



Maryland Report on Part B Indicator 8 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

2014-2015

December 1, 2015

Submitted to:

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early
Intervention Services

Submitted by:

ICF International
530 Gaither Road
Rockville, MD

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Data Collection Methodology.....	1
1.2 Analytic Methods	3
2. Preschool Survey.....	3
2.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents' Children	4
2.1.1 Age, Race/Ethnicity.....	5
2.1.2 Primary Exceptionality/Disability	6
2.2 Summary of Survey Responses	7
2.3 OSEP Indicator 8 Preschool Estimates	8
3. School-Age Survey	10
3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents' Children	11
3.1.1 Age, Race/Ethnicity.....	11
3.1.2 Primary Exceptionality/Disability	12
3.2 Summary of Survey Responses	13
3.3 OSEP Indicator 8 School-Age Estimates	14
4. Historical Trends.....	16

1. Introduction

ICF International (ICF) was contracted by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) to administer its annual Part B Indicator 8 Parent Survey for the 2014-15 school year. Part B Indicator 8 of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) requires states to report:

Percentage 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.

This Indicator is also used to address involvement of parents with children in preschool as specified in Section 619 of Part B of IDEA. MSDE is required to report the value of this Indicator to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the U.S. Department of Education (ED) by February 1st of each year.

In support of these two objectives, ICF administered two surveys:

- **A Preschool Survey** – completed by the parents/guardians of children who received special education services in preschool during the 2014-15 school year and were between the ages of three and five as of September 30, 2014.
- **A School-Age Survey** – completed by the parents/guardians of children who received special education services in kindergarten or above during the 2014-15 school year and were at least six years of age as of September 30, 2014.

As in prior years, the 2014-15 Survey consists of items obtained from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) item bank. However, this year three new questions were added to the Preschool Survey that were not in the NCSEAM item bank, and four questions were removed; six new questions were added to the School-Age Survey that were not in the NCSEAM bank and seven questions were removed. Both surveys include 24 core questions, which is one less question than last year. The surveys end with several demographic questions and an open-ended comment section.¹ This report summarizes the methodology used to administer the surveys and presents the findings from each survey.

1.1 Data Collection Methodology

Following the administering of the 2014 Survey, the Special Education Directors in each jurisdiction were emailed a brief questionnaire to obtain feedback on how they used the Survey promotional materials with which they were provided (See the 2014 report for a description of these materials). One of the last questions on the questionnaire asked the respondents if they would be willing to participate in a pilot administration of the 2015 Survey. Respondents who indicated interest in the pilot were subsequently invited to participate in a webinar that outlined how the Survey should be administered. Key differences between the pilot and the traditional approach used in prior years are summarized in Exhibit 1.1.

¹ An analysis of the open-ended comments is not a part of this report. However, all comments are compiled and provided to MSDE.

Exhibit 1.1: A Comparison of the Pilot and Traditional Survey Administration Approach

