance.
Direct the use of Part B funds to the LRE indicator(s) in which the public agency needs assistance, when necessary.	March 2007 PASD Staff	For PAs in need of intervention based on performance data and other general supervisory information, MSDE/EIS may elect to direct Part B funds to improve performance.
Monitor existing LSS LRE corrective action plans to ensure strategies are being implemented as described and are having the desired effect.	July 2006 – June 200 7 and ongoing QAM CIDP MITP/PS Staff	Correction of noncompliance as soon as possible and in no case later than one year requires diligence by State staff engaged in general supervisory activities.
Provide targeted technical assistance and oversight to those districts that are significantly below the State's target.	July 2006 – June 2007 and ongoing DSE/EIS Staff	For PAs in need of substantial intervention based on performance data and other general supervisory information, MSDE/EIS provides targeted technical assistance and oversight to improve performance in those PAs that are having the greatest impact on the State's data.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 41__

Study contributing factors and influences that may result in IEP team decisions to recommend placements in separate facilities.	February 2007- September 2007 Nonpublic Staff	Maryland IEP teams recommend separate facilities to educate students with disabilities more frequently than other states. LRE State complaints are more often brought by parents seeking a more restrictive placement rather than a less restrictive one. To fully evaluate why IEP teams recommend such placements, all factors and influences must be identified and understood.
Study and identify the most promising strategies to serve students who might otherwise be referred to restrictive, separate placements.	February 2007 and ongoing Nonpublic Staff	To improve the LRE performance data (Indicator 5C), the State must identify and promote the most promising strategies to serve students who might otherwise be referred to restrictive, separate placements.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

Maryland's LRE performance data is collected annually for the October child count and reported in the *Maryland Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables* document. The LRE performance data in this APR is from the October 28, 2005 edition of that document and is reported by ages 3-5 and 6-21 (Tables 12 and 16, pages 17 and 21). The document is posted on the MSDE website under the Division of Accountability and Assessment: Staff and Student Publications, and permits the public and public agencies (PAs) to review data, refer to past documents to establish trends, and develop strategies for improvement. In addition to the performance data, OSEP has imposed Special Conditions on Maryland for failure to ensure individualized placement decisions are consistent with requirements and has been regularly providing OSEP with documentation demonstrating compliance. As such, Maryland's directors of special education understand the nature of the Special Conditions and are charged with ensuring the individual nature of placement decisions and the provision of supplementary aids and services to enable students with disabilities to participate in general education settings which are a contributing factor in the maintenance and improvement of Maryland's LRE data.

This indicator, as well as Maryland's Special Conditions, was reviewed by the State Special Education Advisory Committee. The Committee reviewed Maryland's 2005 performance data and compared it to the baseline and the target. The Committee reviewed strategies, commented on progress or slippage, and made recommendations for change.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	41.00% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Total Number Students with Disabilities, Ages, 3-5*	Settings with typically developing peers	Home	Early Childhood	Combined	Total	Status
12,136	**Number**	100	2,672	2,530	5,302	Target Met
	Percent	.82%	22.02%	20.85%	43.69%	

From October 2005 Special Education Child Count

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Improvement Activities completed and ongoing during the reporting period resulted in Maryland exceeding the target established for FFY 2005 by 2.69%, with improvement from the baseline data reported in FFY 2004 of 3.15%.

Although Maryland exceeded its target for Indicator 6 by 2.69%, providing services to children with disabilities, ages three through five, in environments where typical children are found continues to be a challenge. There remains a need to establish partnerships with community-based early childhood programs and to expand the number of preschool special educators and related services specialists prepared to function increasingly in a consultative role with early care and education community-based providers.

As a result of final regulations for IDEA 2004, new Preschool LRE settings are in place for FFY 2006. Preschool LRE data reported by local school systems for October 2005 will be compared to most recent Preschool LRE data reported for October 2006. It is anticipated that the change in definitions and criteria for reporting children as participating in a particular setting will have an impact on and be reflected in the statewide preschool LRE data. This change in preschool LRE reporting requirements presents an opportunity to review and revise targets established for FFY 2007-2010, and to revise or add Improvement Activities that will continue to move Maryland's Preschool LRE performance data in a positive direction.

Below lists the activities completed during FFY 2005 (2005-2006). These improvement Activities are also ongoing activities that will continue.

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Hire additional state level staff to provide technical assistance to LSS on the preschool LRE continuum and effective strategies to strengthen community partnerships with other public and private early childhood programs	A new early childhood special education staff position housed within the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program/Preschool Services Branch was filled in April 2006. This position reports directly to the state 619 Coordinator and is responsible for providing technical assistance to local school systems on identified effective practices and strategies for expanding the	DSE/EIS staff MSDE Human Resources Office

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 44__

	continuum of inclusive opportunities with public and private community-based early childhood programs.	
Provide technical assistance to LSS and community early childhood programs to implement effective strategies of LRE for 3-5 year olds in community settings	Technical assistance focusing on expanding community-based options for preschool children with disabilities was provided to local school system Preschool Special Education Coordinators through statewide administrative briefings. This continues to be an effective mechanism for sharing of successful practices among local school systems. Local presentations addressed funding mechanisms, increasing staff and modifying professional roles and expectations, and developing and sustaining collaborative and reciprocal working relationships with both public and private community-based early childhood programs designed primarily for children without disabilities. Provision of technical assistance through bi-annual statewide administrative briefings is ongoing and will continue to include a focus on Preschool LRE, with an emphasis on partnerships with community-based early childhood programs.	DSE/EIS staff
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed for the participation of students with disabilities in appropriate early learning activities with nondisabled peers in environments that are conducive to learning.	The Division of Special Education participated in the review of the legislatively mandated school system Master Plans. The Master Plans and subsequent updates address the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act and Maryland's Bridge to Excellence (BTE) in Public Schools Act. The focused review found that strategies in support of placing students in the LRE tended to address increased use of inclusion and co-teaching at the elementary (includes Pre-k and K) and secondary school levels, as well as increased	DSE/EIS staff DSFSS staff LSS staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 45__

	professional development specific to the use of curriculum and instruction. In addition, there was more hands-on collaboration and planning between general and special educators made possible, in part, by MSDE's AYP Grants supported by Part B funding.	
Include LRE data for students ages 3-5 in local school system report cards.	LRE data is included in the MSDE website under Special Education and is entitled, *Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables, October 28, 2005*. The LRE data will also be publicly reported in the special education school system performance reports in the spring of this year.	DSE/EIS staff MSDE IT staff DAA staff
Explore the impact of the State funding mechanism for students for whom nonpublic placement is sought. Explore arrangements made with public and private institutions to implement LRE placement options for students with disabilities such as memorandums of agreements or special implementation procedures for those arrangements. (34 CFR 300.118)	The Funding Mechanism for separate placements is in Education Articles §§ 8-406 and 8-415, Annotated Code of Maryland. While the funding formula has an impact on placement in separate facilities, other factors are suspected as contributing to such placements. LRE arrangements in public and private institutions are made, as necessary, to implement a student's IEP.	DSE/EIS staff Data/Finance PA Staff Other Agencies
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to least restrictive environment.	All 24 local school systems have been monitored by the State in the implementation of LRE requirements. Because Maryland is under Special Conditions, it has been reporting its results of these monitoring activities in reports to OSEP.	DSE/EIS staff
Review and revise, as appropriate, the Statewide IEP to ensure all requirements related to LRE determination	Maryland has progressed in the development of a uniform Statewide IEP. LRE determination is included. All	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 46__

