STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

For reporting on
FFY 2023

Maryland

PART B DUE February 3, 2025

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

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

Through the implementation of cross matrix leadership, the DEI/SES is committed to the following essential principles to improve results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with developmental delays and disabilities and their families:
Transparency: Maintaining an open door to stakeholders and regularly communicating through formal and informal outreach
Stakeholder Engagement: Engaging our stakeholders in timely and meaningful consultation on priority topics, including policies that affect children with disabilities
Effectiveness: Serving stakeholders in a timely and effective manner and ensure the availability of the best "real-time" data for decision-making and dissemination of evidence-based models throughout the State
Alignment: Arranging our priorities to be synchronous with those of MSDE and federal requirements while also including the concerns of our LEAs, LITPs, PAs, and advocates
Accountability: Striving to improve compliance and performance results for all LEA/PAs. The DEI/SES has developed a tiered system of general supervision and performance support to identify systems and agencies in need of differentiated support and TA (Differentiated Framework)

The Differentiated Framework includes tiers of general supervision and engagement to improve birth through 21 special education/early intervention results. Essential components of the Division's comprehensive system of general supervision include (see General Supervision section for detailed information):
Effective policies and procedures
State Performance Plan (SPP) goals & targets
Accountability to Improve Performance (AIP)
Fiscal management
Dispute resolution
Targeted TA & support

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

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

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

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

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

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

Special Services Information System (SSIS) 618 Data Collection
SSIS functions as a centralized data submission system for the IDEA Part B Section 618 data. Personnel data are collected annually in Excel spreadsheets. Section 618 data are submitted via a secure server file transfer of data from LEAs and PAs, which are to monitor and verify their data collection systems at the local level. Most PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students.

The following processes and procedures are in place to ensure the reliability of the data system:
The SSIS secure server is available twenty-four (24) hours a day for file submissions. The secure server is backed up nightly and replicated off-site. Files posted are reviewed and edited daily. Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using the Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk; and
Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed.

The SSIS Manual provides detailed information for LEAs/PAs to build mechanisms within their systems for data accuracy. The DEI/SES runs edit reports of the files for the LEAs and PAs to correct and resubmit their files to the DEI/SES. To ensure validity, the DEI/SES SSIS Manual provides data standardization for definitions and provides system edits similar to those suggested systems edits provided by the IDEA Data Center (IDC). Validity of the data and consistency with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data instructions are ensured throughout the data collection process by a number of practices and safeguards including edits built into the data collection system, such as data definition edits (what values are put in what fields), out-of-range edits, cross-field or relationship edits, and checks to ensure that all LEAs and PAs submit data.

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

The LEAs/PAs using the Maryland Statewide Online IEP (MOIEP) system transmit data nightly to the SSIS. Four (4) LEAs use vendor-supported IEP systems to aggregate data for electronic file transfers quarterly to an MSDE secure server for web-based data submission of the annual child count, census data, and exit data. Personnel data continue to be collected annually in Excel spreadsheets. Quarterly, the DEI/SES collects child count, exit count, and Indicators 11, 12, and 13 data from LEA/LITP/PAs.

The accuracy of the data is dependent upon the accuracy of the submitted school-level data. Questions and discrepancies in the data are verified by the DEI/SES staff with the respective LEA/LITP/PA. The LEA/LITP/PA SSIS Data Manager corrects errors and resubmits the entire data file to DEI/SES to ensure that corrections are made in both the database and the error file. SSIS allows two methods of data submission:
Data submitted as one large file and then corrected and resubmitted; or
Data submitted as a large file and error records are held in a suspense file until the LEA/LITP/PA corrects the errors online.

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

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

25

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

Comprehensive Monitoring
Much of the work of MSDE, DEI/SES relies on the Differentiated Framework, which establishes tiers of supervision and support. A LITP and LEA/PA is assigned to one of four tiers – Universal, Targeted, Focused, or Intensive – based upon performance on the SPP/APR compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The DEI/SES uses this comprehensive information to provide differentiated engagement, focused on building capacity, to improve performance and directs State resources to those LITPs and LEAs/PAs that are the lowest-performing. Its assigned Tier of General Supervision determines a LITP's and LEA's/PA's performance monitoring cycle, Differentiated Framework (above), the frequency of which is as follows:
Tier of General Supervision/Monitoring Frequency
Intensive Tier/Every Year
Focused Tier/Every Two Years
Targeted Tier/Every Three Years
Universal Tier/Every Four Years

The DEI/SES assigns Maryland's LITPs and LEAs/PAs to Tiers of Supervision based on annual SPP/APR data. The number of LITPs and/or LEAs/PAs varies annually based on their assigned Tier of General Supervision; however, each LITP and/or LEA/PA receives comprehensive monitoring at least once every four years. If a LITP and/or LEA/PA assigned to one particular Tier of General Supervision (i.e., Universal) based on one specific year of SPP/APR data is placed into a higher Tier of General Supervision (i.e., Targeted) based on a subsequent year's SPP/APR data, the DEI/SES will modify the LITP's and/or LEA's/PA's performance monitoring schedule based on the LEA's/PA's new Tier of General Supervision.

The DEI/SES may conduct additional monitoring activities based on Indicator data verification, trends and patterns emerging from State and due process complaints, fiscal data, family support information, advocacy concerns, and as directed by the Assistant State Superintendent. The DEI/SES also conducts additional targeted monitoring activities when it receives credible allegations of potential noncompliance (e.g., a targeted restraint and seclusion monitoring).

Subrecipient Fiscal Monitoring
The Resource Management and Monitoring Branch conducts ten (10) fiscal monitoring visits annually. The schedule of annual monitoring is dependent on the date of the prior monitoring visit and annual self-assessment data. Each LEA/PA is monitored at least once every six (6) years.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified compliance.

For Part C Desk Audit Reviews, the Monitoring Specialists will audit current-year Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSP) and Individualized Education Programs (IEP) from a randomly selected sample of children and students via ELEVATE, the State's performance Monitoring System. The purpose of the audit is to allow the Monitoring Specialists to identify significant IFSP/IEP development and implementation trends in the LITP and LEA/PA. The Monitoring Specialists primarily use the Maryland Online IFSP and the Maryland Online IEP tools to conduct desk audits. If the Monitoring Specialist is monitoring an LEA/PA that does not use the Maryland Online IEP system, the Monitoring Specialist will work with the LEA/PA staff to access the randomly selected IEPs, preferably through electronic review on the LEA's/PA's online system. Part C: The number of IFSPs the Monitoring Specialists audit is based on the number of children receiving Part C services from the LITP (identified by small, medium and large jurisdictions). Records are also pulled from each age band (birth to 1, 1 to 2, 2 to 3, and Extended IFSP). The DEI/SES staff use various parameters to randomly select children for the IFSP desk audits, including children with a range of eligibility criteria across varied ages.

Part C supporting documentation to include:
1. Signed consent for screening, assessment/evaluation, and initiation of Early Intervention (EI) services;
2. Evaluation reports;
3. Prior Written Notice (PWN);
4. Sign-in sheets; and
5. Progress on outcomes.

For Part C Related Service Record Reviews, the Monitoring Specialist will review twenty-five (25) Part C service records for each LITP; for a period of four (4) months, including at least one (1) summer month. ELEVATE randomly selects a sample of service records reviewed for direct services, not consult, for special instruction, Speech and Language Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Occupational Therapy. The LITP must upload to ELEVATE early intervention visit logs/notes indicating:
1. The length of time of each service session;
2. Activities completed during the session;
3. Progress toward child and family outcomes; and
4. Provider's signature and title.

For Part B Desk Audit Reviews, the number of IEPs the Monitoring Specialists audit is based on the number of students receiving Part B services from the LEA/PA, (identified by small, medium and large jurisdictions). Records are also pulled from each age band (preschool, elementary, middle, and high). The DEI/SES staff randomly selects students for the IEP desk audits, including students with a range of disabilities, across varied ages and grade levels. The sample will include, as appropriate, a student attending a charter school and a student placed in an adult correctional facility.
Part B supporting documentation to include:
1. IEP Team meeting sign-in sheets to reflect attendance of all required participants, including parent /guardian and the student (as appropriate);
2. Prior Written Notice; and
3. Signed Parental Consent for:
o Assessment(s);
o Use of Accommodations forms such as Human Reader (include "Appendix D") and Scribe (include "Appendix C");
o Participation in the Alternate Framework (include "Appendix A");
o Use of restraint and seclusion; and
o Placement in an Alternative School.

For Part B Related Service Reviews, the Monitoring Specialists will review twenty-five (25) Part B Related Services records for each LEA/PA, over four (4) school months. ELEVATE randomly selects a sample of related service records that will be reviewed for direct services, not consult, for: Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Speech and Language Therapy, Audiology, Orientation and Mobility, Counseling, and Psychological services. The LEA/PA must enter district-wide and school-specific calendar events (holidays, snow days, and/or other district-wide days off, morning delays, and/or early dismissals) to the master calendar in ELEVATE and upload to the individual student record the following:
1. A copy of the daily attendance record, for the current school year, for each student receiving the randomly selected related service;
2. The service provider therapy log for each related service, documenting the length of time of each session provided to the student during the monitoring window, notes documenting activities conducted and progress towards the student's IEP goals, and the service provider's signature and title;

and
3. Contact logs documenting an acceptable reason for any missed related services, as appropriate.

Compliance is determined by ensuring that each IFSP or IEP is meeting the regulatory requirements of IDEA and COMAR. Monitors use the State's Desk Audit Tool (https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Documents/Special-Ed/Desk-Audit-Tool-2024-2025-A.pdf), which has been integrated into the State's Elevate System.

For SPP/APR Indicators, the state does not use survey data. All compliance data comes from the Special Services Information System (SSIS). All student records applicable to the compliance indicators are reviewed and noncompliance is identified.

The issuance of the Monitoring Report and/or Local Determinations (the State's Notification of Noncompliance, for monitoring and SPP/APR indicators, respectively) begins the one (1) year timeline for the correction of identified noncompliance. The OSEP, as indicated in the OSEP QA 23-01, requires a Two-prong correction process. If both reviews result in 100% compliance, correction is achieved, and the correction of noncompliance is complete. However, if 100% correction is not reached within the one (1) year timeline, a Corrective Action Plan(s) is required. Child/Student Specific Noncompliance Prong 1: The LITP and the LEA/PA must submit data demonstrating correction of all individual child/student-specific findings of noncompliance. Prong 2: The Monitoring Specialists will verify the correction of the noncompliance by reviewing documents that evidence program-level corrective actions by selecting a smaller sample of child/student records that were not reviewed in the original audit process.

If Systemic Noncompliance is identified, the LITP and/or LEA/PA must develop, submit, and implement an Improvement Plan(s) to address each item/area of Systemic Noncompliance. System Noncompliance is identified when an audit item is rated at seventy-five percent (75.00%) or less compliant for a sample size of at least five (5) records.

Still, any level of noncompliance requires the Two-prong correction process (even if compliance does not fall below 75%).

Additional Information on the State's Monitoring Process can be found here: https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/PAB/index.aspx

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

The majority of data reported in the APR, as well as data used for pulling child records for monitoring, comes from the Special Services Information System (SSIS). This System was developed as a way to integrate data from the MOIEP and data from non-MOIEP user LEAs for federal reporting. Non-MOIEP user LEAs must submit data at least quarterly to the SSIS system. Once data are included in SSIS, reports related to each indicator can be run and analyzed.

Data from SSIS is also exported from SSIS into the State's performance monitoring System, Elevate, for the record review and related service audits. Records for monitoring are pulled for 2-3 months prior to the monitoring activities.

For the SPP/APR, all data are from the entire reporting year required (July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024), except for the lag data indicators. The State does not use any sampling for its Indicator reporting.

Dispute resolution data comes from the Elevate system and records are pulled from the current FFY reporting period. These data are ultimately prepopulated into the APR system by the USDE.

Each Branch reports to the Branch Chief for Policy and Accountability on the timeliness of correction for each finding of noncompliance to be reported in the APR, as well as used in local determinations. The Policy and Accountability Branch tracks the correction of findings made using APR data and comprehensive monitoring. The Resource Management and Monitoring Branch tracks the correction of fiscal findings. The Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch tracks the correction of findings made through dispute resolution processes.

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

For dispute resolution, the State makes findings by the number of individual incidences of noncompliance since these are dependent upon periodic investigations that occur throughout the year. For monitoring and APR data, the state makes findings by LITPs/LEAs/PAs using comprehensive monitoring reports and report cards/determinations, respectively, because monitoring reports and determinations occur only one (1) time annually. Tracking of the correction noncompliance occurs through the Maryland Elevate System.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

The State does not utilize pre-finding correction.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

The DEI/SES has aligned its responsibility for general supervision with tiers of engagement for program support and technical assistance to provide a Multi-Tiered System of Support for monitoring and technical assistance to address the needs of each LITP//LEA/PA. The Differentiated Framework illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. The DEI/SES is committed to maintaining compliance and providing supports to improve the quality of special education services. An LITP/LEA/PA is assigned to a tier of general supervision and oversight based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The corresponding programmatic support an LITP/LEA/PA can expect to receive is differentiated and based on their assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of the public agency's needs. The Differentiated Framework directs the DEI/SES' attention to LEAs/PAs in need of more comprehensive engagement, technical assistance, and support to enable those LEAs/PAs to meet indicator targets, improve results, narrow the achievement gap, correct identified noncompliance, and maintain compliance.

Universal Tier
In the Universal Tier of Engagement, the focus is on professional development/learning and support to address statewide needs based on overall State trend data (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide technical assistance include State and regional professional development, online tools, resources through Maryland Learning Links, and Technical Assistance Bulletins. Comprehensive monitoring for the universal tier occurs once every four years.

Targeted Tier
An LEA/PA receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for two consecutive years or "Needs Intervention" for one year is assigned to the

Targeted Tier of General Supervision. An LEA/PA in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for uncorrected noncompliance.