	Pilot	Traditional
Number of Jurisdictions	9 Local School Systems (LSSs)	15 Local School Systems (LSSs) 3 Public Agencies (PA)
Student population estimate	30,651 (estimate of students in the 9 systems; 3,059 preschool children and 27,592 school-age)	74,509 Surveys mailed (12,048 preschool and 62,461 school-age)
Survey Window	September 2014 – June 22, 2015 (extended until June 30, 2015)	April 16, 2015 – June 22, 2015 (extended until June 30, 2015)
Distribution	ICF prepared packages for each school in the pilot. Packages were sent to the LSS who distributed them to their schools.	Mailed directly to parents' home by ICF. Parents' addresses were received from MSDE who forwarded them as received from each LSS and PA. Packets were addressed to "Parent of [name of child]."
Packet Contents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Postcards introducing the pilot – Preschool and School-Age Surveys in English and Spanish – Preschool and School-Age Survey cover letters in English and Spanish – Frequently Asked Questions Document in English and Spanish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preschool or School-Age Survey in English and Spanish – Preschool or School-Age cover letters in English and Spanish – Frequently Asked Questions Document in English and Spanish – Business Reply Envelope
Outreach/Promotional Strategy	<p>Schools were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Include a postcard with the Individualized Education Program (IEP) 10 day annual review invitation sent to parents. – Include a copy of the Survey and cover letter with the documents sent to parents 5 days prior to the IEP meeting. – Provide a copy of the Survey at the IEP meeting (if needed). – Include a postcard with the IEP team summary sent to parents. 	<p>LSSs were asked to promote the Survey to parents and provided various resources to help them in this endeavor. Resources included flyers, web banners, text for inclusion in newsletters, and a podcast created by the Center for Technology Education at Johns Hopkins University (JHU) in collaboration with MSDE.</p> <p>Prior to the opening of the Survey window, an ICF team member contacted each LSS by phone and email to confirm receipt of the promotional material. LSSs with low response rates (compared to their 2014 rates) were re-contacted prior to the close of the window.</p>
Survey Completion Options	Online (marylandlearninglinks.org/13754) in English or Spanish or by postal mail either at the school immediately following the IEP meeting or at the parent's convenience at any time during the survey window.	Online (www.mdparentsurvey.com) in English or Spanish or by postal mail at any time during the survey window.
Survey Support	Bilingual help desk.	Bilingual help desk.
Survey Processing	<p>Paper surveys were returned to ICF where they were processed.</p> <p>Results from the online Survey were forwarded to ICF by JHU – the organization that hosted the pilot Survey. The data was then processed.</p>	<p>Paper surveys were returned to ICF where they were processed.</p> <p>ICF downloaded and processed the online Survey results.</p>

1.2 Analytic Methods

Chapters 2 and 3 provide a summary of findings from the two surveys. The respondents to each survey are described demographically, and the value of Indicator 8 is reported. The value of Indicator 8 is calculated through a Rasch analysis using Winsteps software and the anchors suggested by NCSEAM.

The Rasch analysis condenses all of a respondent's responses to the 24 core survey items into a single measure. This measure represents the extent to which a respondent agrees with the survey items overall; a person with a high number is expressing more agreement with items on the scale than an individual with a lower number.

After assigning this single number to each respondent, the analysis uses a cut score to determine whether or not each respondent believes that his/her child's school is facilitating parent involvement. With the help of an expert panel, NCSEAM determined that the appropriate cut score is 600. Therefore, if a respondent's Rasch measure is equal to or above 600, he/she is considered to believe that their school is facilitating parent involvement.

The value reported for Indicator 8 is the percentage of respondents that meet this criterion. The value of Indicator 8 is reported with a 95% confidence interval; one can be 95% sure that the true value of the indicator lies within this given confidence interval.

2. Preschool Survey

Data received from MSDE indicated that in 2015, there were more than 15,000 preschool children receiving services in the state. Of the 12,048 Surveys mailed to parents (i.e., non-pilot surveys), 3% were returned as undeliverable because the address was out of date or inaccurate. The jurisdictions with the highest rate of undeliverable surveys (more than 5%) were:

- Washington County (13%)
- Dorchester County (11%)
- Kent County (8%)
- Calvert County (6%)

To account for undeliverable surveys, an adjusted response rate was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Adjusted Response Rate} = \text{Total Number of Surveys Completed} / (\text{Total Number of Surveys Mailed} - \text{Total Number of Surveys Undeliverable})$$

Exhibit 2.1 summarizes the Survey completion data. Overall, 1,914 completed Surveys were received, which is an adjusted response rate of 13%; this was the same as the previous year. The pilot administration received a response rate of 9%, compared to an adjusted response rate of 14% for the traditional administration. The jurisdictions with the highest adjusted response rates (above 20%) were:

- MD Schools for the Blind (48%)
- St. Mary's County (37%)
- Anne Arundel County (22%)

Parents had the option of completing the Survey online or on paper, and in Spanish or English. Statewide, 1,763 were completed in English (92%) and 151 surveys were completed in Spanish (8%). In 19 of the 26 jurisdictions, there were no surveys completed in Spanish.

Paper Surveys were more common than online Surveys. Overall, 1,316 paper Surveys were received, which was 69% of all Surveys, while 598 Surveys were completed online (31% of all Surveys). English-language respondents were more likely to use the online Survey than Spanish language respondents;

among respondents who completed the Survey in English, 33% completed the Survey online, compared to just 11% of Spanish language Surveys.