provisions for preschool students are included. Utilize the implementation of the Statewide IEP to review the application of IEP decision-making requirements to determine the LRE.	public agencies are expected to participate in the use of the Statewide IEP by July 1, 2007. Once the program is fully functional, MSDE will be able to monitor implementation of LRE decision making and recommendations for supplemental aids and services through desk audits in some public agencies.	
Explore the use of a data mining program to disaggregate LRE data for preschool data for use in improvement planning.	Data may be disaggregated using current programs by specifying reports.	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Continue the directed use of grant funds toward LRE initiatives.	Maryland continues to stimulate increases in LRE through the implementation of the federal grants program. All local school systems receive funds to improve, enhance, or maintain initiatives related to placement in the LRE. In FFY 2005, three of six school systems who were awarded competitive grants related to LRE directed the funds toward preschool age students.	DSE/EIS staff
DSE/EIS will review LSS policies and procedures for practices that assure access to and participation in general curriculum and appropriate preschool activities in the LRE with the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions as determined appropriate by each child's IEP team.	The State's Monitoring For Continuous Improvement and Results includes the review of policies and procedures related to implementation of LRE requirements.	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Post local program preschool LRE best practices descriptions and related resources/products developed on Early Childhood Gateway website	EC Gateway framework has been developed; links to professional development modules on the IFSP and EC Transition have been Incorporated	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Provide technical assistance and professional development resources and activities to local Family Support Services	Technical assistance focusing on expanding community-based options for preschool children with disabilities and to support	Family Support Services Coordinators DSE/EIS staff Local Preschool Partners

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 47__

Coordinators in each LSS to build their capacity to support and strengthen family involvement in the LRE decision-making process.	building the capacity of parents/families in LRE decision-making was provided to local school system Preschool Special Education Coordinators and local family Support services Coordinators through statewide administrative briefings. This continues to be an effective mechanism for sharing of successful practices among local school systems. Bi-annual statewide meeting will continue to include a focus on Preschool LRE, parental involvement in decision-making, and partnerships with community-based early childhood programs.	
Technical assistance to LSS to identify and implement best practices to increase the provision of services in the settings with nondisabled peers.	MSDE provides technical assistance as it relates to the implementation of corrective action plans in those public agencies where identification of noncompliance was identified in LRE decision making. An initiative at the state level to foster greater collaboration between local school systems and local Head Start programs for improved outcomes for all young children received an expanded focus on preschool children with disabilities, with an emphasis on children with more complex special needs being served within Head Start programs, and on receiving related services as well as direct and consultative special instruction on-site through the LSS. Building on a state level Memorandum of Agreement signed into effect in FFY 03, the state 619 Coordinator and the state Coordinator for the Head Start Collaboration Network (both positions housed within MSDE) conducted a series of regional forums with local school systems and Head Start program representatives. The purpose of the forums was to review the status of local MOAs, identify	DSE/EIS staff

	areas of shared responsibility for serving young children with disabilities, draft updated local Moans (including activities, individuals responsible, timelines and accountability measures), and review timelines for annually reporting MOA status to MSDE.	

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justification
Include LRE data for students ages 3-5 in local school system report cards.	<u>Revised Timeline</u> Annually DSE/EIS staff MSDE IT staff DAA staff	The publication of Preschool LRE data will occur annually.
Review and revise, as appropriate, the Statewide IEP to ensure all requirements related to LRE determination provisions for preschool students are included. Utilize the implementation of the Statewide IEP to review the application of IEP decision-making requirements to determine the LRE.	<u>Revised Timeline</u> June 2006 - July 2008 DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE	Local School systems and public agencies are required to use the same statewide IEP in form and format beginning July 1, 2007. Beginning July 1, 2008, each local school system and public agency is required to use a web-based IEP program. The MSDE IEP work group meets monthly to address questions and issues relative to IEP process, documentation, data collection, including LRE, as appropriate.
Continue the directed use of grant funds toward LRE initiatives.	<u>Revised Timeline</u> March 2006- September 2010 DSE/EIS staff	Use of LRE grants funds is a long-range priority and local school system funds are expected to address identified priorities.
Post local program preschool LRE best practices descriptions and related resources/products developed on Early Childhood Gateway website (EC Gateway framework has been developed; links to professional development modules on the IFSP and EC Transition have been	<u>Revised Timeline</u> Initiate Fall 2006 & Ongoing DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE	The posting of local preschool LRE best practices descriptions and related resources /products has been delayed.

incorporated)		
Design and develop on-line professional development module on the LRE decision-making process for preschool students with disabilities for access by local school system preschool special education	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE Content Specialist Consultant	The design and development of on-line professional development has been delayed in order to receive additional feedback for local school system and Family Support Center Services Coordinators on priorities for professional development.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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.

Revised Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

State Total of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	# of children determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays	# of children found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their birthdays	# 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
*3,368	**Data Not collected for baseline period**	**209****	**0**	**6.21%**

  *Total as reported from the Part C database.
**Total verifiable from Part B SSIS October data collection

Discussion of Revised Baseline Data:

At the time of the first State Performance Plan submission (December 1, 2005), data to address Indicator 12 were not being systematically collected as part of Maryland's annual Student Services Information System (SSIS). MSDE submitted what was referred to at the time as data from the web-based Part C database to address this indicator. In a March 20, 2006 letter, OSEP indicated that Maryland must report Part B data for FFY 2004, and that this data would constitute appropriate baseline data for this Indicator.

By way of clarification as to the relevance of the data submitted with the first SPP, the following explanation is offered, and should have been included with the original submission.

Prior to a site visit conducted by OSEP in March 2004 for both Part C and Part B, Maryland had in place jointly developed Part C/Part B Transition At Age Three State Policies and Procedures that allowed local lead agencies and local school systems to conduct the Part C Transition Planning Meeting and the initial Part B eligibility determination meeting as a combined meeting, as long as each part of the combined meeting met respective regulatory requirements (e.g., informed parental consent, personnel present). In conjunction with this provision, the MSDE and MITP agreed that, since the Part C database was web-based and "real-time" Part C would collect and enter the outcome of each eligibility determination meeting, i.e., Part B data would be collected and maintained in the Part C database. With MSDE as the lead agency for Part C, this coordinated approach to data collection was intended to assist with oversight of the Transition At Age Three process. In response the findings resulting from the March 2004 site visit by OSEP, the MSDE and MITP determined that by allowing the two meetings to be combined, issues of programmatic responsibility had become confused, and therefore remedies to address full compliance were difficult to implement. The MSDE and MITP subsequently revised the State Policies and Procedures to clarify the distinct responsibilities of both programs, separating the formerly combined meetings into separate Part C and Part B functions, and eliminating the collection of outcome data for Part B eligibility determination from the Part C database.

To fully comply with OSEP's March 20, 2006 Directions, Maryland instituted the following procedures to collect and validate data to establish the baseline for FFY 2004:

- Identification of the timeframe of July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 as the baseline data period; (this is consistent with the established period for cumulative Exit data collection).