Comprehensive monitoring occurs every three years and includes customized data analysis with real-time local and State data. Activities may include, but are not limited to: student record reviews using selected sections of the student record review document, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LEA/PA's system of general supervision, interview questions, and/or case studies. State and local joint cross-departmental and cross-divisional teams are formed to address identified needs. The LEA/PA develops a local Improvement Plan which is submitted to and approved by the DEI/SES.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

The corresponding Targeted Tier of Engagement focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, and technical assistance) to address the needs of the LEA/PA on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LEA/PA from needing substantial support. The LEA/PA leadership is required to engage with the DEI/SES to review State and local data and information in order to implement an Improvement Plan that is approved by the DEI/SES to build capacity to effectively address the identified needs. Evaluation and periodic feedback are critical elements of Targeted Engagement. A Targeted Assistance and Support Committee (TASC) team, consisting of jointly identified local and state cross-divisional members, provides performance-based and responsive support.

Focused Tier
An LEA/PA receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for three consecutive years, "Needs Intervention" for two consecutive years, or "Needs Substantial Intervention" for one year is assigned to the Focused Tier of General Supervision. These LEA/PAs generally continue to have findings of noncompliance, have active CAPs for uncorrected noncompliance for two or more years, and demonstrate little progress despite general and targeted technical assistance. These LEA/PAs also may have issues meeting multiple state targets for results indicators.

At this level, the goal of the Focused Tier of Engagement is to direct substantial support to address the continuous lack of improvement of the LEA/PA through significant systems change. A joint multi-faceted State and local Focused Intervention and Accountability Team (FIAT) meet quarterly to develop, implement, and review progress in affecting systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. Principles of effective systems change, implementation, evaluation, and sustainability are foundational elements of the technical assistance. Frequent feedback and general supervision are maintained throughout the extent of the technical assistance. Comprehensive monitoring occurs every other year for LEA/PAs in the focused tier.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a); and/or
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
(i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year;
(ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 et seq. (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year;
(iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention;
(iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA; and/or
(v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

Intensive Tier
At the highest tier, the Intensive Tier of General Supervision, an LEA/PA fails to progress and correct previously identified noncompliance despite receiving technical assistance and support. The failure to comply has affected the core requirements, such as the delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight. The LEA/PA enters into a formal agreement with the MSDE to guide improvement and may have additional sanctions. The LEA/PA informs the MSDE of its unwillingness to comply with core requirements.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

Each year, the State assigns each LEA/PA with a determination (Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, or Needs Substantial Intervention). To make determinations, the State uses a results-based rubric on identified indicators to rate the performance for each LLA and LEA/PA in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. For both Part C and Part B, the rubric includes both compliance and results. The rubric includes valid, reliable, and timely data and correction of noncompliance data. Correction of noncompliance data includes correction from fiscal audits, dispute resolution findings, comprehensive and targeted monitoring findings, and SPP/APR data findings. The rubric is located on the right-hand side of the mdideareport.org website. Beginning for FFY 2022 determinations, the State began using the Elevate System to calculate the determinations based on the rubric. Unless the state is setting a new baseline for an indicator, all SPP/APR indicators are used in the State's rubric. Determinations are typically released to LITPs and LEAs/PAs around May. Once released, the status and results for each LLA and LEA/PA are posted, as required, on the MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results at http://mdideareport.org no later than July 1, annually. Current determination letters are posted within each LITP or LEA. Past determination letters can be found along the right-hand side.

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/PAB/index.aspx

Technical Assistance System:

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

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

Team, Analyze, Plan, Implement, Track (TAP-IT)
The TAP-IT process is the universal delivery system for improved results through the DEI/SES Differentiated Framework: Tiers of Engagement. TAP-IT ensures purposeful resource allocation and collaborative effort in support of research-based actions that narrow the achievement gap for children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. Through TAP-IT the DEI/SES partners with LEA/LITP/PAs around five (5) levers for change based on State Education Agency (SEA) Levers for Change in Local Education Agencies and Schools (Redding, 2013):
Opportunity by braiding of resources to support innovative practices;
Incentives through Statewide recognition of child progress and gap reduction;
Systemic Capacity by providing Statewide data systems that include the Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS), Maryland Online IFSP, and the Maryland Online IEP (MOIEP);
Local Capacity building through expert consultation, establishing of Communities of Practice (CoP), training, coaching, and opportunities for diagnostic site reviews;
Intervention through the DEI/SES Differentiated Framework: Tiers of Engagement that include universal support for internal decision-making processes based on implementation science, and dissemination of proven practices with demonstrated results.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Accessing Technical Assistance by MSDE
While the State received a determination of Meets Requirements from the OSEP in 2024, the DEI/SES continues to seek TA to address the low performance and participation of students with disabilities on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The MSDE, DEI/SES partnered with the MSDE, Division of Assessment, Accountability, Performance Reporting and Research, including the MSDE NAEP Coordinator, John Hopkins Center for Technology and Education, and stakeholders to provide guidance and TA to LEAs, PAs, and families. The DEI/SES has also continued to receive TA from federal Technical Assistance Centers including the IDEA Data Center (IDC), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), and the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO).

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

Professional Development System:

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

MSDE's "Stages of Professional Development for All Teachers Teaching Students with Disabilities" ("Stages") is a roadmap that teachers can use throughout their careers, ideally beginning in the final year of a teacher-preparation program and moving all the way through to retirement. There are other matrices available to guide teacher professional development, but "Stages" is unique. It's specifically geared to help teachers improve the performance of their students with disabilities in both the general and special education environments. While "Stages" can be a great self-assessment tool, it's especially useful during the mentoring process. It helps mentors and mentees identify the mentee's particular areas of strength and areas of need. In addition, it provides clear stepping stones to guide the mentee's professional development on an ongoing, career-long basis. The online version of "Stages", accessible through the Professional Development Online Tracker (PDot), includes links to professional development courses, videos,

curricula, webinars, books, and other materials that can be invaluable during (and after) mentoring.

In order to improve program quality and services to positively impact student results, the MSDE DEI/SES, in collaboration with numerous partners, provides resources, training, consultation, and TA to local special education directors, service providers, community partners, stakeholders, and parents through a variety of formats and forums. Dissemination of these trainings, resources, media, and tools to strengthen student outcomes and the special education services provided to students with disabilities is supported through the DEI/SES Elevates website, formerly Maryland Learning Links, (not to be confused with the Elevate Performance Monitoring System) in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (CTE): https://elevates.marylandpublicschools.org/

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

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

In FFY 2021, the state revised its baseline and targets for Indicator #2, as required by OSEP. The State obtained feedback on its proposal at a

December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets were included in the FFY 2021 submission.

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

81

Parent Members Engagement:

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

Committees/Councils, including the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), and Education Advisory Council (EAC), support Maryland's comprehensive birth through twenty-one (21) system of services. Parents and advisory/advocacy committees are engaged in target settings, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress in numerous ways. Parents, including representatives from the Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC) in Maryland, Parents Place of Maryland, are actively involved in the SICC, SESAC, and EAC Parents Place of Maryland employs eleven (11) parents of children and students with identified delays and disabilities. The SICC currently has three (3) parent members, all from different local jurisdictions systems, who attend regularly. Maryland's SESAC has nineteen (19) parent members who attend regularly. Nonmember parents attend both the SICC and SESAC since the meetings are open to the public. The EAC is a diverse coalition of over 25 individuals and organizations, including individual advocates, advocacy law centers, disability societies/councils, educational consultants, and other agencies with a focus on empowering and supporting children with disabilities and their families. As mentioned before, Parents Place of Maryland, Maryland's PTIC, is a valuable stakeholder with membership on each committee.

Parents, parent support staff, and advocacy groups are also included in State Professional Learning Institutes (PLIs) and statewide webinars intended to provide stakeholders with up-to-date information on legislation, program strategies, evidence-based practice updates, and progress on program results and APR indicators. Thirty-one (31) of 43 Family Support providers in Maryland's LEAs are parents of students with disabilities.
Several ongoing committees have regular participation by parents, including:
The State Implementation Teams (Part B and Part C);
These teams are responsible for moving SSIP work forward.
One (1) parent that serves on each Team.
The Inclusion State Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);
This team advances technical assistance activities which are focused on advancing effective evidence-based inclusion policies and practices within the State's comprehensive birth through age 21 education system.
Two (2) parents that serve on this Team.
The State Inclusion Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);
This team develops state-level guidance and support for the local school systems that were awarded the PS Inclusion grants.
Two (2) parents that serve on this Team.
The Pyramid Model Leadership Committee, which is not led by DEI/SES, but the DEI/SES serves as partners (Part C and Part B); and
This committee focuses development, evaluation, and sustainability of a statewide collaborative effort, guided by national models, that supports the local implementation of the Pyramid Model framework.
Two (2) parents that serve on this Committee.
The Maryland Certificate of Program Completion (MCoPC) Endorsement Task Force
The task force's charge is to review the requirements for the Maryland Certificate of Program Completion requirements and develop standards for endorsements that can be added to the MCoPC that address employment, postsecondary education, and community/citizenship.
Six (6) parents serve on this Task Force.

In addition, MSDE has convened an ongoing Special Education Workgroup to discuss and make recommendations on instruction and services for students with disabilities. Workgroup meetings are held approximately once per month and each meeting includes a dedicated time for public comment during which parents of students with disabilities in Maryland have the opportunity to provide their input. Parents are also engaged as members of the workgroup with four (4) parents of students with disabilities currently serving as members.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to aid in the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, the State provides details on methods and measurement tools used in the collection and analysis of data, and provides interpreters for all meetings, as needed. The State has also developed numerous parent guides to facilitate knowledge of the State's early intervention and special education system, as well as

to build the capacity of parents to be engaged in their children's development. Publications are translated into at least 17 different languages. Parent guides can be found here: https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/info.aspx

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

The Frostburg State University HUB@University of Maryland System Equitable Family Engagement In Early Learning Grant builds on a previous grant where a process manual was created to assist interested LEAs/PAs and community organizations to replicate a successful program that supports families of young children and infants who are at risk and/or receiving early intervention services. This grant's goals include the development of multiple modules for parents around understanding how to support their child's learning at home and in the community, understanding the special education process and navigating mental and behavioral health resources. There are also modules for program leads to replicate their successful family engagement strategies which are informed by evidence-based practices used across Maryland and incorporate strategies to address the needs of culturally, linguistically and socio-economically diverse families. The modules are being piloted in 2 jurisdictions and will be available to share across the state when completed.

Through a DEI/SES grant, the MCF provides training programs to promote family/school partnerships and empower families to advocate for their children, as well as other children, in education and other child-serving care systems. The MCF's annual Family Leadership Institute (FLI) provides an intensive training program to promote the development of local partnerships and community ties. Through the MCF's Family Leadership Program, the MCF seeks to increase parent/caregiver capacity, engagement, and partnership with LITPs and LEAs. Equipping parents/caregivers who care for children with mental health disorders with knowledge, skills, and resources will promote a positive partnership with the school and positive educational outcomes for their child.

The DEI/SES provides the EAC an opportunity to review all guidance documents, including technical assistance bulletins and parent guides, before they are finalized and disseminated. Since the start of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the DEI/SES has developed over 45 guidance documents. Ultimately, these documents are published on the MSDE website to ensure wide dissemination to both providers and families. The DEI/SES technical assistance bulletins and family guides can be found here: https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/TAB.aspx. In 2023 the DEI/SES developed a Parent Information Series: https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/FSDR/ParentInformationSeries-2.aspx. Each Series document has been translated into twenty-four (24) languages to help ensure parent access to information. During the FFY 2023 reporting year, the DEI/SES began creating a new smaller "Guidance Brief" with "bite-size" digestible guidance that is more family friendly than the technical assistance bulletins. These documents, when receiving full approval by legal counsel and MSDE leadership will also be posted on the divisions' website to ensure wide dissemination.

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

Finally, the DEI/SES Family Support Section also provides Technical Assistance to the Local Family Support Coordinators in each jurisdiction in Maryland, including the Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf. Technical Assistance included discussions about:
1) Finding and interpreting local and State SPP/APR data;
2) Reviewing their SPP/APR improvement strategies;
3) Providing feedback on SPP/APR data, improvement strategies, and targets; and
4) the importance of including this in conversations with local SECACs, advisory groups and families.

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

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Throughout the year, stakeholders are made aware of data analysis, improvement strategies, and program data/progress evaluation in a variety of ways, including through Statewide meetings/webinars, SICC/SESAC/EAC meetings, and family support conferences. Statewide webinars occur frequently, but not necessarily with specific regularity as they are often dependent on hot topics or immediate concerns or initiatives. The SICC, SESAC, and EAC meetings occur frequently and regularly with the schedule set at the beginning of each fiscal year. For both types of meetings, stakeholders can provide feedback on data analysis, improvement strategies, evaluation, and target setting. In addition to Statewide meetings and regular stakeholder workgroups, the State has regular family support conferences and webinars. These meetings are regularly attended by parents and family support professionals. Below are examples of topics discussed at Family Support Conferences/webinars in FFY 2020, FFY 2021, FFY 2022, and FFY2023:
Routines-Based Interview;
Authentic Assessment;
Data highlights;
Parent/Family Survey;
Improving Family Engagement;
Early Intervention Personnel Standards;
Components of IEP Goals

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

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

Below is a timeline of the mechanisms used to set targets, baselines, analyze data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate progress for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APR Cycle, including revisions to Indicator 2 targets in FFY 2021, Indicator 17 targets in FFY 2022, and Indicator 3 targets in FFY 2023.

