



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

June 23, 2014

Dr. Lillian Lowery  
State Superintendent of Schools  
Maryland State Department of Education  
200 West Baltimore Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2595

Dear State Superintendent Lowery:

I am writing to advise you of the U. S. Department of Education's (Department) 2014 determination under section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Maryland needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of the State's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2012 Annual Performance Plan (APR) and revised State Performance Plan (SPP), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

As you know, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is implementing a revised accountability framework designed to more directly support States in improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities, and their families. Section 616(a)(2) of the IDEA requires that the primary focus of IDEA monitoring be on improving educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities, and ensuring that States meet the IDEA program requirements.

OSEP's previous accountability system placed a heavy emphasis on compliance and we have seen an improvement in States' compliance over the past seven years of IDEA determinations. OSEP's new accountability framework, called Results Driven Accountability (RDA), brings into focus the educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities while balancing those results with the compliance requirements of IDEA. Protecting the rights of children with disabilities and their families is a key responsibility of State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs), but it is not sufficient if children are not attaining the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve the goals of IDEA as reflected in Congressional findings in section 601(c)(1) of the IDEA Improvement Act of 2004: equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency.

From the start, OSEP committed to several key principles to guide the development of a new accountability framework, including transparency, stakeholder involvement, and burden reduction. In keeping with these principles, over the past two years we have solicited input from stakeholders on multiple occasions and published a new SPP/APR for FFYs 2013 through 2018. The revised SPP/APR significantly reduces data collection and reporting burden by States, and shifts the focus to improving educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities by requiring each State to develop and implement a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The Department is committed to supporting States in the development and implementation of the SSIP which is designed to improve results for all children, including children with disabilities,

and is investing significant resources toward that commitment. OSEP is implementing a system of differentiated monitoring and support, using data on performance (i.e., results data) and other information about a State to determine the appropriate intensity, focus, and nature of the oversight and support that each State will receive as part of RDA. OSEP's technical assistance network will be a key component of differentiated support to States and, through States, to local programs. We believe that only through a coordinated effort across the education system will we positively affect the school and life trajectories of children with disabilities.

In making determinations in 2013, the Department used a compliance matrix that included compliance data on multiple factors, thereby allowing us to consider the totality of a State's compliance data. In the 2013 determination letters, OSEP informed States that it would use results data when making determinations in 2014. OSEP published a Request for Information to solicit comments regarding how results data could be used in making IDEA determinations in 2014 and beyond, and has carefully reviewed these comments in deciding how to use results data in making determinations in 2014.

Your State's 2014 determination is based on the data reflected in the State's "2014 Part B Compliance Matrix" and "2014 Results Driven Accountability Matrix." Enclosed with this determination letter are the following: (1) the State's "2014 Part B Compliance Matrix" and "2014 Results Driven Accountability Matrix;" (2) a document entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2014: Part B," which provides a detailed description of how OSEP evaluated States' data using the Compliance and RDA Matrices; (3) your State's FFY 2012 Response Table, which provides OSEP's analysis of the State's FFY 2012 APR and revised SPP; and (4) a Data Display, which presents certain State-reported data in a transparent, user-friendly manner. The Data Display will be posted on OSEP's Web site and will be helpful for the public in getting a broader picture of State performance in key areas.

For the 2014 determinations, the Department is using results data on the participation of children with disabilities on regular Statewide assessments; the proficiency gap between children with disabilities and all children on regular Statewide assessments; and the performance of children with disabilities on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). At this time, we can meaningfully use data on the participation rate, and proficiency gap, on regular Statewide assessments. We plan to measure growth in the proficiency of children with disabilities when States have transitioned to college- and career- ready standards and assessments. In the interim, we are using data from NAEP on the performance of children with disabilities, which provide a consistent and fair benchmark for performance of children across all States. In the future, OSEP plans to use only regular Statewide assessment data, rather than NAEP data, for annual determinations, including data on the growth in proficiency of children with disabilities on Statewide assessments.

As noted above, the State's 2014 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's 2014 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2011, 2012, and 2013) IDEA Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2014 determination.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following Web site: <https://osep.grads360.org/#program/highlighted-resources> (link goes live July 18, 2014), and requiring the State to work with appropriate entities. In addition, the State should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/newccp/index.html>. The Secretary directs the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. We strongly encourage the State to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which the State received a score of zero or less. Your State must report with its FFY 2013 SPP/APR submission, due February 2, 2015, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

As a reminder, your State must report annually to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR. In addition, your State must: (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP; (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA; (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and (4) inform each LEA of its determination. Finally, please ensure that your APR, updated SPP, and report on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP are posted on the SEA's Web site and made available to the public.

OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with your State over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance, please contact Dwight Thomas, your OSEP State Contact, at 202-245-6238.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Melody Musgrove". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Melody Musgrove, Ed.D  
Director  
Office of Special Education Programs

Enclosures

cc: State Director of Special Education

## **How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2014: Part B**

### **Introduction**

In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) is using both results and compliance data in making our determination for each State under section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). We considered the totality of the information we have about a State, including information related to participation and performance of children with disabilities on regular Statewide assessments and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); the State's Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR)/State Performance Plan (SPP); information from monitoring and other public information, such as Special Conditions on the State's grant award under Part B; and other issues related to State compliance with the IDEA. Below is a detailed description of how the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) evaluated States' data using the Compliance Matrix and the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix. The RDA Matrix includes scoring on Results Elements and a Results Performance Percentage (collectively, "Results Matrix"), a Compliance Performance Percentage, and an RDA Percentage and Determination.

### **The 2014 Part B Compliance Matrix**

In making each State's 2014 determination, the Department used a Compliance Matrix, reflecting the following data:

1. The State's FFY 2012 data for Part B Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 20 (including whether the State reported valid and reliable data for each indicator); and, if the FFY 2012 data the State reported under Indicators 11, 12, and 13 reflected compliance between 90% and 95% (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, were between 5% and 10%), whether the State demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance it had identified in FFY 2011 under such indicators;
2. The State's FFY 2012 data, reported under section 618 of the IDEA, for the timeliness of State complaint and due process hearing decisions;
3. Whether the Department imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2013 IDEA Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2014 determination, and the number of years for which the State's Part B grant award has been subject to Special Conditions; and
4. Whether there are any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 or earlier by either the Department or the State that the State has not yet corrected.

### **Scoring of the Compliance Matrix**

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

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

In the attached State-specific 2014 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for each of Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13<sup>1</sup>:

- Two points, if either:
  - The State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95%<sup>2</sup> compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 5% compliance)<sup>3</sup>; or
  - The State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 90% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 10% compliance); and the State identified one or more findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011 for the indicator, and has demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for the indicator. Such full correction is indicated in the matrix with a "Y" (for "yes") in the "Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2011" column.<sup>4</sup>
- One point, if the State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 25% compliance), and the State did not meet either of the criteria above for two points.
- Zero points, under any of the following circumstances:
  - The State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator reflect less than 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect greater than 25% compliance); or
  - The State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator were not valid and reliable;<sup>5</sup> or

---

<sup>1</sup> A notation of "N/A" (for "not applicable") in the "Performance" column for an indicator denotes that the indicator is not applicable to that particular State. The points for that indicator are not included in the denominator for the matrix, and the indicator does not impact the State's compliance performance percentage, RDA percentage, or RDA determination.

<sup>2</sup> In determining whether a State has met this 95% compliance criterion, the Department will round up from 94.5% (but no lower) to 95%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 90% compliance criterion discussed below, the Department will round up from 89.5% (but no lower) to 90%. In addition, in determining whether a State has met the 75% compliance criterion discussed below, the Department will round up from 74.5% (but no lower) to 75%.

<sup>3</sup> For Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, a very high level of compliance is generally at or below 5%.

<sup>4</sup> An "N" (for "no") in that column denotes that the State has one or more remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction. An "N/A" (for "not applicable") in that column denotes that the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011 for the indicator.

<sup>5</sup> If a State's FFY 2012 data for any compliance indicator are not valid and reliable, the matrix so indicates in the "Performance" column, with a corresponding score of 0. The explanation of why the State's data are not valid and reliable is contained in the attached compliance data summary notes of the Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table.

- The State did not report FFY 2012 data for the indicator.<sup>6</sup>

### **Scoring of the Matrix for Compliance Indicators 15 and 20**

In the attached State-specific 2014 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for each of Compliance Indicators 15 and 20:

- Two points, if the State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, under any of the following circumstances:
  - The State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator reflect less than 75% compliance; or
  - The State's FFY 2012 data for the indicator were not valid and reliable; or
  - The State did not report FFY 2012 data for the indicator.

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

In the attached State-specific 2014 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for timely State complaint decisions and for timely due process hearings, as reported by the State under section 618 of the IDEA:

- Two points, if the State's FFY 2012 data were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the State's FFY 2012 data reflect at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the State's FFY 2012 data reflect less than 75% compliance.
- Not Applicable (N/A), if the State's data reflect less than 100% compliance, and there were fewer than ten State complaint decisions or ten due process hearing decisions.