Exhibit 2.1: Summary of Responses to Preschool Survey

Jurisdiction	Total Number in Jurisdiction	Total Surveys Completed	Surveys Completed in English		Surveys Completed in Spanish		Returned Undeliverable (%)*	Adjusted Response Rate (%)
			Paper (N)	Online (N)	Paper (N)	Online (N)		
Statewide	15,107	1,914	1,181	582	135	16	3%	13%
Allegany	115	7	7	-	-	-	NA	6%
Anne Arundel	1,111	242	143	93	6	-	3%	22%
Baltimore City	960	27	20	7	-	-	NA	3%
Baltimore County	3,445	257	218	26	11	2	2%	8%
Calvert	232	30	17	13	-	-	6%	14%
Caroline	43	8	7	1	-	-	0%	19%
Carroll	317	43	42	1	-	-	4%	14%
Cecil	260	30	21	8	1	-	3%	12%
Charles	386	13	10	3	-	-	NA	3%
Dorchester	47	6	6	-	-	-	11%	14%
Frederick	519	85	31	54	-	-	NA	16%
Garrett	50	4	4	-	-	-	2%	8%
Harford	477	72	62	10	-	-	2%	15%
Howard	675	46	32	14	-	-	NA	7%
Kent	36	3	2	1	-	-	8%	9%
Montgomery	3,793	484	337	89	58	-	3%	13%
Prince George's	1,811	333	135	149	39	10	3%	19%
Queen Anne's	89	12	8	4	-	-	NA	13%
St. Mary's	172	63	3	60	-	-	NA	37%
Somerset	46	6	5	-	1	-	4%	14%
Talbot	49	6	3	2	1	-	NA	12%
Washington	184	15	13	2	-	-	13%	9%
Wicomico	107	8	8	-	-	-	4%	8%
Worcester	94	12	2	10	-	-	NA	13%
MD Schools for the Deaf [†]	66	10	8	2	-	-	2%	15%
MD School for the Blind	23	11	4	7	-	-	0%	48%
Unknown**	-	81	33	26	18	4	-	-

Note: * Maryland LSSs administering the pilot survey did not use mail and therefore the counts for returned undeliverable surveys do not apply to the pilot. [†] Results are aggregated for the Frederick and Columbia campuses of the Maryland Schools for the Deaf. ** Surveys classified as unknown are those on which respondents did not indicate the County in which they receive service.

2.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents' Children

In this section, in addition to discussing the demographic characteristics of respondents' children, these characteristics are compared to those of the population from which the sample was drawn. The respondent demographic data included in this report was self-reported by survey respondents. The

population demographic data included in Section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 were obtained from the 2014 Maryland Special Education/Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables report.²

For the purpose of this report, a demographic group is classified as being overrepresented in the respondent sample if the percentage of that group in our sample is greater than its percentage in the statewide estimate by 3 percentage points or more. Similarly, a demographic group is classified as being underrepresented in the sample if the difference between the percentage of that group in the sample is less than its percentage in the statewide estimates by 3 percentage points or more. Differences of 3 percentage points or more are bolded, indicating areas in which the parents or guardians who responded to the survey are different from the statewide population. If the difference between the sample and the statewide estimate is less than 3 percentage points in either direction, the respondent sample is not significantly different from the statewide population.

Respondents were also asked to indicate their child's age when first referred to Early Intervention or Special Education. Of the respondents who answered this question, 69 percent (n=1,329) indicated that their children had been referred between the ages of two and four.

2.1.1 Age, Race/Ethnicity

Exhibit 2.2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the children of respondents. Parents were asked about the age of their child as of September 30, 2014. Similar to last year, a majority (84%) of respondents stated that their child was between 3 and 5 years of age. Parents of 6 year old children constituted a greater percentage of this year's Survey (8%) than last year's Survey (when 4% of respondents said their child was 6 years old). The parents or guardians of children 5 years of age are underrepresented in our sample (-20%), while parents or guardians of children 3 and 6 years of age are overrepresented (6% and 8%, respectively).

The two racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (44%) and Black children (23%). Similar to last year, parents of Black children are underrepresented (-11%) in the Survey and parents of White children are overrepresented (4%) when compared to the state population as a whole.