Timeline:
July 2021 – October 2021
Reviewed how each indicator was measured in the past cycle and what changes, if any, are required for data collection and reporting
Consulted with internal data collection teams at MSDE (inter-departmental) to ensure data availability and a plan for data analysis and reporting

October 2021 - December 2021
Presented to stakeholders changes to how the indicator will be measured in the new cycle
Identified and developed proposed baseline year, proposed target options, and improvement strategies to meet the targets
Solicited input from stakeholders on priorities for APR indicators
Developed APR Surveys (Part B and Part C) for obtaining feedback from stakeholders

December 2021-January 2022
Disseminated Part C and Part B Surveys to stakeholders throughout Maryland for feedback on APR Indicators (baselines, targets, and improvement strategies)
Solicited additional input from advisory groups, councils, and committees (SESAC, SICC, EAC, etc.)
Reviewed stakeholder survey responses
Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies

February 1, 2022
Submitted SPP-APR FFY2020

April 2022
Developed a 2nd Part B Survey to obtain feedback on Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 5, and 6
Disseminated 2nd Part B Survey to stakeholders to solicit input
Reviewed stakeholder survey responses
Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies
Submitted Final FFY 2020 Part B APR

November 2022
Analyzed dropout data trends using new methodology
Developed proposed targets for dropout indicator

December 2022/January 2023
Presented proposed Indicator 2 baseline, targets, and improvement strategies to stakeholders
Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies for Dropout indicator

February 1, 2023
Submitted SPP-APR FFY2021 with proposed Indicator 2 revised baseline and targets

October 2022-December 2023
Met with SSIP groups (stakeholders) to revise theory of action and discuss new baseline and targets.

February 1, 2024
Submitted SPP-APR FFY2022 with proposed Indicator 17 revised baseline and targets

April 2024 – FFY 2022 OSEP Clarification Call
OSEP informed MSDE that the baseline and targets for Indicator 3 must be revised due to MSDE using a different/shortened assessment methodology during COVID assessment administration. MSDE requested to reset the baseline for FFY 2023 to utilize 2 years of full assessment data (for target setting) and to ensure rich stakeholder feedback.

April 2024- December 2024
Met with stakeholders to discuss new Indicator 3 targets. Provided a statewide survey to obtain feedback from stakeholders on Indicator 3 proposed targets. Modified proposed targets based on stakeholder feedback.

January 2025
Presented "final" proposed targets to stakeholders.

February 1, 2025
Submitted the SPP-APR FFY 2023 with proposed Indicator 3 revised baseline and targets.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

To make the set targets available to the public, the State disseminated final targets included in both APRs to the stakeholders (including parents, advocacy groups, Maryland's PTI Center, SICC, SESAC, EAC, and Program Directors/Coordinators, etc.). The FFY 2022 APR, including APR targets, Improvement Strategies, evaluation of indicator data, and local system-specific data, was posted on mdideareport.org. The FFY 2023 APR, including APR targets, Improvement Strategies, evaluation of indicator data, and local system-specific data, will be posted on mdideareport.org no later than 120 days from submission consistent with submission in previous years.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2022 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2022 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2022 APR in 2024, is available.

As required in the IDEA of 2004, the MSDE reported to the public on its FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023) performance and will report to the public on the performance of LEA/LITP/PAs on Part B Indicators for FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024). Performance data in numbers and percentages are reported for each LEA/LITP/PA, along with the State target, State performance data, and a narrative description of the indicator. In partnership with the Johns Hopkins University CTE, the MSDE has developed an accessible SPP/APR website for local and State performance data. The website currently includes APRs from FFY 2005 to FFY 2022 and can be accessed at mdideareport.org. In addition to the complete SPP/APR, the website includes State and LEA/LITP/PA results for all applicable indicators and tools for comparing local performance in relation to the State targets. Each LEA's special education APR data (with the exception of assessment data) can be found here: http://mdideareport.org/special_main.aspx. The public may see progress and slippage through a combination of tables and graphs populated on the website. In addition, this site also includes the OSEP's annual State determination and the MSDE's annual LEA/LITP/PA determinations.

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

The FFY 2023 APR will be included on this website shortly after the State's submission to the OSEP on February 1, 2025. Copies of the APR and SPP will be provided to LEA/LITP/PAs, SESAC, and other stakeholders simultaneously immediately following the submission of the report.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that in its description of how it makes annual determinations of LEA program performance, the State did not include all the factors that must be considered when making annual determinations, consistent with OSEP's QA 23-01. Specifically, the State did not include valid, reliable and timely data; correction of identified noncompliance; and, other data available to the State about the LEA's compliance with IDEA, including any relevant audit findings in its description of the criteria the State uses to make annual determinations. OSEP may follow up with the State regarding how it makes annual determinations of LEA performance outside of the SPP/APR process.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	73.35%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	70.38%	72.62%	73.35%	73.85%	74.35%
Data	66.84%	63.52%	73.35%	74.08%	68.87%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were

provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,347
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	792
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	59
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,444

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
5,347	7,642	68.87%	74.85%	69.97%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

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

Graduation Conditions
Maryland offers one diploma known as the Maryland High School Diploma. The requirements for a Maryland High School Diploma are applicable to all students, including youth with IEPs. To be awarded a diploma, students, including youth with an IEP, shall be enrolled in a Maryland public school and have earned a minimum of 22 credits that include the following:

Subject Area Specific Credit Requirement
1. English — 4 credits of organized instruction in the comprehension of literary and informational text, writing, speaking and listening, language, and literacy, of which 1 credit shall be aligned with the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment for English;

2. Mathematics — 4 credits, including 1 credit with instruction in algebra aligned with the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment for algebra or 1 or more credits in subsequent mathematics courses for which Algebra I is a prerequisite, and 1 credit with instruction in geometry aligned with the content standards for geometry

3. Science — 3 credits, designed to develop scientific literacy with all courses integrating the application of the science and engineering practices, crosscutting concepts, and each containing a laboratory component, including 1 credit in life science aligned to the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment for Life Science; 1 credit in physical science (including chemistry, physics, or integrated physical science); and 1 credit in Earth/space science or a course with the topics of Earth/space science integrated;

4. Social studies — 3 credits, including 1 credit in United States history, 1 credit in world history, and 1 credit in local, State, and national government aligned with the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment for Government;

5. Fine arts — 1 credit in dance, media arts, music, theatre, or visual art, or a combination of these;

6. Physical education — 0.5 credits;

7. Health Education — 1 credit;

8. Computer science, engineering, or technology education — 1 credit that includes the study of computers and algorithmic processes or the application of knowledge, tools, and skills to solve practical problems and extend human capabilities; and

9. Electives — Students must achieve one of the following: (a) 2 credits of the same world language, which may include 2 credits of American Sign Language; or (b) successful completion of a State-approved career and technical education program. Elective programs and instruction shall be developed at the discretion of the local school system, open to enrollment for all students, and shall focus on in-depth study in required subject areas, exploration, or application and integration of what has been learned.

10. Environmental literacy — All students must complete a locally designed high school program of financial literacy as set forth in COMAR 13A.04.17 that is approved by the State Superintendent of Schools.

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

Students must meet the graduation assessment requirements by;
Passing score on the Maryland High School Assessments for Algebra I, science, government, and English 10;

Achieving a combined score(s) as established by the Department on the Maryland High School Assessments;

Achieving a passing score on an approved alternative assessment as established by the Department, such as Maryland High School Assessment for Algebra II, Advanced Placement examinations, SAT, ACT, or International Baccalaureate examinations; or

Satisfactorily completion of the Bridge Plan for Academic Validation.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	13.26%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	2.55%	2.55%	2.55%	13.26%	13.00%
Data	3.98%	3.26%	3.06%	13.26%	19.45%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,347
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	792
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	59
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,444

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
1,444	7,642	19.45%	12.75%	18.90%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

The State's Dropout Rate is the percentage of students dropping out of school ages 14-21 in a single year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer, from evening high school, and other alternative programs. Using the MSDE 2022-2023 school year Dropout Rate data, the MSDE, DEI/SES reports an Annual Dropout Rate of 18.90%, (1,444/7,642 X 100).

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2022	99.04%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2022	96.14%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	97.94%
Math	A	Grade 4	2022	99.09%
Math	B	Grade 8	2022	95.46%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	96.03%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)
Date:
01/08/2025
Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,925	8,091	5,640

	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,647	1,061	538
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	6,562	5,958	4,489
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	660	838	448

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,929	8,075	5,587
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,515	985	956
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	6,687	5,968	4,003
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	660	839	443

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

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

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,869	8,925	99.04%	95.00%	99.37%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7,857	8,091	96.14%	95.00%	97.11%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,475	5,640	97.94%	95.00%	97.07%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,862	8,929	99.09%	95.00%	99.25%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7,792	8,075	95.46%	95.00%	96.50%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,402	5,587	96.03%	95.00%	96.69%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The State's assessment results can be found on the State's report card website: https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/ using the data downloads page: https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/Graphs/#/DataDownloads/datadownload/3/17/6/99/XXXX/2024

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2022	13.76%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2022	9.98%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	18.39%
Math	A	Grade 4	2022	10.01%
Math	B	Grade 8	2022	3.67%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	5.80%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.50%	15.00%	15.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	19.00%	19.50%	20.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	11.00%	11.50%	12.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.00%	4.50%	5.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	6.50%	7.00%	7.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS

	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	8,209	7,019	5,027
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	503	122	141
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	764	610	649

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	8,202	6,953	4,959
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	362	38	182
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	474	225	30

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,267	8,209	13.76%	14.50%	15.43%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	732	7,019	9.98%	12.00%	10.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	790	5,027	18.39%	19.00%	15.72%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

At the high school level, standards increase in complexity and rigor. Students are expected to read for understanding and learn content, moving beyond basic reading skills. Students with disabilities need additional instruction to address skill gaps and make consistent progress. A shortage of teachers has led to an increase in conditionally certified educators, both within the state and across the country, who face challenges in meeting these demands.

Writing scores have declined nationwide, and this drop can negatively impact reading scores as well, Writing standards continue to be a significant area of difficulty for students. In grade 10, the assessment focuses on argumentative and informative/explanatory writing, with written expression being the weakest area for most students. For example, during the Spring 2024 assessments, the average score for argumentative written expression was lower than the lower-performing reading standards, a pattern that was also observed in the Spring 2023 assessments.

MSDE continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing strategies for improving student proficiency in reading and writing through its DMS

based on yearly local Determinations and related oversight activities, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and writing proficiency.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	836	8,202	10.01%	11.00%	10.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	263	6,953	3.67%	4.00%	3.78%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	212	4,959	5.80%	6.50%	4.28%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The MCAP measures the standards and evaluates whether students can solve challenging problems. It also assesses their ability to solve mathematical modeling and reasoning problems. To address these areas, MSDE is providing professional learning opportunities focused on math and reasoning for LEAs. Across the state, math supervisors are aware of these priorities and are working to support improvement efforts.

Maryland continues to face teacher shortages, with many classrooms staffed by conditionally certified teachers, impacting student performance on mathematics assessments, particularly at the secondary level.

The MSDE continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing strategies for improving student proficiency in math through its DMS based on yearly local determinations and related oversight activities, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve math proficiency.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2022	5.33%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2022	15.14%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	36.58%
Math	A	Grade 4	2022	21.45%
Math	B	Grade 8	2022	7.78%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	39.37%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	6.50%	7.00%	7.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	16.00%	16.50%	17.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	37.00%	38.00%	38.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	23.00%	24.00%	25.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	9.00%	10.00%	11.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

18 Parent Members
Juvenile Services Education
The Parents' Place of Maryland

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	660	838	448
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	36	153	93

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	660	839	443
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	137	66	92

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	36	660	5.33%	6.50%	5.45%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	153	838	15.14%	16.00%	18.26%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	93	448	36.58%	37.00%	20.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

At the high school level, academic standards have become more complex and rigorous. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities often require additional instruction to fil in gaps and make meaningful progress. Many of these students continue to receive instruction in LRE C settings, which can limit access to specialized reading instruction from content experts, impacting the slippage exhibited for group C.

The MSDE continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing strategies for improving student proficiency in reading through its DMS based on yearly local Determinations and related oversight activities, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading proficiency.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	137	660	21.45%	23.00%	20.76%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	66	839	7.78%	9.00%	7.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	92	443	39.37%	40.00%	20.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

At the high school level, academic standards have become more complex and rigorous. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities often require additional instruction to fil in gaps and make meaningful progress. Many of these students continue to receive instruction in LRE C settings, which can limit access to specialized math instruction from content experts, impacting the slippage exhibited for group C.

The MSDE continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing strategies for improving student proficiency in mathematics through its DMS based on yearly local Determinations and related oversight activities, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve math proficiency.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2022	34.90
Reading	B	Grade 8	2022	36.86
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	37.78
Math	A	Grade 4	2022	22.23
Math	B	Grade 8	2022	15.38
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	29.03

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	34.50	34.00	33.50
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	36.50	36.00	35.50
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	37.50	37.00	36.50
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.00	21.50	21.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	15.00	14.50	14.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	28.50	28.00	27.50

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

18 Parent Members
Juvenile Services Education
The Parents' Place of Maryland

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)
Date:
01/08/2025
Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	64,203	64,050	58,431
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	8,209	7,019	5,027
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	28,315	26,771	30,829
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,335	2,849	3,761
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	503	122	141
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	764	610	649

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	65,338	64,640	57,118
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	8,202	6,953	4,959
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19,017	11,886	16,840
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,384	1,261	169
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	362	38	182
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	474	225	30

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.43%	49.30%	34.90	34.50	33.86	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10.43%	46.25%	36.86	36.50	35.82	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	15.72%	59.20%	37.78	37.50	43.48	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

At the high school level, standards increase in complexity and rigor. Students are expected to read for understanding and learn content, moving beyond basic reading skills. Students with disabilities need additional instruction to address skill gaps and make consistent progress. A shortage of teachers has led to an increase in conditionally certified educators, both within the state and across the country, who face challenges in meeting these demands.

Writing scores have declined nationwide, and this drop can negatively impact reading scores as well. Writing standards continue to be a significant area of difficulty for students. In grade 10, the assessment focuses on argumentative and informative/explanatory writing, with written expression being the weakest area for most students. For example, during the Spring 2024 assessments, the average score for argumentative written expression was lower than the lower-performing reading standards, a pattern that was also observed in the Spring 2023 assessments.

MSDE continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing strategies for improving student proficiency in reading and writing through its DMS based on yearly local Determinations and related oversight activities, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and writing proficiency.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10.19%	32.75%	22.23	22.00	22.56	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.78%	20.34%	15.38	15.00	16.56	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.28%	29.78%	29.03	28.50	25.50	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

At the middle school level, math content experts can be assigned to provide instruction to students enrolled in advanced courses, which can impact the quality of instruction available to other students. This can lead to a decrease in high-quality instruction and can result in students with disabilities receiving instruction from a teacher who may not be a content expert. Additionally, Maryland continues to face challenges with a high number of conditionally certified teachers, which affects the consistency of math instruction across the state.