- The Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program provided a data set from the Part C web-based database covering the same time period; this data set included all children entered into the Part C database by Local Infants and Toddlers Program staff as having been referred to local school systems for Part B eligibility determination and found eligible. Social Security numbers are used as the child identification number for the Part C database <u>however parents are not required to provide SSN.</u>

- The MSDE Part B data manager conducted a comparison of the Part C data set with the SSIS data set, using Social Security numbers as the basis for making a match. Part B data includes SSN and pseudo-SSN. Though limited in terms of comparability of the information in both data sets, it was the selected approach due to the lack of connectedness between the Part C and Part B databases. The lack of a consistent assignment of student identification numbers between Part C and Part B, as well as across local school systems contributed to matching inconsistencies.

Results of procedures:

- 209 (6.21%) out of a total of 3,368 children reported by Part C as referred to Part B for eligibility determination could be verified by Part B as having been found eligible with an IEP in effect at age 3.

- Data on the number of children reported by Part C as referred to Part B and determined *NOT eligible* prior to the third birthday were not collected for July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005. It was not until August 2005 that States were advised at a national meeting on State Performance Plan requirements sponsored by OSEP that these data must be collected and reported. Maryland established data collection procedures for local school systems to capture these data beginning with the July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006 collection period. Results are reported as part of Actual Target Data for FFY 2005.

FFY 05	**Measurable and Rigorous Target**
2005 (2005-2006)	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 2005:

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 birthday	# 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
2,840	2,008	519	125	83.4%

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 or initial services	Percentage of **Not** Eligible determinations completed prior to third birthday
2,840	308	5	0	98.4%

For the collection of FFY 05 performance data, MSDE directed all local school systems to:

- Conduct manual reviews of all preschool student records to identify three year-olds who had been referred by Part C to Part B from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 for eligibility determination;

- Identify the outcome of each eligibility determination meeting (eligible/not eligible);

- Document whether the IEP was implemented by the child's third birthday;

- Document accepted reasons and range of days beyond the third birthday if either eligibility determination did not occur prior to or the IEP was not in effect by the child's third birthday; and

- Submit this manually compiled data concurrent with the electronic submission of all other SSIS data. NOTE: The required reporting fields have been incorporated into Maryland's statewide IEP system. All local school systems must implement an electronic collection and reporting of Transition at Age 3 data beginning on July 1, 2007 using either the Maryland IEP or, if using a private vendor, with the required fields incorporated into the vendor's web-based tool. However, data on students determined to be not eligible for Part B Special Education services will still need

to be maintained manually until the procedure for collecting this data electronically can be finalized and included as a component of Maryland's statewide IEP system.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Maryland did not meet the target of 100% established by OSEP for this Indicator, but did show an 77.19% improvement (83.4%) over the FFY 2004 (2004-2005) revised baseline of 6.21%. Division data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 05. Support and technical assistance provided by Division staff to LSS 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.

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Provide training and technical assistance to local school system data managers, local directors of special education, and local preschool special education coordinators related to Early Childhood Transition data.	Training and technical assistance to local school system data managers, local directors of special education, and local preschool special education coordinators on reporting Early Childhood Transition data provided through MSDE sponsored bi-annual LSS Part B data mangers meetings, and bi-annual MSDE sponsored Early Childhood Special Education Administrative Briefings. This will continue for Part B data managers and preschool special education coordinators for FFY 06 in order to attain full compliance statewide with this Indicator.	DSE/EIS Staff Part B Data Managers
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to Early Childhood Transition.	Monitoring, directing improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to Early Childhood Transition were conducted and coordinated among the Division Branch's' with lead responsibilities for complaint investigation, Part C monitoring and program improvement, Part B Preschool program improvement, and Part B monitoring and quality assurance.	DSE/EIS staff MITP Part C Monitoring staff

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 06:

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justification
Hiring of new Part B 619 Monitoring staff position	April-May 2007 DSE/EIS – MITP/PS Branch staff MSDE Human Resources Office	**New Activity** The addition of a new staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 54__

		position for a dedicated Part B 619 Monitoring staff person was approved by the Maryland Department of Budget and Management for SFY 07 (2006-2007). This was a position transferred to MSDE/DSE/EIS from another State agency and must be approved for re-classification to an appropriate staff specialist level prior to initiating the process for approval to advertise. DSE/EIS staff, with the assistance of the MSDE Office of Human Resources, is completing the approval process. It is anticipated that it will be filled during April-May of 2007. This additional position will add much needed capacity to strengthen joint Part C and Part B monitoring and technical assistance activities for Early Childhood Transition.
<u>New Activity</u> Review LSS policies and procedures for practices to ensure 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 in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.124.	DSE/EIS staff LSS Preschool Coordinators LSS directors LITP Coordinators	Division data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 05. Support and technical assistance provided by Division staff to LSS staff will continue to be part of ongoing improvement activities to ensure local policies. Procedures, and practices are in compliance with 34 C.F.R. §300.124 including the maintenance and reporting of accurate local data.
Joint Part C/Part B process for conducting shared monitoring of Early Childhood Transition will be developed.	<u>Revised Timeline/Resources</u> October 2005-August 2007 MITP Part C Monitoring staff Part B 619 Monitoring staff DSE/EIS Part B Monitoring Branch (Quality Assurance and Monitoring –	The original timeline established for the development of a joint Part C/Part B monitoring process for Early Childhood Transition must be extended in light of data collection and

	QAM)	verification issues Part B encountered. Joint monitoring has been occurring. However the availability of verifiable data for Part B as well as Part C will enable further development of a shared process, with improvement plans/corrective action plans developed and coordinated accordingly.
Joint Part C/Part B process for conducting shared monitoring of Early Childhood Transition implemented, including oversight of associated corrective action plans.	February 2006 and ongoing <u>Revised Resources</u> MITP Part C Monitoring staff Part B 619 Monitoring staff DSE/EIS Part B Monitoring Branch (QAM)	Lack of staff capacity: Addition of Part B 619 Monitoring staff position anticipated April-May of 2007. Vacant Part C Monitoring position anticipated filled Spring 2007
New demographics data collection section of the Statewide IEP implemented.	<u>Revised Timeline</u> July 1, 2007 DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE staff	The timeline for statewide use of an electronic IEP has been adjusted to reflect unanticipated development issues for the MSDE/JHU version, and to allow sufficient time for LSSs not using the MSDE/JHU version to have their selected vendors incorporate required fields into their IEP on-line versions.
Completed revision of joint Part C/Part B state technical assistance bulletin on Early Childhood Transition.	<u>Revised Timeline</u> March 2007 MITP Part C staff Part B 619 staff Part B staff	Revision of the joint Part C/Part B State technical assistance bulletin on Early Childhood Transition was initiated, but not completed in accordance with the original timeline.
Early Childhood Transition data will be included in local lead agency and local school system report cards	<u>Revised Timeline</u> January-June 2007 MITP Part C staff Part B 619 and Part B staff	MSDE did not meet the timeline established in the SPP for including Early Childhood Transition data in local lead agency and local school system report cards because cumulative Part B

		baseline data for FFY 04 had not been collected. Pursuant to a March 2006 letter from OSEP, Part B data was used to establish a baseline, and local school systems were given a process for manually collecting and submitting data for FFY 05 to MSDE (SSIS data submissions were due to MSDE by the close of October 2006). FFY 04 baseline data and FFY 05 performance data will be available to include in 2007 local lead agency and local school system reports cards.
Provide training and technical assistance to local school system data managers, local preschool special education coordinators related to reporting Early Childhood Transition data.	Revised Timeline/Resources January 2006 & ongoing Part B 619 and Part B staff	The timeline for providing training and technical assistance on Early Childhood Transition has been extended to "ongoing" in recognition that these activities need to be continuous to ensure that local school system staff maintain current working knowledge of requirements and best practices in order to reach full compliance in this area.
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to Early Childhood Transition.	Ongoing Revised Resources MITP Part C Monitoring staff Part B 619 Monitoring staff DSE/EIS Part B Monitoring Branch (QAM)	The addition of a new staff position for a dedicated Part B 619 Monitoring staff person was approved by the Maryland Department of Budget and Management for SFY 07 (2006-2007). This was a position transferred to MSDE/DSE/EIS from another State agency and must be approved for re-classification to an appropriate staff specialist level prior to initiating the process for approval to advertise. DSE/EIS staff, with the assistance of the MSDE Office of Human Resources, is completing the approval process. It is anticipated that it will be filled during April-May of 2007.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 57__