Exhibit 2.2: Age, Race/Ethnicity: Comparison between Respondent Sample and Statewide Estimate – Preschool Survey†

	Population from 2014 Maryland Special Education Census Data (N=11,980)		Respondents (N=1,914)		Over (Under) Representation
	N	%	N	%	
Age					
3 Years	2,573	21%	518	27%	6%
4 Years	4,244	35%	642	34%	(1%)
5 Years	5,163	43%	444	23%	(20%)
6 Years	-	-	150	8%	8%
Unknown	-	-	160	8%	-
Race/Ethnicity					
White	4,824	40%	851	44%	4%
Black	4,055	34%	448	23%	(11%)
Hispanic or Latino	1,925	16%	283	15%	(1%)

² http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/planningresultstest/doc/20142015Student/2014-2015_SpecEd_102915.pdf; Extended IFSP students were not included in the population demographic data.

	Population from 2014 Maryland Special Education Census Data (N=11,980)		Respondents (N=1,914)		Over (Under) Representation
	N	%	N	%	
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander	637	5%	130	7%	2%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	45	<1%	5	<1%	-
Multi-racial	494	4%	118	6%	2%
Unknown	-	-	79	4%	-

Note: †Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

2.1.2 Primary Exceptionality/Disability

According to statewide estimates, the most common exceptionality or disability evident in the Maryland preschool population is developmental delay (51%). Although this group did make up the largest portion of the sample, compared to the statewide estimate this group was underrepresented among the respondents (-23%). The second most common exceptionality or disability statewide is speech or language impairment. Whereas this population was under-represented in last year's Survey, in this year's Survey there was no significant difference between statewide estimates and Survey respondents. However, parents of children with autism were overrepresented (7%) in this year's Survey, as was the case last year.

Exhibit 2.3: Exceptionalities/Disabilities: Comparison between Respondent Sample and Statewide Estimate – Preschool Survey

	Statewide Estimate of Active/Eligible Population (2014)		Respondents (N=1,914)		Over (Under) Representation
	N	%	N	%	
Autism	886	7%	260	14%	7%
Deaf-Blindness	189	2%	3	<1%	(2%)
Deafness	65	1%	14	1%	-
Developmental Delay	6,134	51%	546	29%	(23%)
Emotional Disability	6	<1%	9	<1%	-
Hearing Impairment	73	1%	14	1%	-
Intellectual Disability	49	<1%	13	1%	<1%
Orthopedic impairment	21	<1%	3	<1%	-
Other Health Impairment	256	2%	28	1%	(1%)
Specific Learning Disability	9	<1%	46	2%	2%
Speech or Language Impairment	4,241	35%	693	36%	1%
Traumatic Brain Injury	16	<1%	4	<1%	-
Visual Impairment including Blindness	34	<1%	11	1%	1%
Multiple Disabilities	1	<1%	34	2%	2%
Unknown	-	-	236	12%	-

Note: †Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

2.2 Summary of Survey Responses

This section provides a statewide summary of survey responses. ICF has also created local jurisdiction dashboards, which provide individual school system's data on every question in the Preschool Survey for this year. These are available in Appendix A.

The Survey asked respondents to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with 24 statements about their satisfaction with special education services they receive. Statewide, every item on the Survey was answered by at least 71% of respondents, including 21 items for which at least 90% of respondents provided an answer.

Exhibit 2.4 shows the percentage of respondents who agreed with each of the statements on the Survey. For each item on the Survey, a majority of parents agreed with the statement, including 20 items where at least 80% of respondents agreed. The statement with the highest percentage of agreement (97%) was Question 12 "People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers, respect my culture." Similar to previous years, the statements with the highest level of agreement were those related to the way teachers and service providers include and value parents.

Also like previous years, the statements with which the smallest percentage of agreement were related to the way parents are connected with outside services, organizations, or individuals. The statement with the lowest percentage of agreement was "People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers, connect me with other families for mutual support," with which 52% of parents agreed.