### **Scoring of the Matrix for Long-Standing Noncompliance (Includes Both Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance and Special Conditions)**

In the attached State-specific 2014 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Long-Standing Noncompliance component:

- Two points, if the State has:
  - No remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2010 or earlier; and
  - No Special Conditions on its FFY 2013 grant award that are in effect at the time of the 2014 determination.

---

<sup>6</sup> If a State reported no FFY 2012 data for any compliance indicator, the matrix so indicates in the "Performance" column, with a corresponding score of 0.

- One point, if either or both of the following occurred:
  - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2010, FFY 2009, and/or FFY 2008, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
  - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2013 Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2014 determination.
- Zero points, if either or both of the following occurred:
  - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2007 or earlier, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
  - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2011, 2012, and 2013) IDEA Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2014 determination.

### **The 2014 Part B Results Matrix**

In making each State's 2014 determination, the Department used a Results Matrix reflecting the following data:

1. The percentage of fourth-grade and eighth-grade children with disabilities (CWD) participating in regular Statewide assessments;
2. The percentage of fourth-grade and eighth-grade CWD scoring proficient on regular Statewide assessments compared to all students scoring proficient on regular Statewide assessments (proficiency gap);
3. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD scoring at basic<sup>7</sup> or above on the NAEP;
4. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD excluded from NAEP testing;
5. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD scoring at basic or above on the NAEP; and
6. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD excluded from NAEP testing.

---

<sup>7</sup> While the goal is to ensure that all CWD demonstrate proficient or advanced mastery of challenging subject matter, we recognize that States may need to take intermediate steps to reach this benchmark. Therefore, this year we assessed the performance of CWD using the basic achievement level on the NAEP, which also provided OSEP with the broader range of data needed to identify variations in student performance across States. Generally, the Basic achievement level on the NAEP means that students have demonstrated partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.

These six Results Elements are scored separately for reading and math, for a total of twelve Results Elements.

The Results Elements are defined as follows:

Percentage of CWD Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments – This is the percentage of CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who took regular Statewide assessments in school year (SY) 2012-13 with and without accommodations. The numerator for this calculation is the number of CWD participating with and without accommodations on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2012-13, and the denominator is the number of all CWD participants and non-participants on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2012-13, excluding medical emergencies. The calculation is done separately by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading). (Data source: *EDFacts* SY 2012-13; data extracted 4/16/14.)

Proficiency Gap – This is the gap between (a) the percentage of CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who scored proficient on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2012-13 and (b) the percentage of students with and without disabilities, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who scored proficient on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2012-13. The calculation is done by subtracting (a) from (b). (Data source: *EDFacts* SY 2012-13; data extracted 4/16/14.)

Percentage of CWD Scoring Basic or Above on the NAEP – This is the percentage of CWD, not including students with a Section 504 plan, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who scored at or above basic on the NAEP in SY 2012-13. (Data Source: Main NAEP Data Explorer; data extracted 4/16/14.)

Percentage of CWD Excluded from NAEP Testing – This is the reported percentage of identified CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who were excluded from taking the NAEP in SY 2012-13. (Data Source: [http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/inclusion.asp#exclusion\\_rates](http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/inclusion.asp#exclusion_rates).)

### **Scoring of the Results Matrix**

In the attached State-specific 2014 Part B Results Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Results Elements:

- A State's participation rates on regular Statewide assessments were assigned scores of '2', '1' or '0' based on an analysis of the participation rates across all States and the percentage of CWD who participate in alternate assessments and whose proficient and advanced scores may be used for accountability purposes under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).<sup>8</sup> For a State that did

---

<sup>8</sup> Under the ESEA, in determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), a State may count the proficient and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards, up to a cap at the LEA and State levels, separately, of one percent of all students assessed in reading and math (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)(i)). In addition, a State may count the proficient and advanced scores of students with disabilities who take an alternate assessment based on modified academic



not administer the alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards (AA-MAAS), a score of '2' was assigned if at least 90% of their CWD participated in the regular Statewide assessment; a score of '1' if the participation rate for CWD was 81% to 89%; and a score of '0' if the participation rate for CWD was 80% or less. For a State that administered an AA-MAAS, a score of '2' was assigned if the participation rate of CWD was 70% or greater; a score of '1' if the participation rate of CWD was 61% to 69%; and a score of '0' if the participation rate of CWD was 60% or less.

- A State's proficiency gaps on regular Statewide assessments were rank-ordered; and the top third of States (i.e., those with the smallest proficiency gaps) received a '2', the middle third of States received a '1', and the bottom third of States (i.e., those with the largest proficiency gaps) received a '0'.
- A State's NAEP scores (basic and above) were rank-ordered; and the top third of States received a '2', the middle third of States received a '1', and the bottom third of States received a '0'.
- A State's NAEP exclusion rates were assigned scores of either '1' or '-1' based on the National Assessment Governing Board's recommendation that NAEP exclusion rates for CWD not exceed 15%.