The MSDE continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing strategies for improving student proficiency in math through its DMS based on yearly local Determinations and related oversight activities, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve math proficiency.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

> -- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

> -- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	71.43%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	66.43%	61.43%	61.43%	50.00%	40.00%
Data	57.14%	Not Valid and Reliable	Not Valid and Reliable		0.00%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC,

SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022.

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The minimum cell size for all LEAs is 5 students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 school days in a school year. The minimum n-size set by the State is 20 students with disabilities in the LEA.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

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

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

For this reporting year, seven (7) LEAs were excluded from analysis for not reaching the minimum cell size of five (5) students. Six (6) of the seven (7) excluded LEAs suspended or expelled less than 1% of their Special education population for greater than ten (10) days. The other LEA is the State's smallest LEA. That LEA suspended/expelled four (4) students greater than ten (10) days, still less than 2% of its special education population.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

The state has not changed its methodology from the previous reporting year.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

The state has not changed its methodology from the previous reporting year.

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

7

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	18	0.00%	35.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 data)

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

No LEAs were identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension identified in FFY 2023 using FFY 2022 (2022 - 2023) data.

When an LEA is found to have a significant discrepancy, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff, using a discipline review document, conduct a review of the suspension policies and procedures related to:
1) discipline of students with disabilities,
2) development and implementation of IEPs,
3) the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports; and
4) procedural safeguards.

Staff from the MSDE and the LEA utilize the discipline review document to conduct a review of policies, procedures, and practices and to ensure compliance with federal and State regulations. Additionally, the MSDE conducts individual student record reviews from an additional data period to ensure that the implementation of policies and procedures, and practices are consistent with federal and State regulatory requirements, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

 A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

 -- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

 -- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable
Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.
NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable		0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data
Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The minimum cell size for all LEAs is five (5) students with disabilities from at least one (1) race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) school days in a school year. The minimum n-size for all LEAs is twenty (20) students with disabilities from at least one race/ethnicity group in that LEA.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

Given that the state has set a low cell size threshold of five (5) students with disabilities from at least one (1) race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) school days in a school year and that no LEAs are excluded from the State's analysis due to the minimum population or n-size, the State and its stakeholders believe that the State's methodology is reasonably designed to identify discrepancies if they exist.

For this reporting year, nine (9) LEAs were excluded from analysis for not reaching the minimum cell size of five (5) students. Each of these LEAs suspended or expelled seven (7) or fewer total students for ten (10) or more days in a school year.

Sixteen (16) LEAs met the minimum cell size of at least five (5) students with disabilities from a particular race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) school days in a school year.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

The State did not revise its minimum n or cell size from the previous reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

The State did not revise its minimum n or cell size from the previous reporting period.

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

9

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
7	0	16	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services (DEI/SES) utilized a Rate Ratio to compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA.

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

Sixteen (16) LEAs met the minimum cell size of at least five (5) students with disabilities from a particular race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) school days in a school year. No LEAs were excluded due to n-size.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 data)

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

For each of the local education agencies (LEAs) identified with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension by race/ethnicity, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff, using a discipline review document, conducted a review of the suspension policies and procedures related to:
1) discipline of students with disabilities,
2) development and implementation of IEPs,
3) the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports; and
4) procedural safeguards.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2020	Target >=	70.90%	70.90%	70.71%	71.00%	71.25%
A	70.71%	Data	70.20%	70.24%	70.71%	71.75%	71.95%
B	2020	Target <=	10.76%	10.76%	12.00%	11.75%	11.50%
B	12.00%	Data	12.06%	11.80%	12.00%	11.50%	11.34%
C	2020	Target <=	5.44%	5.44%	6.41%	6.25%	6.00%
C	6.41%	Data	6.85%	6.68%	6.41%	6.24%	5.89%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	106,914
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	77,619

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11,826
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	5,842
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	67
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	275

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

NO

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	77,619	106,914	71.95%	71.50%	72.60%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11,826	106,914	11.34%	11.25%	11.06%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	6,184	106,914	5.89%	5.75%	5.78%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

    A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

    B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

    C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

    A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

    B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

    C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

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

Part	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	Target >=	65.10%	65.10%	60.87%	62.00%	63.00%
A	Data	59.67%	61.60%	60.87%	59.81%	59.86%
B	Target <=	17.90%	17.90%	20.92%	20.00%	19.00%
B	Data	20.09%	19.03%	20.92%	21.32%	22.30%
C	Target <=			0.00%-0.33%	0.00%-0.33%	0.00%-0.32%
C	Data			0.33%	0.48%	0.29%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/31/2024

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	4,894	6,109	1,221	12,224
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,858	3,678	830	7,366
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,215	1,158	116	2,489
b2. Number of children attending separate school	34	50	28	112
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	1	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	16	23	6	45

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

NO

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,366	12,224	59.86%	64.00%	60.26%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	2,602	12,224	22.30%	18.00%	21.29%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Home	45	12,224	0.29%	0.32%	0.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

>   A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

>   B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

>   C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A1	2017	Target >=	68.78%	68.78%	68.78%	70.50%	71.00%
A1	68.53%	Data	69.90%	70.44%	72.57%	72.06%	72.48%

A2	2017	Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%
A2	52.75%	Data	52.25%	49.41%	46.41%	44.44%	42.75%
B1	2017	Target >=	72.37%	72.37%	72.37%	73.00%	73.50%
B1	72.12%	Data	72.74%	72.91%	75.89%	75.12%	77.16%
B2	2017	Target >=	51.12%	51.12%	51.12%	51.50%	52.00%
B2	50.87%	Data	49.88%	47.90%	45.55%	44.23%	44.03%
C1	2017	Target >=	71.65%	71.65%	71.65%	72.00%	72.50%
C1	71.40%	Data	72.58%	71.14%	72.84%	69.29%	67.56%
C2	2017	Target >=	59.48%	59.48%	59.48%	60.00%	60.50%
C2	59.23%	Data	58.40%	56.71%	54.26%	51.69%	48.89%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,589

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	35	0.76%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	938	20.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,588	34.60%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,360	29.64%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	668	14.56%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	2,948	3,921	72.48%	71.50%	75.18%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	2,028	4,589	42.75%	54.50%	44.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	29	0.63%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	842	18.35%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,653	36.02%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,582	34.47%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	483	10.53%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	3,235	4,106	77.16%	74.00%	78.79%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	2,065	4,589	44.03%	52.50%	45.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	38	0.83%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,091	23.77%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,171	25.52%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,489	32.45%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	800	17.43%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who	2,660	3,789	67.56%	73.00%	70.20%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	2,289	4,589	48.89%	61.00%	49.88%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

(SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Preschool	2016	Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.25%	85.50%
Preschool	82.99%	Data	82.03%	81.98%	82.01%	78.39%	79.97%
School age	2016	Target >=	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%
School age	70.00%	Data	69.00%	72.00%	72.00%	69.05%	68.25%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%

Target B >=	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%			

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

Group	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	931	1,199	79.97%	86.00%	77.65%	Did not meet target	Slippage
School age	5,858	8,434	68.25%	73.50%	69.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for Preschool slippage, if applicable

In discussions with LEAs regarding decreases from FFY 2022 to FFY 2023, many administrators point to staff shortages for decreasing parent involvement data. In particular, administrators report that many staff have had their responsibilities have increased which has had a negative impact on staffs' ability to effectively include families.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

117,269

Percentage of respondent parents

8.21%

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	9.46%	8.21%

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

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

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

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

Preschool:
The parents or guardians of children 3 years of age and 4 years of age are overrepresented in the sample by 6 and 11 percentage points, respectively, whereas the parents or guardians of children 5 years of age are underrepresented by 25 percentage points. The two racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (41%) and Black (26%) children. Parents of Black children and Hispanic/Latino children are underrepresented in the survey (10 and 3 percentage points, respectively) when compared to the State population. Parents of White children are overrepresented by 9 percentage points. According to Statewide estimates, the most common exceptionality or disability evident in the Maryland preschool population is developmental delay which represents 58% of the population. Although this group did make up one of the largest portions of the sample, compared to the Statewide estimate this group was underrepresented among the respondents by 32 percentage points, representing only 26% of the sample. The second most common exceptionality or disability Statewide is speech or language impairment, and sample estimates were overrepresented compared to the actual population (24% of the population, 32% of the sample; 8 percentage point overrepresentation). Students with Autism represent 15% of the population but represented 24% of the sample; parents of children with Autism were overrepresented by 9 percentage points in this year's survey, similar to last year. Students with Multiple Disabilities were overrepresented in the sample by 6 percentage points, as they constituted 8% of the respondents but only comprise 1% of the state's preschool population.

School age:
In considering the ages of children for whom parents/guardians completed the survey, all ages were well represented with over-/under-representation not exceeding three percentage points. The most common racial/ethnic backgrounds of respondents were White (46%) or Black (24%), which is similar to last year's sample. Parents of Black children were underrepresented by 15 percentage points and parents of White children were overrepresented by 14 percentage points. Hispanic or Latino children were underrepresented by 5 percentage points. Parents of children with Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability were each underrepresented in the survey by 9 and 7 percentage points, respectively. Overrepresented in this year's Survey were parents of children with Autism by 8 percentage points.

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

NO

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

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

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

MSDE identified improvement strategies to increase the response rate for the targeted demographic subgroups for both the preschool aged and the school-aged populations. The strategies included:
1) Conducting local outreach efforts to inform families of the importance to respond to the parent survey;
2) Collaborating with Local Family Support Coordinator (LFSC) in each of the LEA/PA to conduct outreach, training, and supports to address the areas of need gleaned from the annual survey; and
3) Collaborating with parent organizations that represent underserved populations using materials that are culturally appropriate and written in the native language.
4) Assigning Improvement Plans to LEAs/Pas who fell below the state average response rate for the Parent Survey.

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

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

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

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

Pre-school:

On average, 78% of respondent parents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, as measured by indicator 8, on the preschool survey.

The representation of parents of 3- and 4-year-olds was not significantly different than their percentage of Maryland's preschool population. Parents of 5-year-olds were underrepresented by 25 percentage points, significantly lower than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population. In analyzing this data for the presence of nonresponse bias, a chi square test was used to compare of the level of agreement of parents of 5-year-old students to that of other age subgroups, revealing no significant difference on indicator 8. These results suggest that nonresponse bias was not present across age groups.

All racial subgroups were proportionately represented in the survey with the exception of parents of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino students. Parents of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino children made up 26% and 17% of survey respondents, respectively, significantly lower than are represented in Maryland's preschool special education student population (36% and 20%, respectively). Again, a chi square test was used to compare of the level of agreement of parents of Black children (78%) and Hispanic children (81%) to that of other racial subgroups, revealing no significant difference on indicator 8. These results again suggest that nonresponse bias was not present across race/ethnicity.

The State also examined response rates of parents of students with specific disability categories and found that parents of students with developmental delay which represents 58% of the population but was underrepresented in survey respondents by 32 percentage points. Again, a chi square test was used to compare the level of agreement of parents of students with developmental delays (75%) to that of other disability categories, revealing no significant difference on indicator 8. In considering disability categories, these results suggest that nonresponse bias was not present.

School-Age:

On average, 69% of respondent parents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, as measured by indicator 8, on the school-age survey.

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

An analysis of survey responses by race/ethnicity was then completed. Like in the preschool survey, parents of Black/African and Hispanic/Latino students were underrepresented in the survey: although these comprise 39% and 19% of the state's school-age special education population, they only represented 24% and 14% of survey respondents, respectively. Chi-square tests were conducted to measure any nonresponse bias and found no significant difference for the level of agreement for the parents Black/African American students compared to other racial/ethnic groups, but that there was a significant difference in the level of agreement for parents of Hispanic/Latino students, indicating potential nonresponse bias.

In terms of primary exceptionalities/disabilities, parents of students with Other Health Impairments and Specific Learning Disabilities were underrepresented in the survey by 9 and 7 percentage points, respectively. Again, chi-square tests were conducted to detect any nonresponse bias when considering students' primary exceptionalities/disabilities and significant differences were found for parents of students with other health impairments and specific learning disabilities when compared to other groups, indicating the potential for nonresponse bias when considering primary

exceptionality/disability.

To reduce identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities, the state has:
1) Helped LEAs to analyze response rates across cross sections of parents on an ongoing basis throughout the data collection process to specifically target groups that are being underrepresented in real-time

2) Conducted targeted outreach to underrepresented groups, particularly Hispanic/Latino parents and Black/African American parents (especially in school-age) and parents of children with certain disabilities
a. Encouraged LEAs to partner with trusted community organizations, cultural centers, and advocacy groups that serve Hispanic/Latino and Black/African American families
b. Utilized bilingual and culturally competent outreach materials, including translated surveys and promotional content
c. Encouraged LEAs to host informational sessions (in person or virtual) in communities with lower response rates

3) Tailor survey administration methods as traditional methods may not be accessible or engaging for all families, particularly those with language, time, or technology barriers
a. Offered surveys in multiple formats
b. Sent reminders via multiple platforms
c. Ensured survey is mobile-friendly as many families primarily access internet via smartphones

4)   Increase engagement with parents of children with specific disabilities who are underrepresented in the survey, particularly parents of children with developmental delays, specific learning disabilities, and other health impairments
a. Encouraged LEAs to include targeted messaging about how participation influences support and services for students
b. Asked school staff and providers to personally encourage families to complete the surveys
c.   Partnered with parent support groups specific to various disabilities

5) Collaborate with LEAs and Service Providers who have direct communication with families and can help close participation gaps
a. Trained LEA staff on the importance of the survey and how to communicate its purpose to families
b. Helped schools analyze response rates by demographic category to help them focus outreach where needed

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State did not analyze the response rate to describe the steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children with disabilities receiving special education services, as required by the Measurement Table.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	25	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

MSDE's analysis of the data for the 2023-2024 performance period demonstrated that zero (0) LEAs were identified as having a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups. No LEAs were excluded from the calculation.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
16	0	25	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

MSDE's analysis of the data demonstrated that sixteen (16) LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. No LEAs were excluded from the calculation

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

The MSDE reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of the sixteen (16) LEAs impacted, followed by a review of IEPs and student records to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.311 for the LEAs. The MSDE did not identify noncompliance through this review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	77.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.64%	98.51%	97.46%	96.96%	95.92%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
20,305	19,709	95.92%	100%	97.06%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

596

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

The MSDE, DSE/EIS identified 596 students with "unacceptable reasons for delays", a decrease of 390 students from FFY 2022 (FFY 2022 = 986 students).