		This additional position will add much needed capacity to strengthen joint Part C and Part B monitoring and technical assistance activities for Early Childhood Transition.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 58__

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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:

On November 10, 2005 Maryland 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. The Maryland Study 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.

DSE/EIS 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." DSE/EIS 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 DSE/EIS 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 Annual Performance Report on February 1, 2008. On November 10, 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 Maryland Study 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 Maryland State Department of Education (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.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 60__

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 Education Agencies (LEA) 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 **(2006-2007)**	*FFY 2006 (2006-2007) is the baseline data year. Baseline data to be reported on February 2, 2008.*
2007 **(2007-2008)**	
2008 **(2008-2009)**	

2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
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.	To Be Determined	DSE/EIS staff Selected Contractor
MSDE will work with the contractor to analyze the data collected on the Post-Secondary Data Collection Survey.	To Be Determined	DSE/EIS staff Selected Contractor
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.	To Be Determined	DSE/EIS staff Maryland Special Education Special Education State Advisory Committee
MSDE will work with the other members of the Interagency Transition Council to assist young adults to apply for education, training, and employment assistance services for which they may be entitled.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DORS staff DDA staff MHA staff DLLR staff WIA staff
MSDE will rewrite and publish the *Maryland Transition Planning and Anticipated Services Guide*. This Guide provides students and families with information on the services available from State agencies that may assist the student in meeting their postsecondary goals.	July 2008	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff DDA staff DORS staff Families MHA staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 62__

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator 1.

Between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006, the MSDE increased efforts and activities to coordinate general supervision within the DSE/EIS. These efforts were the direct result of an OSEP March 2005 visit. In Maryland, the general supervision system and processes continue to undergo positive changes to ensure improved performance results for students with disabilities and compliance with IDEA 2004, Part B requirements. Efforts include greater collaboration within the Division to facilitate general supervision activities. Activities include coordinated meetings with local directors of special education and data managers and staff development to enhance understanding of IDEA 2004 requirements and components of general supervision, including timelines for correcting noncompliance.

The MSDE general supervision structure encompasses a focused and cyclical system of general supervision, verification, program improvement, monitoring for compliance, public reporting and enforcement. The Division includes special oversight for the Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS) under a Consent Decree order. In Maryland, all Public Agencies (PAs) engage in general supervisory activities listed below as a part of the State's efforts to increase the performance results for students with disabilities and ensure compliance with the IDEA 2004 requirements.
Statewide activities include:

- Completing Self-Assessment on priority indicators;
- Collecting and compiling accurate quantitative and qualitative data;
- Involving broad stakeholder input in self-assessment and improvement planning;
- Participating in MSDE, DSE/EIS, monitoring activities;
- Completing required "Corrective Action Plans" (CAP) or requirements based on MSDE monitoring functions; and,
- Reporting annually on local performance to the public.

The following activities were completed:

- Developed and implemented 7QAM, a DSE/EIS computer site with Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) information on each PA, status of corrective action plans, forms used in monitoring, data and other resources;
- Developed and organized monitoring information in hardcopy by PA in binders and files for use by all the DSE/EIS staff; PAs;
- Developed, implemented, verified and reported on Self-Assessment under IDEA 2004, Part B for PAs;
- Completed and disseminated 16 monitoring reports between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006;
- Disseminated to all PAs and members of the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) a copy of the Monitoring for Continuing Improvement and Results manual.

There are 30 PAs in the State: 25 are local school systems (LSSs) and five are State Operated Programs (SOPs). MSDE's priority monitoring areas, placement in the LRE and the provision of related services, were based on the findings of noncompliance as identified by OSEP and as the subject of "Special Conditions". To measure compliance, all PAs were reviewed against the requirements in each of these areas on State developed monitoring tools. Some PAs were monitored in other areas when evidence suggested such a review. The data in this report merges information from all on-site and off-site State monitoring functions that result in an identification of systemic noncompliance. The data is determined to be both reliable and valid for this purpose. MSDE's review of the data shows that the rate of correction of findings of noncompliance as soon as possible and within a year is substantially below the 100% target.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 63__

Those PAs with CAPs received technical assistance (TA) from MSDE as it pertained to the implementation of the corrective actions, the correction of noncompliance and improvement planning through the direction of a portion of federal funds.

The State acknowledges that, while it has not made substantial progress in correction of noncompliance within established timelines, it has made substantial progress in the improvement of its general supervisory processes and procedures. MSDE is now better able to identify noncompliance and track and report on correction. Therefore, the data in this APR will be used as the basis for comparison in the next APR in the determination of progress or slippage. MSDE is expanding its emphasis on the provision of TA and other follow-up activities to ensure identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year from identification. Specific targeted assistance will be provided to those PAs who have not corrected noncompliance within a year or who have multiple areas of noncompliance.

This indicator, as well as Maryland's "Special Conditions", was reviewed by the Special Education State Advisory Committee. The Committee was informed of MSDE's general supervisory responsibilities and functions and approves of the State's commitment to improve, document and report on all activities within its system. The Committee reviewed the data, strategies for improvement, and provided input on progress and the need for improvement of correction of noncompliance. The committee understands this data will be publicly reported in the Special Education State and school system performance report in the spring of this year.

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 from identification.

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 no case later than one year from   identification.

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

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 **(2005-2006)**	100% of corrective actions identified though monitoring systems will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Statewide Correction of PA Systemic Noncompliance: Status Report of Correction for Reporting Period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006	Total of all LSSs and PAs	Total excluding one Consent Decree LSS
a. Number of findings of noncompliance.	29	25
b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	9	9
Percent corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year. Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.	31%	36%

Statewide Correction of PA Systemic Noncompliance by Area: Status Report of Correction for Reporting Period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006				
Topical Areas	CC-1	CC-2	NC1	NC2
Behavior interventions	1			
Disciplinary procedures	1			
Home and Hospital teaching	1			
Identification/evaluation/reevaluation		2	1	1
Individualized Education Program (IEP)		2	2	2
Related services (priority monitoring area)			4	3
Parentally-placed private school students	1			
LRE (priority monitoring area)	2	1	2	1
Proper written notice	1	2		
Suspension			3	2
General supervision	2		1	
Totals	**9**	**7**	**13**	**9**

Code Key:
CC-1   CAP closed within one year
CC-2   CAP closed beyond the reporting period
NC-1   CAP not closed (Statewide LSSs and PAs)
NC-2   CAP not closed (Without Jurisdiction under Consent Decree Order)

Between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006, there were 29 findings of noncompliance in 9 LSSs and 3 PAs. Of these, nine, or 31% were corrected within one year and a total of 16, or 55% were corrected by December 31, 2006.