---

achievement standards, up to a cap at the LEA and State levels, separately, of two percent of all students assessed in reading and math (34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c)(2)(ii) and (3)).

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

Results Elements	Results Scores		
	0	1	2
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessment (reading and math, separately)	≤ 80	81-89	≥ 90
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessment for States With AA-MAAS (reading and math, separately)	≤ 60	61-69	≥ 70
Proficiency Gap for 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessment (reading and math, separately)	≤ 35	34-27	≤ 26
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring basic or above on reading NAEP	≤ 23	24-29	≥ 30
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring basic or above on reading NAEP	≤ 29	30-37	≥ 38
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring basic or above on math NAEP	≤ 51	52-57	≥ 58
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring basic or above on math NAEP	≤ 26	27-33	≥ 34
Percentage of 4th and 8th grade CWD Excluded from NAEP (reading or math): -1 point if >15%. +1 point if ≤15%.			

After a State's RDA Results score was calculated, it was converted into a percentage. Using the cumulative possible number of points as the denominator, and using as the numerator the actual points the State received in its scoring under the Results Elements, the Results Matrix reflects a percentage that constitutes the State's 2014 Results Performance Percentage.

### The RDA Percentage and Determination

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

1. Meets Requirements – a State's 2014 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%,<sup>9</sup> unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2011, 2012, and 2013) IDEA Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2014 determination.
2. Needs Assistance – a State's 2014 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if

<sup>9</sup> In determining whether a State has met this 80% matrix criterion for a Meets Requirements determination, the Department will round up from 79.5% (but no lower) to 80%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 60% matrix criterion for a Needs Intervention determination discussed below, the Department will round up from 59.5% (but no lower) to 60%.

its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2011, 2012, and 2013) IDEA Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2014 determination.

3. Needs Intervention – a State's 2014 RDA Determination is Needs Intervention if the RDA Percentage is less than 60%.
4. Needs Substantial Intervention – The Department did not make a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention for any State in 2014.

<b>Maryland Part B Compliance Matrix: 2014</b>			
<b>Part B Compliance Indicator<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2011</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Indicator 4B:</b> Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 9:</b> Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 10:</b> Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 11:</b> Timely initial evaluation	97.37%	Y	2
<b>Indicator 12:</b> IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.31%	Y	2
<b>Indicator 13:</b> Secondary transition	98.70%	Y	2
<b>Indicator 15:</b> Timely correction	99.51%		2
<b>Indicator 20:</b> Timely and accurate State-reported data	100.00%		2
<b>Timely State Complaint Decisions</b>	100.00%		2
<b>Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions</b>	100.00%		2
<b>Longstanding Noncompliance</b>			2
<b>Special Conditions</b>	NONE		
<b>Uncorrected identified noncompliance</b>	NONE		
	<b>Total Compliance Score</b>		22

<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<b>Compliance Performance Percentage</b>
22	22	100.00%

1. The complete language for each indicator is located on page one of the State's Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table.

## Maryland Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table

### Part B SPP/APR Indicators

1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]
3. Statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator] B. Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments. [Results Indicator] C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; [Results Indicator] B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator]
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator]
7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]

10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. [Compliance 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. [Compliance Indicator]
13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. [Compliance Indicator]
14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. [Results 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. [Compliance Indicator]
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]

**Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions**  
**(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)**

**Timely Resolution of State Complaints:** 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

**Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests:** Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

**Maryland Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Results Data Summary**

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 TARGET</b>
1. Graduation	56.57%	57.41%	≥ 81.5% <sup>1</sup>
2. Drop Out	5.41%	5.87%	≤ 3.27% <sup>2</sup>
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup	48%	8%	≥ 50%
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading	99.17%	99.1%	≥ 95%
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Math	99.05%	98.86%	≥ 95%
C. Proficiency Rate	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	16.7%	16%	4.1 ≤ %
5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21			
A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day	67.12%	67.97%	≥ 63.11%
B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day	13.66%	13.34%	≤ 15.11%
C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals	7.01%	6.94%	≤ 6.22%
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending:			
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program;	63.6%	56.2%	≥ 64.1%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.	19.6%	20%	≤ 19.1%
7. Preschool Outcomes	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement-School Age	42%	40%	≥ 38%
Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement-Pre-School	49%	47%	≥ 40%
14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:			
A. Enrolled in Higher Education	24.94%	23.1%	≥ 50%
B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed	57.79%	56.73%	≥ 73%
C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment	85.99%	85.36%	≥ 82%
18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	70.5%	64.3%	≥ 64-75%
19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	76.6%	76.1%	≥ 75-85%

<sup>1</sup> As used in this table, the symbol “≥” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be greater than or equal to the established target.