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

An analysis of these data identified the following range of days for all unacceptable reasons:
289 (1 day to 15 days) = 48.5%
208 (16 to 45 days) = 34.9%
99 (beyond 45 days) = 16.6%

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	16	1	0

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified seventeen (17) new findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022. Sixteen (16) of the seventeen (17) findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. One (1) finding was corrected subsequently, although late.

To date, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that all seventeen (17) LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction was verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each LEA achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.40%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.89%	99.77%	98.81%	98.75%	98.75%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,503
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	177
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,869
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	206
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	1,229

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,869	1,891	98.75%	100%	98.84%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

22

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified twenty-two (22) students with "unacceptable reasons for delays." The unacceptable reason for each student's delay was identified as paperwork errors, administrative errors, and staffing.

The range of unacceptable delays were:
1 to 15 Days = 5 students
16 to 30 Days = 11 students
31 to 45 Days = 3 students
Beyond 45 Days = 3 students

This information is used by the MSDE Monitoring Staff to assist local education agencies and public agencies in analyzing data and in providing technical assistance. The MSDE data management and program staff worked closely with local education agencies' staff to ensure the integrity of the data reported in FFY 2023.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified six (6) findings of noncompliance. All six (6) findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local Education Agency (LEA) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction is verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each LEA/PA achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	86.10%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.62%	97.14%	99.65%	99.97%	99.70%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
21,256	21,320	99.70%	100%	99.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

If no, please explain

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For FFY 2022, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified four (4) findings of noncompliance and all four (4) findings were fully corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance.

The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local Education Agency (LEA) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

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

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2024 on students who left school during 2022-2023, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2022-2023 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. *Definitions*

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. *Data Reporting*

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).
Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.
Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*
Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2020	Target >=	27.00%	28.00%	24.87%	25.00%	25.50%
A	24.87%	Data	28.04%	26.54%	24.87%	26.77%	25.44%
B	2020	Target >=	53.00%	60.00%	56.32%	57.00%	58.00%
B	56.32%	Data	60.64%	61.87%	56.32%	63.63%	60.98%
C	2020	Target >=	59.00%	74.00%	56.63%	58.00%	58.00%
C	56.63%	Data	67.05%	64.66%	56.63%	65.11%	62.77%

FFY 2021 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	7,637
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,637
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,082

2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school					2,497		
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)					159		
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).					4		

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,082	7,637	25.44%	26.50%	27.26%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,579	7,637	60.98%	59.00%	59.96%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4,742	7,637	62.77%	60.00%	62.09%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

For the purpose of determining representativeness, a demographic group is classified as being overrepresented in the MLDSC data set if the percentage of that group is greater than its percentage in the Leaver group by at least 3 percentage points. Similarly, a demographic group is classified as being underrepresented in the MLDSC data set if the difference between the percentage of that group in the MLDSC data set is less than its percentage in the population by 3 percentage points or more. Differences of 3 percentage points or more indicate areas in which the characteristics of Leavers differed from the state's MLDSC data set. If the difference between the MLDSC data set and the Leavers is less than 3 percentage points in either direction, the respondent sample (MLDSC data set) is not significantly different from the Leaver population.

Because 100% of Leavers were found to be contained within the MLDSC and as such, their associated postsecondary and workforce data is included in the analysis, full representativeness was achieved.

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

The State's data include all Leavers (youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school), so no groups of students were underrepresented or overrepresented.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

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

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

In Maryland, Indicator 14 is calculated using an administrative records exchange with the Maryland Longitudinal Data System Center (MLDSC) and two additional state agencies that provide post-secondary education and training to individuals with disabilities that do not supply data to the MLDSC (rather than through an attempt to survey the students, their families, or teachers). Therefore, there is no true "response rate" as there would be for a survey. Instead, the state reports on Census data. All students with disabilities who have Maryland Public School attendance files are intended to be included in MLDS. In practice, however, some students may not be included in the MLDSC due to data entry error or a failure at the LEA level to submit an attendance file for a student. Still, through this process, 100% of Leavers were found to be contained within the MLDSC and as such, their associated postsecondary and workforce data is included in the analysis.

After identification of students in the MLDSC, the State then collects training and education information about students from the Department of Rehabilitative Services (DORS) and Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) and adds it to MLDSC information (although DDA has been unable to provide information since the start of the COVID 19 Pandemic).

The State's goal is to identify post-secondary information for all Leavers (full representativeness) to satisfy its Indicator 14 reporting requirement. . This exchange provides data on the number of youth with disabilities no longer in secondary school and who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school (Leavers), and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. At this time, the data contained in MLDSC does not contain any out-of-state employment or college placements, or federal employment placements. However, data sharing agreements are continuing to be developed between MLDSC and other agencies (i.e., State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency, Developmental Disabilities Administration) to reflect additional efforts to match additional students' post-school outcomes. The State reports on census data, so a response rate (like would be calculated from a survey) is not entirely applicable. Through its partnerships, the State was able to locate information on all 7,637 (100%) Leavers in the MLDSC.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Because the state is able to report data on 100% of leavers, nonresponse bias was not an issue. As mentioned above, the State makes efforts to obtain information on every Leaver through its partnerships with outside agencies and as a result the State continues to be able to report on a high percentage of leavers.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	**Yes / No**
Was a survey used?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baselines or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	68
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	13

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle, the MSDE also had discussions about new baselines and targets for APR Indicators, including the State's SSIP, with stakeholders at numerous other State facilitated meetings. These meetings included but are not limited to, the

Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the SICC Meetings (October 7, 2021, and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team (SIT) Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the SESAC Meetings (November 17, 2021, and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021, SICC meeting and January 28, 2022, SESAC meeting included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APRs. Both of these meetings allowed for significant input from the public. Past performance for each indicator was presented, along with proposed revised baselines and targets (for applicable indicators). Possible targets were suggested based on patterns of performance from previous years. DEI/SES staff was available to answer methodological or procedural questions related to the indicators and discussed priorities of the State, specific to each indicator.

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	64.00% - 75.00%	64.00%-75.00%	64.00%-75.00%	64.00%-75.00%	64.00%-75.00%
Data	55.21%	58.49%	28.26%	46.15%	34.15%

Targets

FFY	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	64.00%	75.00%	64.00%	75.00%	64.00%	75.00%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target (low)	FFY 2023 Target (high)	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
13	68	34.15%	64.00%	75.00%	19.12%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The State's data showed slippage in this reporting period. The State attributes the challenge of meeting the resolution sessions target to the changing perceptions of dispute resolution.

The State believes that the strong voice of Maryland's parent advocacy community may contribute to higher expectations from the resolution process and result in the possibility of more difficult communications between the parties. MSDE continues to address the possible lack of understanding regarding the purpose and role of resolution sessions and what parents can expect from their local school systems in this process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

MSDE is continuing to respond to this issue by focusing upon parent support and parent education. We continue to be committed to providing high-quality parent support through the use of MSDE Family Support Specialists, who respond to parent requests for assistance through telephone calls, email, and written correspondence. The MSDE Family Support Specialists also serve as school system liaisons in order to ensure that parents have access to school system-based information and resources for support. In this effort, the State has created a Parent Information Series of documents: https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/FSDR/ParentInformationSeries-2.aspx.

MSDE also continues to strengthen the training and support provided to its Statewide Family Support Providers. This year, topics have included the complaint process, Parent and Family Survey data and review, and sessions around IEP development. MSDE also provided an opportunity for the FSC to Family Support Coordinators (FSC) to review, discuss, and compare resources and presentation ideas utilized in their LEA. MSDE believes that these efforts can have a positive impact on the successful outcome of resolution sessions for families and the school system.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baselines or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1 Mediations held	179
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	42
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	42

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	73.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	70.48%	66.45%	46.96%	54.97%	42.39%

Targets

FFY	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target (low)	FFY 2023 Target (high)	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
42	42	179	42.39%	75.00%	85.00%	46.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data*:* The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage, and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets*:* In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:
- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):
- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):
- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B.   Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2024). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate progress and narrow the gap in mathematics performance.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset is inclusive of students with and without disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5 in the SPDG participating schools (2 per designated LEA – Baltimore County and Howard County Public Schools).

Demographic Profile of Participating Schools 2023 - 2024
Baltimore County
• MEES: Total student population 350 learners with 25.7% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 80.8% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 56.6% of the student population identify as African American, 12.6% identify as White, 19.1% identify as Hispanic, 8.6% Multi-racial and 3% identify as Asian.
• SBES: Total student population 465 learners with 13.1% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 77.3% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 84.9% of the student population identify as African American, 2.5% identify as Multi-racial, and 9.2% identify as Hispanic.
Howard County
• HHES: Total student population 844 learners with 18% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 48.1% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 40.4% of the student population identify as African American, 11.01% identify as White, 18.4% identify as Hispanic, 7.46% Multi-racial and 22% identify as Asian.
• JHES: Total student population 397 learners with 13.2% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 46.8% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 38.3% of the student population identify as African American, 9.4% identify as White, 22.4% identify as Hispanic, 8% Multi-racial and 10.8% identify as Asian.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/MDTheoryofActionFFY2021.pdf

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	5.56%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	7.50%	8.50%	9.50%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Total number of students with disabilities from SPDG sites grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) on MCAP	Total number of students with disabilities from SPDG sites grade 3 through 5 tested on MCAP	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
9	148	5.56%	7.50%	6.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 data.

SiMR data come from grade-level results on the MCAP exam in mathematics administered during the fourth quarter of each school year. Baseline data for FFY 2022 represent student outcomes for the May 2023 administration of MCAP for students in grades 3, 4, and 5 in the SSIP/SPDG LEAs.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

High-stakes test scores are publicly available data. The data are aggregated by district, participating school, and grade level. Student achievement data are disaggregated by those students with a disability as compared to data for all students participating in the assessment program. The SSIP target is the percentage of students with disabilities who are proficient (levels 3 & 4) in meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations in mathematics. reportcard.msde.maryland.gov (https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov)

Baseline Profile
The average State percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 11.23%.
Statewide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 15.9% in grade 3, 10% in grade 4, and 7.8% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 22 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of all students across the State.

Baltimore County Public Schools
Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 12.5% in grade 3, 9.0% in grade 4, and 6.4% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 21 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

Howard County Public Schools
Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 16.1% in grade 3, 13.8% in grade 4, and 12.1% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 36 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

BCPS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5,scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 1.96%.
HCPSS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5, scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 8%.
* Reflects a revised baseline as indicated in FFY 2021 reporting

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)
YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The State SPDG plan details a comprehensive data collection and analysis process for documenting student and participant outcomes aligned with the SiMR. Data targets include:
•   Students' Mathematics Benchmark/Universal Screener outcome data for the Winter administration.

Winter 2024
Ongoing progress as represented by the percentage of students demonstrating growth with a score of 5 or higher on the MAP benchmark assessment was also noted across grade levels for the participating schools.
Hanover Hills
Grade 1   RIT score 167   N=136   68% adequate growth
Grade 2   RIT score 179   N=116   47% adequate growth
Grade 3   RIT score 190   N=123   75% adequate growth
Grade 4   RIT score 199   N=140   54% adequate growth
Grade 5   RIT score 207   N=116   41% adequate growth
Jeffers Hills
Grade 1   RIT score 174   N=56   59% adequate growth
Grade 2   RIT score 183   N=72   68% adequate growth
Grade 3   RIT score 195   N=68   74% adequate growth
Grade 4   RIT score 206   N=65   65% adequate growth
Grade 5   RIT score 208   N=61   49% adequate growth
Mars Estates
Grade 5   RIT score 210   N=46   67% adequate growth
Scotts Branch
Grade 2   RIT score 178   N=67   not tested in fall

The SEL Student Self-assessment Tool (I AM A Resilient Math Learner) is aligned with the Maryland State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) SPDG # H323A210010, Social-Emotional Learning Instruction & Embedded Supports Practice Profile - Tenets: Identity and Agency (Items 1 & 5), Cognitive Regulation (Items 4 & 7), Emotional Regulation (Items 2 & 6) and Social Skills (Items 3 & 8). Gaumer Erickson, A. S. & Noonan, P. M. (2023). I am a resilient math learner. Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). Adapted with permission from Heger, E. S., Haught, T., Noonan, P. M., & Gaumer Erickson, A. S. (2022). Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (K–2). In Teaching self-efficacy in elementary classrooms K–2 (pp. 2–3) [Teacher lessons and student workbook]. College & Career Competency Framework. https://www.cccframework.org/competency-lessons-and-student-workbooks/

Students' Social Emotional Learning Competency outcome(s) are to be measured in the Fall and Spring / Winter of each school year. The data represented in this reporting shows outcomes from the May 2024 Pilot: JHES. The school used the data to identify areas of need for students and teacher instructional practice. Following this pilot the tool was finalized with all schools conducting baseline administration December 2024.