The DSE/EIS is using this data for planning on-going technical assistance and enforcement. For example, PAs with more findings of noncompliance or who fail to correct noncompliance within timelines require higher levels of TA and oversight. And, any PA with findings of noncompliance requires periodic checks by the State to ensure the focus on correction continues as a high priority. Maryland will continue to increase its system of TA and layered enforcement actions that are necessary to correct noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2005:

The DSE/EIS increased efforts to improve general supervision by improving accountability for its work through written documentation of all monitoring activities. Maryland will continue to develop and refine its monitoring practices and procedures. The increased efforts to follow-up with technical assistance in areas of noncompliance identified during general supervisory activities will result in adherence to correction timelines and improvement in the reported data.

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Increase dedicated Quality Assurance and Monitoring staff by three full time positions and three part-time positions for a total of five full time and six part time staff members.	Currently, the Division has four full time positions (and one position unfilled) and eight part-time staff members.	Position Approval
MSDE will continue to enhance general supervisory capacity through coordinated planning activities that involve staff from all branches of the division to enhance coordinated tracking of data, TA and monitoring to address correction of systemic noncompliance.	Six branches in the DSE/EIS meet regularly to: • assist in coordinating general supervisory responsibilities • prevent and address gaps in supervisory activities • coordinate TA activities	DSE/EIS Staff
Focused Monitoring activities for LRE and the provision of related services will be conducted by MSDE in 10 additional local school systems during the period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 (for a total of 17 of 24 local school systems). CAPs will be assigned to those local school systems with systemic findings of noncompliance.	Maryland completed its monitoring activities for LRE and the provision of related services in all local schools systems. When findings of noncompliance were identified, CAPs were assigned.	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams
On-site verification of the results of the CAP will be conducted by MSDE within six months of the close of the CAP as per revised monitoring procedures.	Five on-site verification visits were conducted by MSDE within six months of the close of the CAP. **Note:** Based on OSEP direction, MSDE modified its verification practices to be completed within one year of notification of findings.	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams
24 of 24 LSSs will have self-monitoring systems in place to ensure compliance with all requirements associated with FAPE in the LRE and the delivery of related services.	Local school systems identified with areas of noncompliance are required to develop internal self-monitoring systems to provide evidence of ongoing correction.	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams
Upon completion of the Self-Assessment Desk Audit and On-Site Review, the PAs will be	Upon completion of the Self-assessment Desk Audit and On-site Review, the Office of QAM	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams

required to submit Local Performance Plans (LPP). MCIR and Focused Monitoring procedures will define required actions, including TA and/or enforcement to be applied to those LSS and PA with sustained noncompliance.	forwarded a summary report identifying indicators as met or not met. LSSs and PAs engage in improvement planning activities based on these results.	
The State will complete its focused monitoring for LRE and the provision of related services and select additional monitoring priority areas for focused monitoring.	The State completed its focused monitoring for LRE and the provision of related services in response to "Special Conditions" in these areas. Some PAs were monitored in other areas when evidence/data suggested such a review was required.	SESAC IDEA Partnership Team
The revised MCIR manual will be distributed to all LSS and PA.	The MCIR manual was distributed to all LSSs and PAs prior to the October 2006 Leadership Conference.	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams

In addition, and as required by OSEP, the MSDE, DSE/EIS, submitted three reports addressing the "Special Conditions" required by OSEP. These "Special Conditions" reports were submitted on November 11, 2005, February 6, 2006, and May 10, 2006. The reports addressed actions to ensure individualized placement decisions and the provision of all related services as documented on student IEPs and improvement in the State's general supervision system.

MSDE also engaged in the following activities beyond the reporting period of this APR:

- TA and/or verification activities have been scheduled in all PAs with findings of noncompliance to ensure correction as soon as possible.

- The MSDE, DSE/EIS, 2006 Leadership Conference (October 18-20, 2006) focused on the theme "Moving Forward for Positive Results". This annual leadership conference was designed for public agency (PA) personnel. The conference focused on accountability measures for improving outcomes for children and youth with disabilities and correcting noncompliance. Planning for this meeting included input from multiple stakeholders and technical assistance by Dr. W. Alan Coulter, Director of the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring. Dr. Coulter presented multiple sessions at this meeting.

- MSDE updated the DSE/EIS Self-Assessment of PA performance on IDEA 2004, Part B Indicators for future dissemination to the public agencies. Dr. Coulter reviewed a draft of the self-assessment as part of the preparation for the fall 2006 Leadership Conference. The Self-Assessment has been aligned with the SPP indicators and will be presented at the upcoming FY 2008 Grants meeting for PAs on March 30, 2007.

Due to monitoring and other activities there has been progress in PAs within the State. MSDE's general supervisory activities have heightened the awareness of local directors regarding accountability for both performance and compliance outcomes. PA staff understands the nature of general supervision, monitoring activities, improved performance, compliance, and correction. For all PAs in general, and for

the nine PAs with sustained noncompliance in particular, MSDE will strengthen TA and enforcement actions.

The State is rigorous in identifying corrective actions and requiring CAPs the first time noncompliance is identified. The State's current performance related to correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year is substantially below the target. Within the context of improvement in the State's general supervision system, MSDE anticipates improved performance by the next APR and looks forward to reporting the data. The State's slippage is due to changes and clarification in verification timelines and parameters for changes in the baseline due to removal of individual student complaint investigations and due process hearings.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005.

MSDE has expanded its system of general supervision to address identified noncompliance. MSDE recognizes that the target of 100% has not been met and proposes the following improvement activities to make progress on reaching the standard. The selection of each activity is based on the findings and data in this report and is designed to promote and improve the State's general supervisory system.

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justification
When a CAP has been completed and PA submitted data to show correction has been made, the State will conduct verification activities as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the identification of noncompliance.	September 2006 – June 2007 and ongoing QAM CIDP Staff	The MSDE is implementing monitoring procedures consistent with IDEA requirements and OSEP interpretation of general supervision.
Develop data collection methods that continue to ensure data are valid and reliable across the DSE/EIS.	February 2007 – June 30, 2007 and ongoing DSE/EIS Staff	The data used to determine compliance or noncompliance with requirements of IDEA and COMAR that may result in corrective actions is gathered from various branches within the Division. Therefore, MSDE must maintain a data verification system.
Identify TA and monitoring activities that serve as alternatives to on-site activities.	February 2007 – June 30, 2007 QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD	On-site monitoring activities are staff and time intensive. Identifying TA and monitoring activities that do not require on-site visits will allow MSDE to more efficiently review data, track progress and conserve resources. This may enhance correction of noncompliance within one year of identification.
Coordinate the findings from the Self-Assessment instrument with	March 2007	The Office of QAM, in collaboration with the PASD, is