<sup>2</sup> As used in this table, the symbol “≤” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be less than or equal to the established target.



**3.C Statewide Assessments:**

**Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

Grade	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
	Reading	Reading	Reading	Math	Math	Math
3	69.34%	61.57%	≥ 94.55%	63.37%	52.13%	≥ 95.22%
4	71.47%	66.87%	≥ 96.15%	66.09%	60.99%	≥ 95.19%
5	72.27%	65.36%	≥ 95.23%	61.01%	48.05%	≥ 94.13%
6	57.82%	51.77%	≥ 95.5%	54.13%	42.96%	≥ 93.12%
7	51.96%	53.95%	≥ 95.25%	49.68%	38.48%	≥ 92.83%
8	52.24%	44.61%	≥ 94.82%	37.96%	29.22%	≥ 92.64%
HS	51.56%	49.39%	≥ 93.17%	48.33%	48.16%	≥ 91.22%

**7. Percent of Preschool Children Aged 3 through 5 with IEPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes**

<b>Summary Statement 1<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>FFY 2011 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Target</b>
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	69.2%	67.3%	≥ 68.3%
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	70.4%	66%	≥ 68.6%
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	65.52%	61.5%	≥ 63.7%
<b>Summary Statement 2<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>FFY 2011 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Target</b>
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	69.53%	66.4%	≥ 73.5%
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	60.38%	55.7%	≥ 59.3%
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	67%	64.1%	≥ 66.2%

<sup>3</sup> **Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

<sup>4</sup> **Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

### Maryland FFY 2012 Results Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 3B: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 3C: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 4A: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that four districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.

The State reported that eight of 25 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “30 students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 school days in a school year.”

The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.

For the district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011 whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures, and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.

INDICATOR 7:

#### **REQUIRED ACTIONS**

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

**Maryland Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Compliance Summary**

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 TARGET</b>	<b>CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011</b>
4B. Significant disproportionality in suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
9. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
10. Disproportionate representation by disability of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
11. Timely Initial Evaluation	97.79%	97.37%	100%	The State reported that 21 of 22 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner and that the one remaining finding was subsequently corrected by February 2014.
12. Early Childhood Transition	99.89%	99.31%	100%	The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
13. Secondary Transition	97.5%	98.7%	100%	The State reported that 478 of 479 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner and that the one remaining finding was subsequently corrected by February 2014.

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
15. Timely Correction	98.08%	99.51%	100%	The State reported that 1,027 of 1,032 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner and that the five remaining findings were subsequently corrected by February 2014.
20. Timely and Accurate Data	97.82%	100%	100%	

**Maryland Part B FFY 2012 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports**

<b>REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 DATA</b>
Timely resolution of complaints	98.8%	100%
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	100%	100%

## Maryland FFY 2012 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 4B: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that four districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.

The State reported that 20 of 25 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “30 students with disabilities in a particular race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than 10 school days in a school year.”

The State reported that it corrected the noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b), i.e., that the State reviewed the district’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, for the districts identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2012.

INDICATOR 9: The State reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that four of 25 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “30 students with disabilities in a racial or ethnic category for all local school systems” and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 10: The State reported that 12 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that four of 25 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “30 students with disabilities in a racial or ethnic category for all local school systems” and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 11:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.<sup>5</sup> In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 12:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 13:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

<sup>5</sup> OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.



INDICATOR 15:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

In responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

Identification of Children with Disabilities

STUDENT ENROLLMENT, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Student Category	State Students (#)	State Students (%)	Nation Students (#)	Nation Students (%)
All students	760,509		44,960,222	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	90,367	11.9	5,823,844	13.0

Explanatory Note: The number of total students enrolled in public schools in the state and nation as of October 1, 2011 (or the closest day to October 1) for all grade levels from grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded. The number and percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2012). Children with disabilities (IDEA) are served by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Data reported for IDEA 2012 Child Count and the SY 2011-12 Common Core of Data (CCD). National IDEA Child Count data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and the national CCD data represent the US and Outlying Areas.

PERCENT OF POPULATION WHO ARE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA), AGES 3 THROUGH 21

Age	State (%) SY 2010-11	State (%) SY 2011-12	State (%) SY 2012-13	Nation (%) SY 2012-13
3 through 5	5.9	5.9	5.9	6.1
6 through 21	7.3	7.3	7.4	8.6

Explanatory Note: The percentage of the population who are children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state designated special education child count date, for the age ranges of 3 through 5 and 6 through 21. Data reported for IDEA 2012 Child Count and Census. National IDEA Child Count data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and national Census data represent the 50 states and DC (including BIE).