May 2024 JHES SEL Outcomes

SEL Tenets	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
I can learn to do anything if I try hard.	82.8%	67.6%	60%
I can keep trying…	75.9%	74.6%	58.5%
I can be a good friend.	86.2%	69%	76.9%
I can tell my strengths_ in math.	62.1%	54.9%	46.2%
I can problem solve.	84.5%	60.6%	64.6%
I can take turns and share.	70.7%	66.2%	70.8%
I can refocus ...	77.6%	47.9%	49.2%
I can tell how my words impact…	65.5%	59.2%	53.8%

SEL Tenets	Grade 4	Grade 5
I can learn to do anything if I try hard.	71.9%	54.2%
I can keep trying…	75%	72.9%
I can be a good friend.	71.9%	81.3%
I can tell my strengths_ in math.	59.4%	50%
I can problem solve.	65.6%	68.8%
I can take turns and share.	60.9%	81.3%
I can refocus ...	62.5%	60.4%
I can tell how my words impact…	71.9%	68.8%

• Participant Survey data relative to the impact of professional learning on personnel capacity and the implementation of EBPs with fidelity.
Program Measure: At least 70% of professional development components demonstrate a score of 3 (good) or 4 (exemplary), as measured by the OSEP SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Rubric. Actual Performance Data: 75%
Program Measure: The SPDG Design Team effectively designs and refines the mathematics, SDI, and SEL EBP resources, implementation processes and evaluation tools as measured by Stakeholders' ratings of identified resources/processes/tools as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) for quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based (QUR & E). Actual Performance Data: 91.20%
Performance Measure: At least 80% of participants in professional learning report knowledge gain or extensive prior knowledge on learning targets as measured by a training evaluation. Actual Performance Data: 82.22%
•   Coaching Implementation Fidelity data to identify the impact of professional learning and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes.
Program Measure: After two coaching cycles, 80% of teacher implementers demonstrate improvement in the implementation of EBPs in mathematics, as outlined on the Maryland SPDG Evidence-Based Mathematics and Specially Designed Instruction Practice Profile and the Social-Emotional Learning Instruction and Embedded Supports Practice Profile, measured by coaches through classroom observations and facilitated coaching cycles. Actual Performance Data: 100%
Performance Measure: After two or more coaching cycles, implementing educators report experiencing high-quality coaching from local coaches as measured by coaching feedback survey responses with ratings averaging 2.5 on a 3-point scale. Actual Performance Data: 97.33%

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, which affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

Academic normalcy remains out of reach for many students, educators, and parents. Local schools have faced severe staff shortages and high rates of absenteeism among staff and student populations, this continues to be reflected in this reporting cycle. The impact of post COVID interventions has yet to demonstrate a positive impact. While funding is in place for the implementation of summer and after-school interventions local systems struggle with the staffing of these programs. Furthermore, students and educators continue to struggle with mental health challenges, higher rates of violence and misbehavior, and concerns about lost instructional time.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation
Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.
http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/EvaluationPlanDraftFFY23.pdf
Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)
NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

MSDE received, a State Personnel Development Grant specifically designed to address the SiMR, with highly structured strategies, fidelity measures, and PL/Coaching model that can be consistently applied across school districts to improve student learning and demonstrate connections between teaching with evidence-based practices (both specially designed mathematics instruction and social-emotional support strategies). Organizational structures needed to accompany professional learning have been identified, such as: systems for using student data to analyze intervention needs, design of an integrated system of math and SEL supports that include the necessary, ongoing collaborative planning using continuous improvement cycles, and school schedules that allow for collaborative planning time and direct instruction in the needed dose and intensity for learners with disabilities.

Governance
• Integrate the NIRN Stages of Implementation and Drivers through a collaborative team and data-informed process.
• Identify and establish a Core Leadership Team responsible for driving SSIP improvement actions and responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up.
• Expand the role of the State Stakeholder Advisory Group
• Focus on school and family engagement as a key factor in SSIP improvement outcomes. Focus on school and family engagement with the provision of family centered learning events emphasis on mathematics and SEL.
• Involve educators in collaboration with key community partners in the development of responsive and reciprocal decision making for the improvement of culture, climate, and learning by targeting mathematics achievement.

Professional Learning/Technical Assistance
Address and expand capacity building across the SSIP LEAs and within the State Implementation Team. Implementation activities focus on:
• Emphasis on broad stakeholder ownership as the foundation of systemic change via ongoing implementation team meetings, data reviews, and professional learning.
• Identification of grade level specific school personnel (general education/special education) for the focused implementation of the Maryland Practice Profiles and Instructional Coaching with expansion to 4 implementation grade levels per school.
• Provide multiple opportunities for varied professional learning aligned to the Maryland Practice Profiles and integrated with school improvement objectives. In-person and digital training options. Bi-weekly coaches training. Site based observations with feedback.
• Establish a collective of ready resources supporting improvement targets related to Maryland's Practice Profiles and identified site specific improvement targets: mathematics fluency, social-emotional learning, and family partnerships related to mathematics.
• Establish an instructional coaching protocol and related professional learning resources grounded in the work of Elena Aguilar and Thomas Guskey. Finalized the Maryland Coaches Guide for implementation.

Data-Informed Decisions
• Support a plan for continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics and social-emotional learning competencies using EBP aligned to implementation fidelity.
• Establish data collection processes and measures to address consistency and validity.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The FFY 2023 SSIP infrastructure improvements are represented by the following short-term/intermediate outcomes necessary for achievement of the SiMR; sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or scale-up.
Short-term outcome measure:

Program Measures:
At least 70% of professional development components demonstrated a score of 3 (good) or 4 (exemplary), as measured by the OSEP SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Rubric. Actual data: 75% Professional Learning / Technical Assistance
After two coaching cycles, 80% of teacher implementers demonstrated improvement in implementation of EBPs in mathematics, as outlined on the Maryland SPDG Evidence-Based Mathematics and Specially Designed Instruction Practice Profile and the Social-Emotional Learning Instruction and Embedded Supports Practice Profile, measured by coaches through classroom observations and facilitated coaching cycles. Actual data: 100% Data-Informed Decisions

Performance Measures:
The SSIP/SPDG Design Team effectively designs and refines the mathematics, SDI, and SEL EBP resources, implementation processes and evaluation tools as measured by Stakeholders' ratings of identified resources/processes/tools as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) for quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence based (QUR & E). Actual data: 91.20% Governance
The SSIP/SPDG Leadership Team, with input from stakeholders, established and implemented readiness criteria for local participation and selects elementary school partners as measured by agreements with participating districts. Actual data: 100% Governance
At least 80% of participants in professional learning report knowledge gain or extensive prior knowledge on learning targets as measured by a training evaluation. Actual data: 82.22% Professional Learning/Technical Assistance – Data-Informed Decisions
After two or more coaching cycles, educators reported experiencing high-quality coaching from local coaches as measured by a coaching feedback survey with ratings averaging 2.5 on a 3-point scale. Actual data: 97.33% Professional Learning/Technical Assistance – Data-Informed Decisions

Long-term outcome measures:
Program Measures:
After one year of educator implementation, at least 70% of students with disabilities demonstrated growth in mathematics at a rate comparable to their grade-level peers as measured by the MCAP (Spring state assessment) and MAP (Winter grade-level performance data). Ongoing. Data-Informed Decisions

Performance Measures:
Within one year of engagement with the SPDG Leadership and Stakeholder Advisory Group, University partners developed and embedded EBP in mathematics SDI and SEL within the context of special education teacher preparation coursework. Governance – Professional Learning Technical Assistance
The MOU/subgrant award was finalized October 2024. University partners have been engaged direct communication, planning, and development of the EBP since May 2023. The following goals define the expected outcomes for this partnership moving forward as identified in the MOU.

Goals for the partnership include:
1. Modify UMD's current special education math methods course to include the MSDE reforms developed for personnel preparation in the planning, delivering, and evaluation of evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports for elementary age students with disabilities.
2. Design one online professional learning 3-credit course reflecting MSDE reforms developed for personnel preparation in the planning, delivering, and evaluation of evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports for elementary age students with disabilities.
3. Offer the course described in Goal 2 to Maryland teachers through UMD's Institute for the Study of Children and Youth.
4. Mentor two other universities with special education departments to design/redesign undergraduate mathematics special education courses reflecting MSDE reforms developed for personnel preparation in the planning, delivering, and evaluation of evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports for elementary age students with disabilities.
After two or more observations of coaching, local coaches report experiencing high-quality coaching from state-level Professional Learning Specialists as measured by a coaching feedback survey.
After six months of educator coaching, at least 70% of students demonstrate growth or proficiency on SEL performance-based observation indicators as measured by the Maryland Accelerates! Social-Emotional Competencies: Performance-Based Observation.
After six months of educator coaching, at least 70% of all students demonstrate math skill development as measured by classroom formative data.
After six months of educator coaching, at least 70% of students with disabilities demonstrate math skill development as measured by classroom formative data.

Governance
Collaborative teams are integral to the planning and implementation of improvement actions. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. A climate of trust, respect, and openness is required to build and sustain collaboration over time, building a commitment to systemic change, common goals, and interdependence.
•   Establish SSIP Implementation Teams that are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change.
o SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief. Monthly collaboratives.
o SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core mathematics, specially designed instruction mathematics, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching. Quarterly meetings.
o   Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, Maryland Special Education State Advisory Committee, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Mathematics, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives. Quarterly meetings.
o   School-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports. Monthly meetings.
o   Leverage connections and relationships to engage families as active participants and contributors to not only WHAT their children are learning, but HOW they are learning.

***Continued in "Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)" section.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Full implementation using the resources and professional learning protocols developed using the practice profile methodology to define specific evidence-based practices for core mathematics, specially designed instruction (SDI) mathematics, and embedded social-emotional learning. Utilizing the Maryland Coaching Guide, State and district level personnel will implement systemic instructional coaching support to address the specific instruction practices necessary for improved student outcomes in elementary mathematics (Maryland Practice Profiles for core content and SDI with embedded SEL).

Outcomes:
• Conduct Stakeholders Advisory Group and Focus Groups for continued collaboration and board ownership of systems change. [Governance]
• Operationalize the implementation of EBP in mathematics, SDI mathematics, and SEL. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance and Data Informed Decisions]
• Application of professional learning and coaching framework across learning environments. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance]
o Content focus
o Active learning
o Sustain connections within professional learning and coaching activities.
o Coherence including the use of data analytics.
• Embedded EBP Math in SDI and SEL university level coursework. [Professional Learning/Technical Assistance]
• Demonstrate continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics across SSIP districts as evidenced in the SiMR data. [Data Informed Decisions and Governance]
• Gather and report student data in mathematics achievement and SEL competence. [Data Informed Decisions]
• Analyze and summarize student performance data by grade, school, and district to target improvement. [Data Informed Decisions and Governance]

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The FFY 2023 SSIP implementation plan emphasized the development and initial implementation of specific practice profiles targeting improvement actions to address SiMR:
o   Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practice Profile.
o   Evidence-based Mathematics SDI Practice Profile
o Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework Practice Profile.

Individual Participant Survey Response Data using a 1 – 5 Rating Scale of Quality, Usefulness, Relevance (OUR) and Knowledge gained (QUR-K). Administered following each professional learning experience including asynchronous, remote, and in-person events.

Benchmarking Survey administered three times per year to track professional growth and inform ongoing support needs (Beginning of School Year (Aug/Sept), Mid-year (Jan), and End of School Year (June)).
Coaching Implementation Fidelity tool to identify the impact of professional learning and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes. Instructional coaching protocol

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

• Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practice Profile aligned with the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for Mathematics and the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Practice Guide. Tier 1 Interventions and effective evidence-based core instructional practices supporting elementary students at risk for or with disabilities. This profile serves as a rubric of best practices in intervention research with easily comprehensible instructional teacher practices related to the following EBP:
o Explicit (Systematic) Instruction
o Mathematical Language
o Representations
o Number Lines
o   Word Problems
o Fact Fluency

• Evidence-based Mathematics SDI Practice Profile for accelerating learner progress with the adaptation of instruction based on the individual characteristics of learner, with consideration of the cognitive load in the teaching process and cognitive energy required for learning. https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/srs/cresource/q1/p01/#content This profile focuses on accelerating progress to narrow the achievement gap for students with disabilities. The EBPs have been shown to improve student learning of academic content. The practices are specific to SDI in mathematics:
o Systematic prompting and feedback
o Self-regulation support for learning and behavior
o Peer assisted instruction
o Manipulative-based instructional sequences
o Contextualized instruction
o Modified schema-based instruction
o Learning and communication accessibility

• Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework Practice Profile incorporating four of the five tenets of everyday SEL instruction designed by Nancy Frey, Dominque Smith, and Douglas Fisher. The SEL practices identify the SEL tenets (improvement targets), the learner competencies (student), and the proficiencies to be demonstrated by the teachers. These include the following:
o Identity and Agency
o Emotional Regulation
o Cognitive Regulation
o   Social Skills