grants in the Local Application for Federal Funds (LAFF).	PASD Staff	aligning self-assessment results with the LAFF to ensure funds are utilized to implement corrective actions in accordance with assurances.
Based on an analysis of the data, implement TA activities that addresses targeted areas in PAs.	February 2007 – December 2007 and ongoing QAM MITP/PS PASD	Increasing TA activities will assist PAs in improving performance, maintaining compliance and correcting noncompliance within one year.
Conduct DSE/EIS general supervisory coordination meetings for the purpose of coordinating practices, data collection and improving the rate of correction of noncompliance through TA and other strategies of enforcement.	February 1, 2007 – June 30, 2007 and ongoing QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD	General supervisory meetings between various branches in the DSE/EIS will assist in coordinating general supervisory responsibilities and address and prevent gaps in meeting these responsibilities. This process allows the division to utilize expertise for TA.
Clarify and expand enforcement activities.	May 2007 – June 2007 QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD	MSDE is aligning enforcement actions to be consistent with the four categories utilized by OSEP. Based on the Secretary's "Determinations" and information provided in the SPP, DSE/EIS is required to provide this information to the PAs to ensure understanding of the implications for enforcement actions.
Work with PAs to ensure adequate systems are in place that are designed to self-identify, monitor, and correct noncompliance.	February 2007 – December 2007 and ongoing QAM PASD	Self-identification and correction of noncompliance by PAs is expected to result in improved rate of compliance overall and reduce the number of State identified corrective actions. Since determinations are based on the State's performance in the aggregate, it is in the State's interest to support PA self-monitoring activities.
Update the monitoring manual, as necessary. Clarify how PAs are selected for monitoring and how determinations are made.	May 2007 – September 2007 and ongoing QAM, CIDP, MITP/PS	The MCIR manual, as a general information source for PAs and the public, is updated to reflect the changes in federal and State regulations and ensure understanding of the monitoring

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 69__

		selection process and how enforcement determinations are made.
Align indicators with the State's monitoring areas for reporting.	March 2007 – June 30, 2007 QAM CIDP MITP/PS PASD	Alignment of indicators with State monitoring areas will clarify the targets and ensure consistency of data and reporting.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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 2005 (2005-2006)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

99% - see Table 7

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

99% of complaints were resolved within the 60-day timeline or within a timeline extended as required during the 2005-2006 school year. This represents one (1) complaint not completed within acceptable timelines. OSEP's March 20, 2006, letter regarding this Indicator states that "OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement." While we did not meet the target of 100%, it represents an improvement over the previous year, where 3 letters of finding were not completed within allowable timelines. This improvement was accomplished in spite of having to replace the Section Chief who oversees the complaint investigation process and the addition of one new investigator.

Maryland has begun a limited project utilizing facilitators to assist parents and school systems at IEP meetings. This project was instituted in 5 pilot counties, with hopes of increasing public agency participation over the next several years. Hopefully, this will reduce the number of State complaints, due process complaints, and formal mediation requests.

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Review and revise, as appropriate complaint resolution procedures to ensure consistency with IDEA 2004 and its implementing regulations.	It was anticipated that the MSDE would review and revise, as appropriate, complaint resolution procedures to ensure consistency with IDEA 2004, however, without the final regulations no revisions were necessary to the State complaint process during this time period.	N/A

Recruit and retain qualified personnel needed to ensure complaint investigations are conducted within proper timelines.	During this reporting period we received approval to hire up to two (2) additional investigators to add to the staff responsible for resolving complaints.	DSE/EIS Staff MSDE Office of Human Resources
Provide professional development to DSE/EIS staff to ensure staff members are properly trained and knowledgeable of the requirements of IDEA 2004 and State special education law.	Professional development activities continued to occur over the past year to provide guidance to MSDE/EIS and public agency personnel regarding changes to IDEA 2004. Activities have included staff attending the LRP Conference, the State's annual Leadership Conference, and other activities for which we brought in experts in the field to discuss significant changes to the Act. Staff has also provided in-service activities for SEA and public agency staff, and parent advocacy groups regarding the IDEA 2004 requirements.	DSE/EIS Staff MSRRC Contact AG Office

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justifications
Project utilizing facilitators to assist parents and school systems at IEP meetings.	September 2005 and ongoing DSE/EIS Staff LSS staff Consultants	This project was instituted in 5 pilot LSSs, with hopes to increase public agency participation over the next several years. Hopefully, this will reduce the number of State complaints, due process complaints, and formal mediation requests.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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 2005 (2005-2006)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

97% - see Table 7

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

97% of due process hearings were completed within the required timelines. This represents one (1) due process hearing not completed within acceptable timelines. This is an improvement over the previous year where nine (9) decisions were not issued within the required timelines. The one (1) decision not rendered within the required timelines was a result of the parent and the local school system agreeing to continue to try to resolve the dispute through ongoing resolution meetings. The complaint required an expedited due process hearing, and therefore, an extension of time is not permitted. In light of this decision being issued outside of the expedited timelines the DSE/EIS recognized that further steps needed to be taken to avoid future occurrences. A DSE/EIS staff member now reviews all due process complaints, and if it appears the complaint may require an expedited due process hearing the public agency is contacted and informed of the steps necessary to be taken to ensure a timely hearing as required. OSEP's March 20, 2006, letter regarding Maryland's SPP identified Indicator #17 as requiring action. The letter states, "The State must submit data that demonstrate compliance with this requirement by June 1, 2006." In response to this request, the DSE/EIS responded, by letter, dated May 10, 2006. In our response the above mentioned due process hearing which was not completed within required timelines was also documented along with the actions taken to remediate any future occurrences as referenced above.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisions April 5, 2007)

Page 73__

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Meet regularly with OAH	Quarterly meetings with OAH continue to take place to discuss mutual concerns, and improvement activities.	DSE/EIS Staff AG Office
Provide OAH with monthly timeliness reports for all hearing decisions rendered	Monthly timeline reports continue to be provided to OAH administrative staff to assist with monitoring compliance.	DSE/EIS Staff
Evaluate each ALJ on the timeliness of their decisions	OAH continues to evaluate each ALJ on the timeliness of their decisions.	OAH Staff
Provide professional development to ALJs and OAH staff on legal updates and revisions to federal and State policies and procedures, as appropriate.	ALJs and OAH staff attended national training specifically geared for special education hearing officers and mediators, and LRP.	ALJs, OAH Staff, DSE/EIS Staff

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justification
Receive copies of all requests for due process hearing and review requests to determine if an expedited hearing is warranted. If upon receipt of a request that may need an expedited hearing, MSDE contacts OAH so appropriate action can be taken without delay.	May 2006 and ongoing DSE/EIS staff	OSEP's March 20, 2006, letter regarding Maryland's SPP identified Indicator #17 as requiring action. The letter states, "The State must submit data that demonstrate compliance with this requirement by June 1, 2006." In response to this request, the DSE/EIS responded, by letter, dated May 10, 2006. DSE/EIS staff member now reviews all due process complaints, and if it appears the complaint may require an expedited due process hearing the public agency is contacted and informed of the steps necessary to be taken to ensure a timely hearing as required.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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 2005 (2005-2006)	Maintain 75 – 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

73% - see Table 7

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

The DSE/EIS recognizes the slippage in the percentage of mediations which resulted in written agreements. In light of this information, we carefully analyzed the data regarding the above referenced data. We found that of the 63 cases where mediation was attempted and did not result in an agreement, 37% of these cases involved a desire for a more restrictive environment and we would not expect either party to resolve such a dispute through a mediated agreement. We are also considering that the recent court decision, Weast vs. Schaffer, which lays the burden of proof on the party opposing the IEP as also having an impact on mediation settlements. We will continue to analyze this data and determine if additional steps are required to maintain our target.

In the future we look forward to analyzing mediation and resolution data together to determine the early resolution settlement rate of disputes.