Exhibit 2.4: Summary of Responses to Survey Questions – Preschool Survey[†]

Survey Questions	Respondents Answering this Statement	Respondents Agreeing with this Statement
Q12 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers respect my culture.	93%	97%
Q4 Written information I receive is in words I understand.	99%	95%
Q1 I am part of the IEP decision-making process.	98%	95%
Q9 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers are available to speak with me.	97%	94%
Q14 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers ensure that I have fully understood my rights related to preschool special education.	96%	93%
Q2 My recommendations are included on the IEP.	97%	93%
Q13 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers value my ideas.	96%	93%
Q10 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers treat me as an equal team member.	97%	92%
Q11 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	97%	90%
Q3 My child's IEP goals are written in a way that I can work on them at home during daily routines.	98%	90%
Q15 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers communicate regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.	97%	88%

Survey Questions	Respondents Answering this Statement	Respondents Agreeing with this Statement
Q18 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers give me enough information to know if my child is making progress.	97%	87%
Q22 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers offer me different ways of communicating with people from preschool special education (e.g., face-to-face meetings, phone calls, e-mail).	94%	86%
Q19 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers give me information about the approaches they use to help my child learn.	97%	86%
Q6 My child receives his/her preschool special education services with children without disabilities to the maximum extent possible.	91%	85%
Q17 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers provide me with strategies to deal with my child's behavior.	90%	84%
Q16 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers give me options concerning my child's services and supports.	95%	83%
Q23 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers explain what options I have if I disagree with a decision made by the preschool special education IEP team.	89%	82%
Q5 I have been asked for my opinion about how well preschool special education services are meeting my child's needs.	97%	82%
Q7 If my child's services are provided only with children with disabilities, a written explanation of this is on the IEP.	71%	80%
Q20 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers give me information about organizations that offer support for parents (e.g., Parent Resource Centers, disability groups).	90%	73%
Q21 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers offer me information regarding parent training.	90%	71%
Q8 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers provide me with information on how to get other services (e.g., childcare, parent support, respite, regular preschool program, WIC, food stamps).	90%	70%
Q24 People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers connect me with other families for mutual support.	87%	52%

Note: † Table is sorted in descending order of the percentage of participants agreeing with each statement.

2.3 OSEP Indicator 8 Preschool Estimates

While we present a summary of responses to each question in the section above, NCSEAM recommends that the value of Indicator 8 be calculated using Rasch analysis. In Rasch analysis, each item on a scale (in this case the Survey) has a calibration value. The value is an indication of how challenging the item is to agree with. Items with lower calibration values are easier to agree with than items with higher values. The Rasch Analysis uses these calibration values and converts a person's responses to all items on the Survey (the scale) into a single number or "measure." NCSEAM recommends that states report the percentage of respondents who have a measure at or above the NCSEAM established cut point measure of 600.

For the 2014-15 school year, 48% of parents had measures that exceeded the cut point measure. **Therefore, the value of OSEP Indicator 8 for parents of preschool students during the 2014-15**

school year is 48%. This means that 48% of parents, statewide, agree that their child's school facilitated parent involvement. The 95% confidence interval for this Indicator is from 46% to 50%.

Another way to analyze survey responses is to look at the mean of respondents' measures. The mean of the measure statewide was 602. This means that parents are by and large agreeing strongly, or very strongly, with all the items on the survey up to the item that has a calibration value at around 602. If the state would like to increase its mean measure, one thing it could do is focus its efforts on getting parents to agree with statements with calibration values above 602, such as:

- *People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers provide me with information on how to get other services (e.g., childcare, parent support, respite, regular preschool program, WIC, food stamps). (Q8)*
- *People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers give me information about organizations that offer support for parents (for example, Parent Resource Centers, disability groups). (Q20)*

Exhibit 2.5 presents the estimates of Indicator 8 for the preschool population by LSS or PA. Estimates are not reported where there are fewer than 10 respondents.