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	Percent of Overall Student Enrollment State (%)	Percent of Overall Student Enrollment Nation (%)
Autism	1.18	0.99
Deaf-blindness	0.00	0.00
Emotional disturbance	0.91	0.80
Hearing impairment	0.12	0.15
Intellectual disability	0.68	0.94
Multiple disabilities	0.49	0.28
Orthopedic impairment	0.04	0.12
Other health impairment	2.14	1.71
Specific learning disabilities	4.12	5.20
Speech or language impairment	1.85	2.36
Traumatic brain injury	0.03	0.06
Visual impairment	0.04	0.06

Explanatory Note: The percentage of enrollees who are children with disabilities (IDEA), by disability category, in the state and nation for the age range of 6 through 21 (excluding children with developmental delays). For this calculation, the numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) in a specific disability category as of the state-designated special education child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2012) for ages 6 through 21 (excluding children with developmental delays) and the denominator is the total number of students enrolled in public schools as of October 1, 2011 (or the closest school day to October 1) for all grade levels from grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded. Data reported for IDEA 2012 Child Count and 2011-12 CCD. National IDEA Child Count data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and national CCD data represent US and Outlying Areas.

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 3 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5 State (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5 Nation (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 6-21 State (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 6-21 Nation (%)
All disabilities	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Autism	6.6	7.8	10.1	7.8
Deaf-blindness	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Developmental delay*	51.6	37.2		
Emotional disturbance	0.1	0.4	7.8	6.3
Hearing impairment	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.2
Intellectual disability	0.5	2.0	5.9	7.4
Multiple disabilities	1.3	1.1	4.2	2.2
Orthopedic impairment	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.9
Other health impairment	1.8	2.9	18.5	13.5
Specific learning disabilities	0.1	1.2	35.5	41.0
Speech or language impairment	36.3	44.7	16.0	18.6
Traumatic brain injury	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4
Visual impairment	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5

\*Developmental delay is only allowable through age 9, so a 6-21 percentage cannot be calculated.

Explanatory Note: The percentage represents a distribution of children with disabilities (IDEA) by disability category for age ranges 3 through 5 and 6 through 21 (excluding children with developmental delays). For this calculation, the denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA) for the specified age range, excluding developmental delays for ages 6 through 21. Data reported for IDEA 2012 Child Count. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

**Graduation Rates**

FOUR-YEAR REGULATORY ADJUSTED COHORT GRADUATION RATE

	SY 2011-12 CWDs (IDEA) (%)	SY 2011-12 All Students (%)
Graduation Rate	57%	84%

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students from the original cohort who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma. Data reported for CSPR purposes.

Educational Environment

EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS, AGES 3 THROUGH 5

Disability Category	CWDs Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program State (%)	CWDs Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program Nation (%)	CWDs Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility State (%)	CWDs Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility Nation (%)
All disabilities	56.2	42.4	20.0	26.4
Autism	34.4	32.1	45.1	48.7
Deaf-blindness	0.0	31.3	100.0	50.9
Developmental delay	58.2	42.8	25.7	35.7
Emotional disturbance	33.3	47.7	44.4	22.8
Hearing impairment	29.2	35.6	54.5	42.5
Intellectual disability	26.5	31.2	39.7	45.6
Multiple disabilities	29.4	23.8	57.1	50.7
Orthopedic impairment	64.9	42.7	16.2	35.3
Other health impairment	45.0	44.8	41.6	29.0
Specific learning disabilities	100.0	51.5	0.0	11.8
Speech or language impairment	60.1	44.7	3.5	12.8
Traumatic brain injury	33.3	38.3	40.0	35.5
Visual impairment	69.6	44.7	17.4	32.6

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation by disability category attending a regular early childhood program, or a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility. Note that this table does not include all reported preschool educational environment categories. The denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 5, in the specified disability category. Data reported for IDEA 2012 Educational Environment. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Percent of Time Spent Inside the Regular Classroom