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Meetings with OAH staff	The DSE/EIS continues to conduct quarterly meetings with OAH to discuss mutual concerns regarding the use and success of mediations.	DSE/EIS staff OAH staff
Encourage public agency's attendance at conferences which encourage and discuss the use of mediation and other less formal means of dispute resolution.	During this reporting period DSE/EIS staff has conducted presentations for public agency staff and parent advocates encouraging	DSE/EIS staff

	the use of mediation and other less formal means of dispute resolution.	
Review and analyze mediation data to ensure public agencies are offering mediation to resolve disputes.	*See Improvement Activities and Justification Chart below.*	*N/A*
Train mediators through attendance at conferences and workshops.	The OAH staff continues to attend national and in-service training specifically geared for special education mediators.	DSE/EIS Staff Consultants

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justification
Review and analyze mediation data to ensure public agencies are offering mediation to resolve disputes.	N/A	<u>Justification to Remove:</u> We will continue to review and analyze mediation data, however, with use of resolution meetings, monitoring this activity alone does not portray an accurate portrait of early dispute resolutions. We are encouraging the use of all means to resolve disputes at the local level without SEA intervention. This includes resolution meetings, mediation, IEP Facilitation, and other ways to resolve disputes. Hopefully, this will reduce the number of State complaints, due process complaints, and formal mediation requests.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.

Revised Indicator 20 Baseline Date (as per March 20, 2006) OSEP letter.

On March 20, 2006, OSEP notified MSDE of its review of the Part B SPP. Attached to that letter was Table A that identified issues to be addressed by MSDE by providing additional information as part of the State's APR. Specific to Indicator 20, OSEP stated, "The State should reconsider the baseline data provided for Indicator 20 of the SPP and provide accurate information, including improvement activities in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information in this indicator may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of IDEA."

The baseline for FY 2004 (2004-2005) was revised to reflect:

• 100% of the 618 data and annual performance reports were submitted on or before due dates; and

• 19 out of 20 Indicators reported accurate data.

MSDE developed the following measurement to address OSEP's concerns:

$(a + b) \div (c + d) \times 100 = \text{Percent}$

The elements are defined as follows:

a = Number of 618 data submissions on or before due date.

b = Number of SPP/APR Indicators with accurate data

c = Total number of required 618 data and SPP/APR data submissions

d = Total number of SPP/APR Indicators

In the reconsideration of the FFY 2004 (2004-2005) SPP baseline data, considering the incomplete/inaccurate data submitted for Indicator 12 MSDE has determined the for the FFY 2004 (2004-2005) SPR the results indicate the following:

a = Number of 618 and SPP/APR data submissions on or before due date = (6)

b = Number of SPP/APR Indicators with accurate data = (19)

c = Total number of required 618 and SPP/APR data submissions = (6)

d = Total number of SPP/APR Indicators = (20)

$(a + b) \div (c + d) \times 100 =$ Percent

$(6 + 19) \div (6 + 20) \times 100 = (25) \div (26) \times 100 = 96.4\%$

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are submitted on or before due dates.

Name of Report	Date Due	Date Submitted	Follow-up Questions from WESTAT or OSEP	Response to Follow-up	Flags
Table 5 Discipline	11/1/05	10/31/05		Submitted 6/12/06 Data Notes to WESTAT	Yes
Table 4 Exit	11/1/05	10/31/05		Exit Data resubmitted 11/22/06	Yes
Table 2 Personnel	11/1/05	10/31/05		Data Notes 9/1/06 Revised Data 11/18/06	Yes
Table 1 Child Count	2/1/06	2/1/06		Resubmitted 2/8/06	Yes
Table 3 LRE	2/1/06	2/1/06		Resubmitted 2/10/06	Yes
FFY 04 (7/1/04-6/30/05 SPP	12/2/05	12/2/05	3/20/06	In accordance with 3/20/06 letter - 2/1/07	
Indicator 17	6/1/06	5/10/06	3/20/06	Response required by 3/20/06 OSEP Letter	

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisisons April 5, 2007)

Page 78__

Flag = Year to year significant change. Data is loaded into database. If necessary, WESTAT asks the state to revise the data or send "Data Notes" explaining the change.

MSDE has been approved to submit exit data through Eden.

Following the formula above:

a = Number of data submissions on or before due date (There were 6 required 618 and SPP/APR data submissions required plus an additional data submission on or before June 1, 2006 for Indicator 17 as specified in Table B of the March 20, 2006 OSEP letter to MSDE) = 7

b = Number of SPP/APR Indicators with accurate data = 20

c = Total number of required 618 and SPP/APR data submissions = 7

d = Total number of SPP/APR Indicators = 20

$(a + b) \div (c + d) \times 100$ = Percent

$(7 + 20) \div (7 + 20) \times 100 = (27) \div (27) \times 100 = 100\%$

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 <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

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 DSE/EIS collaborates with staff members from the Division of Accountability and Assessment (DAA), the Division of Instruction (DI), and the Division of Student, Family and School Support (DSFSS) to collect, disaggregate, analyze, report, and/or develop new data collections, as determined appropriate, to ensure data on students with disabilities required in accordance with IDEA are accurate, valid, and reliable.

These collaborations include the following:

- 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 in the 2007-2008 school year using the New Maryland's Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems. MSDE will implement 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.

- Public agencies complete cross reference 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. Public agencies 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 Mdk12 website is available to assist schools and other interested parties to analyze state assessment data and guide them in

Part B State Annual Performance Report for *(FFY 2005 (2005-2006))*
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 08-31-2009) (Resubmitted with revisons April 5, 2007)

Page 79__

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 (LRE) data on students with disabilities. At present MSDE is testing the ability to match the DSE/EIS Special Services Information System (SSIS) data collection on students with disabilities which generates LRE data with the MSA data collection system. The links are presently based on several logarithms and direct matches and student identifiers. Please refer to Indicators 3 and 5 for more 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. At present these relational links are being instituted in many local school systems (LSS). MSDE is not presently able to complete this transaction electronically, however manual comparisons are being conducted. This process will be used to check the validity of data reported in Indicator 2.

- Linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) data collection on children, birth to three years old, to SSIS for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old. MSDE has added additional fields to the SSIS 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 would result in enhancements to the data system that would allow for collection of cumulative data through mdssis.org. Please refer to Indicator 12 for additional information.

Most LSS and PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students. However, 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 have no electronic web-based management of special education records. MSDE/JCEP has made some progress toward utilizing an electronic web based management system and anticipates the use of the statewide IEP system by the 2007-2008 school year.

The SSIS 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 LSS, 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 on a local level. Most PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students.

Other LSS and PA 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. Six LSS and one PA who are utilizing the Statewide IEP System are presently testing submission of data to the SSIS nightly utilizing a scripting program (Tumbleweed from Apache Software, Inc). 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 LSS/PA. The LSS/PA SSIS 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 LSS/PA corrects the errors online. Once corrected records are accepted LSS/PA can extract the corrected file and repopulate the LSS/PA system with the corrected records.

Data on students with disabilities is submitted electronically from public agencies. Each LSS and PA 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 SSIS records is required and must be accurately maintained. The database consists of two types of records: the SSIS Student Record that contains student demographic information; and the SSIS 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 SSIS data. These data submissions are for the last Friday of October Census Data, including the annual child count, and the June 30 Exit data. LSS/PA using the 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 LSS/PA 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 SSIS secure server is available 24 hours a day for file submissions. The secure server is backed up nightly and replicated off-site. Files posted are reviewed and edited daily.

- Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk.

- Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed.

- The SSIS 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.
- Upon receipt of the SSIS data, each SSIS 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 LSS/PA.
- Each LSS/PA data manager receives a copy of the report for review and verification.

In the event that discrepancies are found, the LSS/PA 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 LSS/PA 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 an Individual Education Programs (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.

To ensure validity, the MSDE SSIS 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 LSS/PA submit data.

- MSDE regularly revises the SSIS Manual according to State and/or Federal regulations. The Manual is distributed at Data Managers Meetings and is also sent to each LSS/PA 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. Additional internal reports produced are the 5% Analysis Report which highlights any LSS or PA 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 LSS/PA 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 LSS or PA provides MSDE the reasons for large changes in data and that information is analyzed at MSDE and provided to WESTAT.

- MSDE conducted a routine audit that compared Special Services Information System (SSIS) to Exit Data from each LSS/PA. The students were matched by using the student's social security number (SSN) as the link between two data collections. The MSDE required LSS/PA to explain/revise data following an analysis of the students who were described as exited in the SSIS Exit Count, yet also reported as receiving services in the next SSIS Child Count Data. After reviewing the LSS/PA are required to provide to MSDE a letter of summary analysis of findings for each category. All student records referenced in the detailed report provided to the LSS/PA 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. PA data systems are student level systems and sampling may be required for audits and record reviews.

- MSDE Division of Budget and Management routinely audits LSS to determine whether: (1) students included on the State Aid for Special Education report are eligible; (2) applicable laws and regulations are complied with governing State Financial Assistance under Special Education Grant; and (3) accurate data is reported in claiming State funds.

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 LSS and PA reported all required special education data for FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005). The submission dates were within the OSEP timeline requirements. MSDE will continue to provide technical assistance to LSS/PA to facilitate timely accurate data submission. The validity and reliability of student level data are high. MSDE uses validation rules to ensure that SSIS 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 be 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. However, the development of predefined reports and an end-user maintenance function to permit data imports by dialogue boxes has been delayed due to vendor delays. MSDE still 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 LSS web-based standardized IEP system parallel running of the SSIS will be completed during the 2005-2006 school year.

Improvement Activities	Activities Completed	Resources
Conduct professional development activities with LSS and PA data managers and LSS and PA directors of special education	Annually June 2005 (3)–Regional Meetings June 2006 (3)–Regional Meetings	DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data managers
Conduct MSDE internal parallel test of Enhanced SSIS System using LSS Child Count data	December 2005 Conducted parallel testing of the Old SSIS and New mdssis.org completed October 2005 and April 2006 The MDSSIS.org system went live June 6, 2006.	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Conduct pilot testing of Enhanced SSIS System using LSS data	January - February 2006 Advisory Committee pilot test summer 2005	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Conduct professional development for LSS/PA staff on Enhanced SSIS System and predefined reports created with the SSIS warehouse System	March – April 2006 June 7 - 8, 2006 (4 sessions, AM and PM)	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Develop MSDE production usage of enhanced SSIS System for administrative section of online SSIS system	October 2006 June 6, 2006 went live with new mdssis.org	JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Validate LSS/PA data	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultants

submissions		DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Participate in QAM monitoring of LSS/PA data collection and reporting, as appropriate	Annually DSISB staff shared results of results of Exit/October Child Count Audit with QAM November 2006.	DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA data mangers
Technical assistance to LSS/PA on data submissions prior to submissions to OSEP/WESTAT	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Researching the feasibility of developing a web-based data entry system to report these data to MSDE	From Present to July 2007	DSE/EIS Staff Center for Technology in Education DataLab USA
Share the New Excel Form with Data Managers, for input on proposed changes to fields in SSIS record layout and discuss the consideration of cumulative data collection using mdssis.org	Regional meetings held January 17,18,19, and 22- 2007	SSIS Data Managers Directors of Special Education QAM Preschool Staff
Recommendations to MSDE Leadership, QAM (monitoring), Special Education State advisory Committee (SESAC), and data staff regarding procedures for collecting and reporting data for Special Education Indicator 11	Present to May 2007	MSDE Leadership, QAM SESAC Data Collection staff/Data Managers

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

- Linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) data collection on children, birth to three years old, to SSIS for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old. MSDE has added additional fields to the SSIS 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 data fields in the FFY 2004 (2004-2005) baseline year did not provide the required cumulative data; therefore MSDE used Excel forms for the collection of data for Indicator 12 for the FFY 2005(2005-2006) collection. 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) at which time the data will be collected through the online Statewide IEP.   MSDE provided technical assistance for collecting and reporting this data at annual

Data Managers meetings in 2005-2006. Additionally this subject is on the agenda for Data Managers meetings scheduled for January 2007. Please refer to Indicator 12 for additional information.

- MSDE/JCEP has made some progress toward utilizing an electronic web based management system and should be using the statewide IEP system by the 2007-2008 school year.

- MSDE conducted an annual audit that compared Special Services Information System (SSIS) October Child Count Data to Exit Data from each LSS/PA. The students were matched by using the student's social security number (SSN) as the link between two data collections. The MSDE required LSS/PA to explain/revise data following an analysis of the students who were described as exited in the SSIS Exit Count, yet also reported as receiving services in the next SSIS Child Count Data. Each LSS/PA is required to provide to MSDE a letter of summary analysis of findings for each category of exit. All student records referenced in the detailed report provided to the LSS/PA may be included in a random audit of these records. OSEP Tables 3 and 4 may be revised as a result of findings.

- Results of the annual audit that compared Special Services Information System (SSIS) October Child Count Data to Exit Data from each LSS/PA was shared with the Quality Assurance Monitoring Branch (QAM) at MSDE. Staff from the QAM Branch is invited to attend Data Managers meetings.

Improvement Activities	Timeline/Resources	Justification
New Activity Review LSS/PA policies, procedures, practices to ensure valid, reliable, accurate, and timely data reporting.	February 2007 and ongoing DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA staff	Division data management and program staff worked closely with local school system staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported for FFY 05. A review of local policies, procedures, and practices relative to valid, reliable, and accurate data collection along with support and technical assistance to LSS/PA staff will enable LSS/PA to maintain and report accurate timely data.
New Activity Linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) data collection on children, birth to three years old, to SSIS for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old	June 30, 2008	It was realized that the data fields in the FFY 2004 (2004-2005) baseline year did not provide the required cumulative data. MSDE used Excel forms for the collection of data for Indicator 12 for the FFY 2005 (2005-2006) collection.
New Activity It is anticipated that MSDE will continue to use Excel forms to collect data on children served under Part C transitioning into		Instruction for completing the 2006-2007 Excel forms and results of 2005-2006 data collection was on the agenda for Data Managers meetings

Part B through FFY 2007 (2007-2008)		in January 2007 (January 17-22, 2007) After FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data for Indicator 12 will be collected through the online Statewide IEP
Integrate the SSIS Data Warehouse into MSDE existing infrastructure.	<u>Revised Timeframe</u> June 2006- June 2008 JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff	DAA staff met with MSDE IT staff and CTE staff in June 2006. It was determined that the SSIS Data Warehouse cannot be integrated into the MSDE existing infrastructure at this time. MSDE is researching additional hardware/software needed to integrate the system.