Exhibit 2.5: 2014-15 Estimates for Part B Indicator 8 – Preschool Survey

Jurisdiction	Estimate of Indicator 8	Number of Valid Responses	Std. Error	Lower CI	Upper CI
Statewide	48%	1,914*	.01	46%	50%
Allegany	-	7	-	-	-
Anne Arundel	50%	242	.03	43%	56%
Baltimore City	44%	27	.10	26%	63%
Baltimore County	46%	257	.03	40%	52%
Calvert	47%	30	.09	29%	65%
Caroline	-	8	-	-	-
Carroll	40%	43	.07	25%	54%
Cecil	50%	30	.09	32%	68%
Charles	77%	13	.12	54%	100%
Dorchester	-	6	-	-	-
Frederick	53%	85	.05	42%	64%
Garrett	-	4	-	-	-
Harford	39%	72	.06	28%	50%
Howard	50%	46	.07	36%	64%
Kent	-	3	-	-	-
Montgomery	47%	484	.02	43%	52%
Prince George's	48%	333	.03	42%	53%
Queen Anne's	33%	12	.14	7%	60%
Saint Mary's	40%	63	.06	28%	52%
Somerset	-	6	-	-	-
Talbot	-	6	-	-	-
Washington	47%	15	.13	21%	72%
Wicomico	-	8	-	-	-
Worcester	92%	12	.08	76%	107%

Jurisdiction	Estimate of Indicator 8	Number of Valid Responses	Std. Error	Lower CI	Upper CI
MD School for the Deaf [†]	50%	10	.16	19%	81%
MD Schools for the Blind	36%	11	.15	8%	65%

Note:[†] Results are aggregated for the Frederick and Columbia campuses. * Of the respondents with valid data for this calculation, 81 did not report the LSS or PA with which they are affiliated.

3. School-Age Survey

Data received from MSDE indicated that in 2015, there were more than 90,000 children between the ages of 6 and 21 who were receiving special education services in the state. Of the 62,461 Surveys mailed to parents (i.e., non-pilot surveys), 3% were returned as undeliverable. The jurisdictions with the highest undeliverable rates were SEED School (14%) and Cecil County (11%); no other jurisdiction had more than 7% of Surveys returned as undeliverable. To account for undeliverable surveys, an adjusted response rate was calculated using the same formula as the Preschool Survey. The adjusted response rate this year was 10%, compared to 9% on last year's Survey. The pilot administration received a response rate of 6%, compared to an adjusted response rate of 12% for the traditional administration. The jurisdictions with the highest adjusted response rates (above 20%) were:

- Somerset County (24%)
- St. Mary's County (22%)

Parents had the option of completing the Survey online or on paper, and in Spanish or English. As in the previous year, nearly all Surveys (95%) were completed in English, with just 5% completed in Spanish statewide. The jurisdictions with the highest percentage of Surveys completed in Spanish were Prince George's County (8%) and Montgomery County (8%); in no other counties were more than 5% of Surveys completed in Spanish, and in 9 jurisdictions there were no Surveys completed in Spanish.

Paper Surveys were more common than online Surveys. Of the 8,895 surveys received, 70% were completed on paper and 30% were submitted online. Similar to the Preschool Survey, respondents who completed the Survey in English were more likely to submit an online Survey (31%) than those who completed it in Spanish, of whom 13% submitted the Survey online.

Exhibit 3.1: Summary of Responses to School-Age Survey

Jurisdiction	Total Number in Jurisdiction	Total Surveys Completed	Surveys Completed in English		Surveys Completed in Spanish		Returned Undeliverable (%) [*]	Adjusted Response Rate (%)
			Paper (N)	Online (N)	Paper (N)	Online (N)		
Statewide	90,053	8,895	5,860	2,626	355	54	3%	10%
Allegany	1,174	113	92	21	-	-	NA	10%
Anne Arundel	6,967	1,139	643	480	15	1	3%	17%
Baltimore City	12,544	280	252	24	4	-	NA	2%
Baltimore County	10,382	806	702	94	10	-	3%	8%
Calvert	1,275	169	84	85	-	-	3%	14%
Caroline	538	66	64	2	-	-	1%	12%
Carroll	2,800	268	245	20	3	-	1%	10%
Cecil	2,084	179	143	34	2	-	11%	10%
Charles	2,377	80	76	4	-	-	NA	3%
Dorchester	435	42	36	5	1	-	7%	10%
Frederick	3,778	430	303	122	5	-	NA	11%