Disability Category	≥ 80% of Day State (%)	≥ 80% of Day Nation (%)	40 to 79% of Day State (%)	40 to 79% of Day Nation (%)	< 40% of Day State (%)	< 40% of Day Nation (%)	Separate School or Residential Facility State (%)	Separate School or Residential Facility Nation (%)
All disabilities	67.9	61.5	10.4	19.5	13.2	13.7	6.8	3.3
Autism	42.0	39.5	13.5	18.1	27.3	33.2	16.4	8.1
Deaf-blindness	26.7	21.5	13.3	11.5	13.3	34.0	40.0	27.8
Emotional disturbance	40.4	44.1	12.0	17.8	19.6	20.3	25.1	14.7
Hearing impairment	45.9	57.8	8.7	16.4	9.5	12.6	33.7	11.6
Intellectual disability	14.3	17.1	20.6	26.6	56.1	48.7	8.6	6.6
Multiple disabilities	27.9	13.1	10.3	16.2	24.1	46.2	35.6	20.7
Orthopedic impairment	61.0	54.8	16.9	16.2	14.2	21.6	6.0	4.7
Other health impairment	77.0	64.0	10.6	22.2	8.7	9.7	2.3	1.9
Specific learning disabilities	80.6	67.2	10.8	24.6	7.0	6.3	0.6	0.6
Speech or language impairment	91.4	86.6	2.9	5.5	1.7	4.3	0.2	0.3
Traumatic brain injury	47.3	49.0	14.6	22.3	20.9	20.1	15.1	5.8
Visual impairment	77.5	64.7	4.8	13.0	1.7	11.0	12.5	9.3

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation by disability category (excluding children with developmental delays) attending regular classrooms, or separate schools and residential facilities. Note that this table does not include all reported educational environment categories. The denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21 (excluding children with developmental delays), in a specified disability category. Data reported for IDEA 2012 Educational Environment. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

Participation and Performance on Assessments

PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) IN STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	General Assessment (%)	Alternate Assessment (%)	Non-participant (%)
4th grade reading/language arts	92	7	1
8th grade reading/language arts	90	9	1
High school reading/language arts	55	44	1
4th grade mathematics	92	7	1
8th grade mathematics	89	9	2
High school mathematics	53	45	1

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in statewide assessments for reading and mathematics for 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school. The denominator is the sum of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated and children with disabilities (IDEA) who did not participate in statewide assessments (excluding those with a significant medical emergency who did not take the assessment). Due to differences in the calculations used for the “children with disabilities (IDEA)” subgroup, these percentages may differ from those reported for the CSPR. Data reported for 2012-13 Assessment, accessed from ED Facts on April 16, 2014. Participation data submitted by the following states/ entities were flagged due to questionable data quality in one or more subject area, grade, and assessment type: BIE, CA, DC, ID, IL, MA, NM, OK, RI, WV, and WY.

PERFORMANCE ON STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	Proficient (%) General Assessment (CWD)	Proficient (%) Alternate Assessment (CWD)	Proficient (%) General Assessment (All Students)
4th grade reading/language arts	66	90	88
8th grade reading/language arts	41	89	81
High school reading/language arts	54	45	85
4th grade mathematics	60	84	89
8th grade mathematics	25	84	67
High school mathematics	57	39	87

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students in the state who scored at or above proficient (as determined by each state) on the general assessment for all students and children with disabilities (IDEA) in 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school, and the percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state who scored at or above proficient (as determined by each state) on the alternate assessment. Due to differences in the calculations used for the “all students” and “children with disabilities (IDEA)” subgroup, these percentages may differ from those reported for the CSPR. Data reported for 2012-13 Assessment, accessed from ED Facts on April 16, 2014. Achievement data submitted by the following states/ entities were flagged due to questionable data quality in one or more subject area, grade, and assessment type: BIE, CA, IL, MA, OK, and WY.

PERFORMANCE ON 2013 NAEP ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	At or Above (%) Basic (CWD)	At or Above (%) Basic (Non-CWD)	At or Above (%) Proficient (CWD)	At or Above (%) Proficient (Non-CWD)
4th grade reading/language arts	51	78	22	46
8th grade reading/language arts	51	83	9	43
High school reading/language arts				
4th grade mathematics	46	87	15	50
8th grade mathematics	29	79	6	41
High school mathematics				

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students in the state who scored at or above the Basic level and at or above the Proficient level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), for children with disabilities (IDEA) and children without disabilities. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires states that receive Title I funding to participate in the state NAEP in reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8 every two years. State NAEP does not provide individual scores for the students or schools assessed. Instead, NAEP provides results about subject-matter achievement, instructional experiences, and school environment, and reports these results for populations of students (e.g., fourth-graders) and subgroups of those populations (e.g., children with disabilities (IDEA)). Most states' proficiency standards are at or below NAEP's definition of the Basic performance level. See "Mapping State Proficiency Standards onto the NAEP Scales: Variation and Change in State Standards for Reading and Mathematics, 2005-2009" for more information.

EXCLUSION RATES FOR 2013 NAEP ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	Exclusion Rate State (%)	Exclusion Rate Nation (%)
4th grade reading/language arts	66	16
8th grade reading/language arts	60	15
High school reading/language arts		
4th grade mathematics	6	9
8th grade mathematics	9	10
High school mathematics		

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students identified as having a disability who were excluded from the NAEP assessment. National exclusion rates were based on figures available under "National (public)."