• Instructional coaching protocol and related professional learning resources grounded in the work of Elena Aguilar (Transformational Coaching) and Thomas Guskey (Evaluating Professional Development). The Instructional Coaching Protocol provides a structure coaching program supporting educators with planning, implementing, and adjusting evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports with fidelity. Coaches engage educators in the coaching cycle to support fidelity of the evidence-based practices. The coaching cycle offers feedback aligned to clear criteria of the evidence-based practices and support through learning activities such as reteaching, planning, modelling, co-implementing, and videotaping.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Intended Impact to SiMR
Maryland's Practice Profiles for mathematics (core & SDI), SEL, and instructional coaching were designed by a Design Team of local, State, and National experts with review and input from the Stakeholder Advisory Group over the course of a yearlong development process. Implementation science (NIRN) strategies using the practice profile methodology and fidelity measures were used to define the EBP by targeting the inclusion of research or best practices, alignment of competencies with a theory of change, and the recognition of "what works" through the experience of communities, practitioners, and key stakeholders. The benefits of practice profiles include:
• Greater specificity and an operationalized model for consistent implementation of improvement actions.
• Facilitate the development and implementation of effective training protocols, coaching, and fidelity assessments.
• Refine the organizational and systems necessary to install and facilitate consistent and effective practices across implementing teachers.
• Promote the use of continuous improvement as an essential function of the practice.
•   Track outputs and outcomes relative to fidelity and provide rationale for facilitating actions or subsequent change. (Metz, 2016)
The standards and expectations targeted in Maryland's Practice Profiles align with Maryland's College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics and identify the specific instructional practices required to improve mathematics learning outcomes for elementary students with disabilities. With full implementation the impact to the SiMR should be demonstrated by marked improvement of student performance on formative and summative measures inclusive of State assessment data and outcomes on local benchmarks.
• Increased achievement in mathematics for children with disabilities over 3 years (MCAP data)
• School-wide decrease in achievement gap in mathematics (Universal Screener)
• Increased social emotional competence (SEL assessment tool)
• Improved implementation of professional learning (QUR & E)
SPDG Coaches worked collaboratively with educators to create conditions for deep reflection, learning, and desirable changes in practice that support teacher growth and autonomy. SPDG Coaching facilitates ongoing targeted professional learning grounded in research and builds on the strengths and talents of educators to ensure all students, specifically students with disabilities, have access to rigorous evidence-based math, social-emotional, and specially designed instruction which contributes to increased math achievement and equitable outcomes for students.
Coaches engaged educators in the coaching cycle to support fidelity of the evidence-based practices. The coaching cycle offers feedback aligned to clear criteria of evidence-based practices and support through learning activities such as reteaching, planning, modelling, co-implementing, and videotaping.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The State SPDG plan details a comprehensive data collection and analysis process for documenting student and participant outcomes aligned with the SiMR. Data targets include:
• Participant Survey data relative to the impact of professional learning on personnel capacity and the implementation of EBPs with fidelity.
Program Measure: At least 70% of professional development components demonstrate a score of 3 (good) or 4 (exemplary), as measured by the OSEP SPDG Evidence-Based Professional Development Rubric. Actual Performance Data: 75%
Program Measure: The SPDG Design Team effectively designs and refines the mathematics, SDI, and SEL EBP resources, implementation processes and evaluation tools as measured by Stakeholders' ratings of identified resources/processes/tools as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) for quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence based (QUR & E). Actual Performance Data: 91.20%
Performance Measure: At least 80% of participants in professional learning report knowledge gain or extensive prior knowledge on learning targets as measured by a training evaluation. Actual Performance Data: 82.22%
•   Coaching Implementation Fidelity data to identify the impact of professional learning and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes.
Program Measure: After two coaching cycles, 80% of teacher implementers demonstrate improvement in implementation of EBPs in mathematics, as outlined on the Maryland SPDG Evidence-Based Mathematics and Specially Designed Instruction Practice Profile and the Social-Emotional Learning Instruction and Embedded Supports Practice Profile, measured by coaches through classroom observations and facilitated coaching cycles. Actual Performance Data: 100%
Performance Measure: After two or more coaching cycles, implementing educators report experiencing high-quality coaching from local coaches as measured by a coaching feedback survey responses with ratings averaging 2.5 on a 3-point scale. Actual Performance Data: 97.33%

Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Individual Participant Survey Response Data using a 1 – 5 Rating Scale of Quality, Usefulness, Relevance (QUR) and Knowledge gained (QUR-K). Administered following each professional learning experience including asynchronous, remote, and in-person events.
Benchmarking Survey administered three times per year to track professional growth and inform ongoing support needs (Beginning of School Year (Aug/Sept), Mid-year (Jan), and End of School Year (June)).
Coaching Implementation Fidelity tool to identify the impact of professional learning and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes. Instructional coaching protocol

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practice and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Continued implementation using the resources and professional learning protocols developed using of the practice profile methodology to define specific evidence-based practices for core mathematics, specially designed instruction (SDI) mathematics, and embedded social-emotional learning. Utilizing the Maryland Coaching Guide, State and district level personnel will implement systemic instructional coaching support to address the specific instruction practices necessary for improved student outcomes in elementary mathematics (Maryland Practice Profiles for core content and SDI with embedded SEL).
• Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practice Profile aligned with the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for Mathematics and the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Practice Guide. Tier 1 Interventions and effective evidence-based core instructional practices supporting elementary students at risk for or with disabilities. This profile serves as a rubric of best practices in intervention research with easily comprehensible instructional teacher practices related to the following EBP:
o Explicit (Systematic) Instruction
o Mathematical Language
o Representations
o Number Lines
o   Word Problems
o Fact Fluency

• Evidence-based Mathematics SDI Practice Profile for accelerating learner progress with the adaptation of instruction based on the individual characteristics of learner, with consideration of the cognitive load in the teaching process and cognitive energy required for learning. https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/srs/cresource/q1/p01/#content This profile focuses on accelerating progress to narrow the achievement gap for students with disabilities. The EBPs have been shown to improve student learning of academic content. The practices are specific to SDI in mathematics:
o Systematic prompting and feedback
o Self-regulation support for learning and behavior
o Peer assisted instruction
o Manipulative-based instructional sequences
o Contextualized instruction
o Modified schema-based instruction
o Learning and communication accessibility

• Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework Practice Profile incorporating four of the five tenets of everyday SEL instruction designed by Nancy Frey, Dominque Smith, and Douglas Fisher. The SEL practices identify the SEL tenets (improvement targets), the learner competencies (student), and the proficiencies to be demonstrated by the teachers. These include the following:
o Identity and Agency
o Emotional Regulation
o Cognitive Regulation
o   Social Skills
• Coaching Feedback Survey – Spring 2024
o Communication: I receive a message (text, email, etc.) from my coach at least 1 – 2 days prior to an observation or meeting to discuss next steps. I receive a note or text thanking me after each visit by my coach.
o Timeliness: My coaching conversations are scheduled with my coach within 2 working days after my observation. My coach adheres to the start and end times for my scheduled observations, conversations, and learning opportunities.
o Availability: My coach is flexible to meet with me at the times when it is most convenient for me.
o Trust: My coach continually maintains a safe relationship that makes me feel comfortable and that our conversations are confidential.
o Lenses: My coach facilitates my critical thinking through a variety of perspectives when analyzing my implementation of the targeted evidence-based

practice and determining next steps for growing my skill.
o Listening: My coach listens without judgement and with intention to create space for me to express myself and reflect on my implementation.
o Questioning: My coach asks questions for clarification and to prompt me to be thoughtful about my implementation.
o Stances: As I am learning, my coach demonstrates patience and shows compassion for what I am experiencing.
o Learning: My coach effectively supports me to implement the targeted practices from the Maryland SPDG Practice Profiles by providing resources, reflecting on lesson plans/materials, modelling, co-implementing, and/or use of video analysis.

• Aligned Program Measures:
• Program Measure: Within one year of engagement with the SPDG Leadership and Stakeholder Advisory Group, University partners develop and embed EBP in mathematics SDI and SEL within the context of special education teacher preparation coursework.
• Performance Measure: After two or more observations of coaching, local coaches report experiencing high-quality coaching from state-level Professional Learning Specialists as measured by a coaching feedback survey.
• Performance Measure: After one full year of educator implementation, at least 70% of students with disabilities demonstrate growth in mathematics at a rate comparable to their grade-level peers as measured by the MCAP (Spring state assessment) and MAP (Winter grade-level performance data).
• Performance Measure: After six months of educator coaching, at least 70% of students demonstrate growth or proficiency on SEL performance-based observation indicators as measured by the Maryland Accelerates! Social-Emotional Competencies: Performance-Based Observation.
• Performance Measure: After six months of educator coaching, at least 70% of students with disabilities demonstrate math skill development as measured by classroom formative data.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Program and performance data demonstrate a pattern of improvement relative to teacher implementation of the Maryland Practice Profiles with fidelity. While MCAP performance is lagging, growth has been noted with no slippage. Ongoing monitoring of formative measures aligned with implemented practices supports a trend of gradual improvement. Consistent access to structured instructional coaching with targeted support to individual coaches has shown greater implementation of the coaching protocol with reliability.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2023, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 24, 2025, the draft FFY 2023 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

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

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

For FFY, 2023, the State is proposing revisions to its baseline and targets for Indicator 3. During the FFY 2022 OSEP APR Clarification Call, the State was made aware that it had to revise the baseline for Indicator 3 since the FFY 2020 state assessment was given using a shortened version of the assessment. Therefore, baselines and targets based on that methodology should have been revised when the State resumed the full assessment methodology in FFY 2021. During the call, the state requested using the FFY 2023 APR to reset the baseline and set targets for Indicator 3 to ensure substantial stakeholder input on the targets. Since FFY 2022 was the second year of returning to full assessment methodology, the State is proposing that FFY 2022 be the baseline year. Targets were proposed based, in part, on the progress the State made from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022.

In preparation for its FFY 2023 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example, the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in birth through 21 leadership meetings that generally occur quarterly. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC meeting in FFY 2023. Further, the state used stakeholder surveys to obtain input on proposed Indicator 3 targets.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Collaborative teams are integral to SSIP planning and implementation of improvement actions. These teams are responsible for identifying barriers to effective implementation, defining solutions for implementation improvement, and planning for sustainability and scale-up. A climate of trust, respect, and openness is required to build and sustain collaboration over time, building a commitment to systemic change, common goals, and interdependence. SSIP Implementation Teams are cross-disciplined and representative of the knowledge, skills, and expertise essential to systems change. The teams include:
• SSIP/SPDG Core Team consists of SPDG Co-Principal Investigator, SPDG Coordinator, MSDE, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist, SPDG Professional Learning Specialist Consultant, Data Coordinator, Assistant State Superintendent and Branch Chief. Monthly collaboratives.
• SSIP/SPDG Design Team: State, local, and national experts across content areas of core mathematics, specially designed instruction mathematics, social-emotional learning, and instructional coaching. Quarterly meetings.
•   Stakeholder Advisory Group includes diverse representation from the State Interagency Coordinating Council, Maryland Special Education State Advisory Committee, Parents' Place (family engagement and technical assistance), Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, University of Maryland, external evaluators from the University of Kansas, Elementary Mathematics, and SEL specialists in addition to MSDE agency representatives. Quarterly meetings.
• School-based and District-level Leadership Teams consisting of a core set of local system personnel responsible for the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of the SSIP/SPDG improvement activities such as hiring of essential personnel, professional learning, and curricular supports. Monthly meetings.
Stakeholder outreach is on-going via social media, MSDE Webpage, and email blasts.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

The average State percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 11.23%.
Statewide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 15.9% in grade 3, 10% in grade 4, and 7.8% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 22 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of all students across the State.

Baltimore County Public Schools
Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 12.5% in grade 3, 9.0% in grade 4, and 6.4% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 21 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

Howard County Public Schools
Countywide: Students with disabilities had a proficiency rate of 16.1% in grade 3, 13.8% in grade 4, and 12.1% in grade 5. An average performance gap of 36 percentage points was noted when compared to the performance of students without disabilities across the LEA.

SSIP/SPDG Sites
Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 5.56% (7 SWD of 126 SWD assessed).
All students in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 19.93% (165 students of 828 students assessed).
Achievement Gap = 14.37 percentage points

BCPS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 1.96% (1 SWD of 51 SWD assessed).
HCPSS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 8% (6 SWD of 75 SWD assessed).
* Reflects a revised baseline as indicated in FFY 2021 reporting

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The following timelines have been adjusted to reflect ongoing implementation actions.
By the end of the 2024 implementation cycle, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will Identify and design the EBPs associated with evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by Stakeholders' ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (1: very low – 5: very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.
By the end of the 2024 implementation cycle, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will define and establish the fidelity of implementation of EBP measures associated with specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (1: very low – 5: very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.
By the end of the 2024 implementation cycle, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will revise the specially designed math and SEL EBP process based on implementation fidelity and coaching input, as measured by a 4 out of 5 QUR rating on a 1 – 5 scale by teacher implementers.
By the end of the 2025 implementation cycle, University of Maryland faculty will have embedded EBP in math SDI and SEL practices in special education teacher preparation coursework, as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, and 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.
By the end of the 2026 implementation cycle, all general and special education elementary teachers participating in professional learning and coaching activities will demonstrate improved implementation of math and SEL EBPs as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Mathematics achievement has been a long-standing challenge for all students but especially students with disabilities. Similar patterns are again noted at the local level clearly demonstrating a need to accelerate achievement for all learners with rigor and high expectations. Achievement trends across the local systems demonstrate inequities across student groups, with the lowest-performing students not making the adequate growth needed to accelerate achievement and close gaps.

Mathematics achievement has been a long-standing challenge for all students but especially students with disabilities. Similar patterns are again noted at the local level clearly demonstrating a need to accelerate achievement for all learners with rigor and high expectations. Achievement trends across the local systems demonstrate inequities across student groups, with the lowest performing students not making the adequate growth needed to accelerate achievement and close gaps.

Maryland SSIP/SPDG focuses on improved student mathematics proficiency and social-emotional competence with an emphasis on children with disabilities. Implementation targets evidence-based core mathematics and specially designed mathematics instruction with embedded social-emotional learning skills. Project structures addressed during Years One and Two of implementation include the identification of well-defined evidence-based practices (EBPs) with fidelity (Maryland Practice Profiles), data-driven decision-making, job-embedded professional learning, progress-monitoring using common measures, and coaching support. Implementation is supported with ongoing professional learning and instructional coaching. This approach to capacity building is based on the stages of implementation, drivers of implementation with fidelity, and teaming structures as defined by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) with an end goal of replication and sustainability across the State, local education agencies (LEA), and school levels. This implementation cycle emphasized capacity building for implementation with the identification of grade level teams of teachers, recruitment of district level coaching personnel, and targeted professional learning opportunities. District- and school-based personnel participated in the SPDG Summer Academy, instructional coaches' training, and collaborative planning outside of the regular duty day. This process was impacted by significant delays in the hiring of project personnel as well as leadership changes across the State and local agencies.

BCPS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 4.4% representing a gain of 2.44 percentage points. Overall gain is the result of specific gains demonstrated by students with disabilities attending MEES (8.8% proficiency).
HCPSS SSIP/SPDG: Students with disabilities in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient (levels 3 & 4) in grade level mathematics (MCAP) was 7.4%. However, this percentage does not represent the specific gains demonstrated by students with disabilities attending JHES (14.3% proficiency).