Jurisdiction	Total Number in Jurisdiction	Total Surveys Completed	Surveys Completed in English		Surveys Completed in Spanish		Returned Undeliverable (%)*	Adjusted Response Rate (%)
			Paper (N)	Online (N)	Paper (N)	Online (N)		
Garrett	367	47	36	11	-	-	1%	13%
Harford	4,715	514	440	69	5	-	2%	11%
Howard	4,161	202	167	35	-	-	NA	5%
Kent	220	20	14	3	3	-	6%	10%
Montgomery	14,505	1,680	1,104	421	148	7	2%	12%
Prince George's	13,211	1,542	783	621	100	38	4%	12%
Queen Anne's	834	69	39	30	-	-	NA	8%
St. Mary's	1,591	354	63	290	-	1	NA	22%
Somerset	390	88	38	48	-	2	5%	24%
Talbot	389	52	15	35	2	-	NA	13%
Washington	2,275	191	168	22	1	-	5%	9%
Wicomico	1,684	146	136	7	3	-	4%	9%
Worcester	744	96	49	47	-	-	NA	13%
SEED School	37	6	6	-	-	-	14%	19%
MD Schools for the Deaf	404	57	37	17	3	-	3%	15%
MD School for the Blind	172	20	16	3	-	1	1%	12%
Unknown**	-	239	109	76	50	4	-	-

Note: * Maryland LSSs administering the pilot survey did not use mail and therefore the counts for returned undeliverable surveys do not apply to the pilot. † Results are aggregated for the Frederick and Columbia campuses of the Maryland Schools for the Deaf. ** Surveys classified as unknown are those on which respondents did not indicate the County in which they receive service.

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents' Children

All grade levels (Kindergarten – Grade 12) were well represented in the respondent sample. Each grade level accounted for between 3% and 9% of the respondent sample. The majority of respondents (83%) indicated that their child had been referred for special education services between the ages of zero and eight.

In response to a new question on this year's School-Age Survey, 7% of respondents (N=630) indicated that their child attended a non-public school as a result of an IEP team decision for a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), while 88% of respondents (N=7,832) indicated that their child attended a public school during the 2014-15 school year. Five percent of respondents did not answer this question.

3.1.1 Age, Race/Ethnicity

Exhibit 3.2 summarizes the age and race/ethnicity characteristics of the children of respondents.

Respondents were asked about the age of their child as of September 30, 2014. Much like last year, the age distribution of children of Survey respondents did not significantly differ from the age distribution of the state.

The most common race/ethnic backgrounds of respondents were White (48%) or Black (29%), which is similar to last year's sample. Also like the previous year, parents of Black children were underrepresented (-14%) and parents of White children were overrepresented (10%).

Exhibit 3.2: Age, Race/Ethnicity: Comparison between Respondent Sample and Statewide Estimate – School-Age Survey †

	Population from 2014 Maryland Special Education Census Data (N=91,031)		Respondents (N=8,895)		Over (Under) Representation
	N	%	N	%	
Age					
Less than 6 Years	-	-	178	2%	-
6 Years	5,893	6%	532	6%	-
7 Years	6,410	7%	582	7%	-
8 Years	7,070	8%	742	8%	<1%
9 Years	7,409	8%	777	9%	1%
10 Years	7,856	9%	780	9%	-
11 Years	7,806	9%	726	8%	-
12 Years	7,741	9%	711	8%	(1%)
13 Years	7,716	8%	654	7%	(1%)
14 Years	7,507	8%	664	7%	(1%)
15 Years	7,419	8%	637	7%	(1%)
16 Years	7,196	8%	582	7%	(1%)
17 Years	6,007	7%	490	6%	(1%)
18 Years	2,796	3%	255	3%	-
19 Years	1,179	1%	107	1%	-
20 Years	919	1%	96	1%	-
21 Years	107	<1%	28	<1%	-
Unknown	-	-	354	4%	-
Race/Ethnicity					
White	34,627	38%	4,243	48%	10%
Black or African-American	38,982	43%	2,565	29%	(14%)
Hispanic or Latino	11,553	13%	909	10%	(3%)
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander	2,532	3%	320	4%	1%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	313	<1%	44	<1%	-
Multi-racial	3,024	3%	495	6%	3%
Unknown	-	-	319	4%	-

Note: †Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

3.1.2 Primary Exceptionality/Disability

Exhibit 3.3 shows the distribution of primary exceptionalities/disabilities among the children of Survey respondents and the state as a whole. Similar to the 2013-14 Survey, parents of children with Other Health Impairment (-11%) and Specific Learning Disability (-10%) were underrepresented in our Survey. Unlike last year, parents of children with Deaf-Blindness were also underrepresented (-5%) in this year's Survey. Overrepresented in this year's Survey were parents of children with Autism (6%) and parents of children with multiple disabilities (6%).