Race/Ethnicity

PERCENT OF STATE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	Hispanic/ Latino (%)	Black or African American (%)	White (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (%)	All Race/ Ethnicities (%)
All students	11.6	35.3	43.2	5.9	0.3	0.1	3.6	100.0
All disabilities	11.4	43.4	39.1	2.6	0.3	0.1	3.1	100.0
Autism	8.2	34.5	47.7	5.8	0.3	0.0	3.5	100.0
Deaf-blindness	13.3	13.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	100.0
Emotional disturbance	4.4	58.7	32.8	0.8	0.3	0.1	2.9	100.0
Hearing impairment	13.0	27.7	49.3	7.3	0.3	0.1	2.2	100.0
Intellectual disability	9.2	55.5	30.1	2.9	0.1	0.1	2.1	100.0
Multiple disabilities	8.1	35.3	49.4	2.9	0.3	0.1	3.9	100.0
Orthopedic impairment	11.6	41.9	38.2	4.5	0.7	0.0	3.0	100.0
Other health impairment	8.0	45.9	40.7	1.5	0.4	0.1	3.5	100.0
Specific learning disabilities	15.1	45.5	34.8	1.5	0.3	0.1	2.7	100.0
Speech or language impairment	12.9	32.7	46.2	4.2	0.3	0.1	3.6	100.0
Traumatic brain injury	7.1	43.9	40.6	2.9	0.8	0.4	4.2	100.0
Visual impairment	9.7	37.0	40.1	9.3	0.3	0.0	3.5	100.0

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category and particular race/ethnicity category in the state. The numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category and race/ethnicity category as of the state designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2012) and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category. The "All Student" row is calculated using the total number of students enrolled in public schools in grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded, in the state as of October 1, 2011 (or the closest day to October 1). Data reported for IDEA 2012 Child Count and 2011-12 CCD.

**PERCENT OF STATE CWDS (IDEA) BY EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21**

Educational Environment	Hispanic/Latino (%)	Black or African American (%)	White (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (%)	All Race/Ethnicities (%)
≥ 80% of day spent inside regular classroom	70.0	61.4	74.2	64.7	69.9	73.5	75.2	100.0
40 to 79% of day spent inside regular classroom	11.8	11.5	8.6	9.8	10.4	7.4	9.0	100.0
< 40% of day spent inside regular classroom	13.8	18.2	8.0	15.7	10.0	10.3	9.5	100.0
Separate school; Residential facility	3.8	7.6	6.6	7.8	7.9	7.4	5.2	100.0

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category and particular educational environment in the state. The numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category and particular educational environment as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2012) and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category. Data reported for IDEA 2012 Child Count.

**TOTAL DISCIPLINARY REMOVALS OF CWD (IDEA) IN STATE BY RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 3 THROUGH 21**

Student Group	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	White	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Two or more races	All Race/Ethnicities
Number of Disciplinary Removals per Child with a Disability	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3

Explanatory Note: The number of disciplinary removals per child with a disability (IDEA), ages 3 through 21, by race/ethnicity category. The numerator is the total number of disciplinary removals in a particular race/ethnicity category and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2011). Data reported for IDEA 2011-12 Discipline and 2011 Child Count.

**Parental Involvement**

INDICATOR 8: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (FFY 2012 APR, 2014)

	State (%)
Percent of parent with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	40.0
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of parents from whom a response is requested is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

**Preschool Outcomes**

INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES (FFY 2012 APR, 2014)

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each of the following outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program in the outcome of:	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	67.3
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	66.0
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	61.5
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each of the following outcomes by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	66.4
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	55.7
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	64.1
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

**Post School Outcomes**

INDICATOR 14: POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES (FFY 2012 APR, 2014)

Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were:	State (%)
Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	23.1
Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56.7
Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school	85.4
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

Data Display: **MARYLAND**  
Publication Year 2014

x Data have been suppressed to protect small cell counts.

<=3 Data in the cell are less than or equal to three.

- Data not available.

\* Data flagged due to questionable data quality. These data violated data quality edit checks. Additional information explaining the discrepancies in the data may be available in the accompanying data notes document.

Note: Sum of percentages may not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

References: Additional state-level data on children with disabilities (IDEA) can be found at: <http://www.ideadata.org>, <http://www.data.gov>, <http://www.eddataexpress.ed.gov>, <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/>, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>, and <http://factfinder2.census.gov>. Information on U.S. Department of Education Special Education funding can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/osep/2012apps.html>.