Challenges impacting implementation:
• Recruitment and hiring of SSIP/SPDG Coach Facilitator/Professional Learning Specialist. Hiring and onboarding of personnel occurred November 29, 2023, following a 2 -year recruitment process. This specialist is responsible for coordinating the training and resources related to site-based direct coaching support (1.0 FTE). Full implementation of a plan for robust professional learning and consultation aligned with a structured coaching approach supporting educators with planning, implementing, and adjusting evidence-based specially designed mathematics instruction and social-emotional supports with fidelity was initiated December 2023 with the support of a contracted specialist and the MSDE Professional Learning Specialist. The contracted specialist (.4 FTE) provides technical assistance, facilitates, and leads the compilation of literature related to the evidence of effective professional learning and coaching practices.
•   Recruitment and hiring of SSIP/SPDG Site-based Coach - BCPS Each of the participating local schools identified two grade level teams and a site-based leadership team for the initial implementation of Maryland SSIP/SPDG. Despite agreements to do so the LEA failed to hire a full-time SSIP/SPDG coach to support plan implementation at the participating schools. The LEA filled the position with a resource teacher specialist serving each school 1.5 days per week. To accommodate this alternate schedule each of the participating schools reduced the number of implementing grade levels to one per school (grade 2 at SBES and grade 5 at MEES).
•   Implementation of a new countywide math curriculum – BCPS. The LEA rolled out a new math curriculum in August of 2023 for all elementary grade levels and special education. This implementation resulted in additional professional learning needs to increase the knowledge, capacity and understanding of the curriculum. Varied support structures may have impacted implementation with fidelity.
• Abbreviated implementation timeline prior to State assessments.
•   Inconsistent school – and district-level leadership support relative to collaborative time for planning, coaching, and capacity building.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Professional Learning/Technical Assistance
Professional learning when integrated with school improvement and inclusive of ongoing seminars, on-demand supports and contact with peers during the learning process provides opportunities for personnel to engage in learning that transforms practice and sustainable active learning. Studies have shown that effective professional learning encompassing models of expected practice, coaching support, and reflective performance feedback are key

considerations for improving student math performance. (Akiba, M & Liang, G., 2016)
• Allocation of State discretionary funding to support locally driven professional learning, instructional coaching, and continuous improvement.
•   Developed, implemented, and refined specific practice profiles targeting improvement actions to address SiMR:
o   Evidence-Based Mathematics Core Practices aligned with the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for Mathematics and the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Practice Guide (.https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguides) Tier 1 Interventions and effective evidence-based core instructional practices supporting elementary students at risk for or with disabilities.
o Increasing Intensity of Instruction/Intervention through Data-Based Individualization and the Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity for Tier 2 or supplemental mathematics intervention.
o Evidence-based Mathematics SDI for accelerating learner progress with the adaptation of instruction based on the individual characteristics of learner, with consideration of the cognitive load in the teaching process and cognitive energy required for learning.
https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/srs/cresource/q1/p01/#content
o Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework incorporating four of the five tenets of everyday SEL instruction designed by Nancy Frey, Dominque Smith, and Douglas Fisher.
• Summer 2023 Professional Learning Academy for the launch of SSIP/SPDG improvement actions. A three-day academy featuring local, State and National experts in the areas of mathematics (core and SDI), social-emotional learning and professional learning for the development of school-wide instructional practices targeting improved mathematics performance and social-emotional competence for all learners and narrowing achievement gaps for students with disabilities. Targeted professional learning to meet the needs of personnel at the participating schools, identify improvement priorities and practices for the 2023 – 24 school year. National experts included Jenny Root, Nancy Frey, and Douglas Fisher.
• Summer 2024 Professional Learning Academy for the launch of SSIP/SPDG improvement actions. A three-day academy featuring local, State and National experts in the areas of mathematics (core and SDI), social-emotional learning and professional learning for the development of school-wide instructional practices targeting improved mathematics performance and social-emotional competence for all learners and narrowing achievement gaps for students with disabilities. Targeted professional learning to meet the needs of personnel at the participating schools, identify improvement priorities and practices for the 2024 – 25 school year. National experts included John SanGiovanni with consultative support of Nancy Frey
•   Developed of asynchronous learning modules aligned to the Maryland Practice Profiles and integrated with school improvement objectives.
• Purchased and distributed professional learning resources aligned with State and local improvement targets.
• Cultivated University partnership for the development of preservice and in-service learning for general education and special education teachers. MOU was established with University of Maryland College Park, October 2024.
• Piloted Maryland's SPDG Coaching Guide and training protocol for district and State personnel linked to the implementation of instructional coaching related to Maryland's Practice Profiles. Technical assistance and feedback provided by Thomas Guskey.
o Hired MSDE and LEA coaches.
o Initiated a series of professional learning for the development of coaches' capacity. Initial training provided via a two-day in-person workshop followed by bi-weekly job-embedded collaborative opportunities for ongoing learning and networking.
o Defined the roles and responsibilities of the Instructional Coach, School Principal, and School Leadership Team in support of SSIP/SPDG improvement actions and the implementation of instructional coaching with fidelity.
o Collaborate with University of Kansas, Debriefscape to establish a prototype of an analytical observational toolkit for mathematics and SEL aligned with the Maryland Practice Profiles supporting coaches working with SSIP/SPDG elementary teachers using a tailored dashboard of professional learning resources including video sampling.
Data-Informed Decisions
Using data strategically to guide decisions and actions provided stakeholders with the evidence necessary for educators to address the high leverage problems of practice. Data enables policymakers to make objective decisions about education systems and provide states, locals and/or schools with information on program effectiveness; can provide teachers and administrators with information on student learning to influence instruction, programming, and professional development; and can be shared with students and families to help motivate and engage them in the learning. (IES, 2021).
• The FFY 2023 SSIP/SPDG supported a plan for continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics and social-emotional learning competencies using EBP aligned to implementation fidelity. The State took the following actions during this reporting period:
o Hire external evaluators (A. Gaumer-Erikson and P. Noonan) to assist State efforts to define and implement a valid and usable data system to track learner outcomes and progress toward SiMR.
o Collect and analyze baseline MCAP data.
o Identify students' Mathematics Benchmark/Universal Screener outcome data for the Winter administration.
•   The FFY 2023 SSIP implementation plan identified measures to reliably assess personnel capacity, implementation of EBPs with fidelity and improved student outcomes:
o Students' Social Emotional Learning Competency outcome(s) for the Fall and Spring Winter of each school year.
o Participant Survey data related to the impact of professional learning on personnel capacity and the implementation of EBPs with fidelity. In development.
o Coaching Implementation Fidelity data to identify the impact of professional learning and job-embedded coaching on personnel capacity and improved student outcomes.
o Benchmarking Survey administered three times per year to track professional growth and inform ongoing support needs (Beginning of School Year (Aug/Sept), Mid-year (Jan), and End of School Year (June)). In development.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Indicator 18: General Supervision

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

a. # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)

b. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

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

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	98.94%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 4B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There were no additional findings to report related to Indicator 4B.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

The State did not identify noncompliance.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

The State did not identify noncompliance.

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

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There were no additional findings to report related to Indicator 9.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

The State did not identify noncompliance.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

The State did not identify noncompliance.

Indicator 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0		0		0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There were no additional findings to report related to Indicator 10.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

The State did not identify noncompliance.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

The State did not identify noncompliance.

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

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
17	6	16	2	5

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

In FFY 2022, six (6) additional findings of noncompliance were made through the dispute resolution process.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

For FFY 2022, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified twenty-three (23) new findings of noncompliance.

Eighteen (18) of the twenty-three (23) findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance.

There were five (5) findings of noncompliance that were not corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. Of those findings, one (1) finding was corrected subsequently, although late and (4) findings have not been fully corrected to date.

Regardless of the method of identification (SPP/APR data, monitoring, or dispute resolution), to ensure correction, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction was verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified by ensuring each student received their initial evaluation as required. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES has verified that the LEA achieved 100% compliance for nineteen (19) (18 within one year of notification and 1 after one year of notification) of twenty-three (23) incidences of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

MSDE is continuing to work with the LEAs that have not fully corrected noncompliance from FFY 2022 to ensure correction as soon as possible.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Regardless of the method of identification (SPP/APR data, monitoring, or dispute resolution), the MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual student for which evaluations were not completed within timelines and verified that the evaluation was completed, although late, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Through this review process, the MSDE verified that each individual student identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with regulatory requirements and OSEP QA 23-01. All individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 related to indicator 11 have been corrected.

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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
6	1	6	1	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

In FFY 2022, one (1) additional finding of noncompliance was made through the dispute resolution process.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified seven (7) total findings of noncompliance. All seven (7) findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. Regardless of the method of identification (SPP/APR data, monitoring, or dispute resolution), the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each Local Education Agency (LEA) or Public Agency (PA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. First, correction is verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that all seven (7) LEAs/PAs for which noncompliance was identified achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent data analysis for Indicator 12, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Regardless of the method of identification (SPP/APR data, monitoring, or dispute resolution), the MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the IEPs and records for each of individual child with findings of noncompliance in the LEA/PA where the findings of noncompliance were made, The DEI/SES verified that, although late, an IEP was developed and implemented for all those students unless the child was no longer within the local education agency or public agency, or the parent had withdrawn consent. An updated random sample of student records from a subsequent data set was reviewed to determine if those records were also compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE verified that each individual student identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP QA 23-01. All individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 related to indicator 12 have been corrected.

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

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected)
4	11	4	9	2

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

In FFY 2022, eleven (11) additional findings of noncompliance were made: six (6) through the dispute resolution process and five (5) through the comprehensive monitoring process.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

For FFY 2022, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified fifteen (15) total findings of noncompliance.

Thirteen (13) of the fifteen (15) findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance.

Two (2) dispute resolution findings have not been fully corrected to date. For these two (2) findings, correction has occurred at the individual student level but subsequent school-level data has not yielded 100% correction.

Regardless of the method of identification (SPP/APR data, monitoring, or dispute resolution), to ensure correction, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b). First, correction was verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, records were reviewed to determine if those records were compliant by meeting all the requirements of Indicator 13. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that thirteen (13) of fifteen (15) LEAs achieved 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

MSDE is continuing to work with the two (2) LEAs that have not fully corrected noncompliance from FFY 2022 to ensure correction as soon as possible.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Regardless of the method of identification (SPP/APR data, monitoring, or dispute resolution), the MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the IEPs and records for each of the individual children identified with noncompliance in each LEA/PA where noncompliance occurred. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that the records of each individual child contained the required components for secondary transition as defined by 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA/PA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. All individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 related to indicator 13 have been corrected.

Optional for FFY 2023, 2024, and 2025:

Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
618	618	0

Explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

For FFY 2022, the State is opting to report on another 618 findings of noncompliance identified through the comprehensive monitoring process.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

For FFY 2022, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified 618 new findings of noncompliance through the comprehensive monitoring process. All 618 findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance.

To ensure correction, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of for each area of noncompliance. First, correction was verified in the records of the students where the noncompliance was identified. In particular, IEPs were reviewed for each student where noncompliance was identified to ensure the noncompliance was corrected on each student's IEP. Second, using updated data, subsequent to the issuance of the written finding, for each area in which noncompliance was identified, was reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that each LEA achieved 100% compliance for each identified area of noncompliance identified, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the IEPs and records for each of the individual children identified with noncompliance in each LEA/PA where noncompliance occurred. The MSDE, DEI/SES verified that the records of each individual child were corrected in the area of the identified noncompliance to meet the requirements of IDEA unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
27	636	26	630	7

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2022	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
656	663		100%	98.94%	N/A	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	1.06%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023)	663
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	656

3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	7

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	7
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	1
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	0
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	0
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	0
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	0
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	0
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	0
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	0
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	6

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

LEAs must correct noncompliance within one (1) year of notification, as required by OSEP QA 23-01. When LEAs fail to fully correct noncompliance within one (1) year of notification, they are required to complete a Corrective Action Plan. MSDE's Corrective Action Plans require the LEA to conduct a root cause analysis of the noncompliance and to develop and implement strategies to correct noncompliance. LEAs that fail to correct noncompliance within one (1) year as required may receive impacted determinations. Timely correction of noncompliance is one factor that the State uses to make determinations. As noted in the APR's introduction, the LEA's determination impacts its Tier of General Supervision and monitoring cycle, as well as additional enforcement actions (.eg., withholding or directing the use of funds). For information on how the state subsequently verified that the correction of noncompliance reported for Indicator 11 were corrected, please see the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022" in Indicator 11.

18 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported 98.94% of its findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of identification. However, the State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 related to Child find; Early childhood transition; and, Secondary transition because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP QA 23-01. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022: (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.

The State has established baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2023, but OSEP cannot accept that baseline data because it cannot determine whether the State's FFY 2023 data are valid and reliable, as noted above.

18 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Brian Morrison

Title:

Branch Chief, Policy and Accountability

Email:

brian.morrison@maryland.gov

Phone:

4107670863

Submitted on:

04/23/25 2:55:57 PM

Determination Enclosures

Data Rubric
Maryland

FFY 2023 APR (1)
Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
18	0	0

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2023 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5

Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 7/31/24	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/19/25	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/19/25	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/19/25	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/8/25	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/13/24	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 9/4/24	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	27.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.28571429 points are subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	27.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	53.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	54.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9815
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	98.15

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.28571429.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2025 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely –   A State will receive one point if it submits all ED*Facts* files or the entire E*MAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described in the table below).

618 Data Collection	ED*Facts* Files/ E*MAPS* Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	FS002 & FS089	7/31/2024
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	2/19/2025
Part B Exiting	FS009	2/19/2025
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	2/19/2025
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/8/2025
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in E*MAPS*	11/13/2024
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in E*MAPS*	9/4/2024

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data and metadata responses submitted to ED*Facts* align. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.

Dispute Resolution
IDEA Part B
Maryland
School Year: 2023-24

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing' if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	279
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	230
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	183
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	203
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	23
(1.2) Complaints pending.	6
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	1
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	43

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	392
(2.1) Mediations held.	179
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	113
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	42
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	66
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	42
(2.2) Mediations pending.	28
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	185

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	360
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	68
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	13
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	20
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	6
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	14
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	61
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	279

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	1
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	1
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0

(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	1	Part B

State Comments:

Errors:
Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Maryland
These data were extracted on the close date:
11/13/2024