Exhibit 3.3: Exceptionalities/Disabilities: Comparison between Respondent Sample and Statewide Estimate – School-Age Survey

	Statewide Estimate of Active/Eligible Population (2014) (N=91,031)		Respondents (N=8,895)		Over (Under) Representation
	N	%	N	%	
Autism	9,586	11%	1502	17%	6%
Deaf-Blindness	4,553	5%	3	<1%	(5%)
Deafness	447	<1%	92	1%	1%
Developmental Delay	2,508	3%	387	4%	1%
Emotional Disability	6,445	7%	418	5%	(2%)
Hearing Impairment	410	<1%	94	1%	1%
Intellectual Disability	5,289	6%	463	5%	(1%)
Orthopedic Impairment	232	<1%	40	<1%	-
Other Health Impairment	17,178	19%	704	8%	(11%)
Specific Learning Disability	30,612	34%	2,094	24%	(10%)
Speech or Language Impairment	13,235	15%	1,119	13%	(2%)
Traumatic Brain Injury	227	<1%	34	<1%	-
Visual Impairment including Blindness	294	<1%	65	1%	-
Multiple Disabilities	15	<1%	560	6%	6%
Unknown	-	-	1,320	15%	-

3.2 Summary of Survey Responses

This section provides a summary of statewide Survey responses. As with the Preschool Survey data, ICF has enhanced the utility of district dashboards to provide individual district data on every question asked within the School-Age Survey this year.

The Survey asked respondents to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with 24 questions about their satisfaction with special education services they receive. Statewide, every question was answered by at least 88% of respondents.

Exhibit 3.4 shows the percentage of respondents who agreed with each of the statements on the Survey. Similar to the Preschool Survey, every statement presented on the Survey was able to obtain agreement from a majority of parents, including 17 items for which at least 80% of parents agreed with the statement. The statements for which the highest percentage of agreement were those related to the way the school and/or teachers communicate with parents, with the most agreement (93%) on Question 10 “Written information I receive is written in words I understand.”

Parents were least likely to agree with statements about the training provided by the school, how well the school connects parents to other organizations or agencies to support them, or options parents have when they disagree with a decision of the school. The statement with the lowest percentage of agreement (60%) was “The school and/or school system offers me training about special education issues.”

Exhibit 3.4: Summary of Responses to Survey Questions – School-Age Survey[†]

Survey Questions	Respondents Answering the Statement	Respondents Agreeing with this Statement
Q10 Written information I receive is written in words I understand.	99%	93%
Q8 I am comfortable asking questions and expressing concerns to school staff.	99%	91%
Q20 The school and/or school system has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions.	98%	90%
Q9 I was given all pertinent reports and evaluations related to my child prior to the IEP team meeting.	98%	89%
Q17 Teachers and administrators answer any questions I have about Procedural Safeguards.	91%	89%
Q16 Teachers and administrators set a climate for acceptance of diversity.	94%	87%
Q1 I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program.	99%	87%
Q19 Teachers and administrators ensure that students with disabilities have the same opportunities to learn and participate in school programs as students without disabilities (e.g., academics, fundraising events, sports, etc.).	94%	87%
Q5 All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.	98%	86%
Q18 Teachers and administrators value my ideas and input.	97%	85%
Q15 Teachers and administrators expect parents to participate in decision making.	97%	85%
Q14 Teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.	97%	84%
Q12 The transition outcomes developed for my child are appropriate to meet his/her needs.	93%	83%
Q6 My child is educated in regular classes (general education) with supports, to the maximum extent appropriate.	94%	82%
Q3 At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments.	96%	82%
Q21 The school and/or school system gives me enough information to know whether or not my child is making adequate progress.	98%	82%
Q4 My child's school consistently implements all accommodations and modifications documented on my child's IEP.	98%	81%
Q13 Teachers and administrators seek out parent input.	97%	78%
Q2 I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.	99%	78%
Q11 I was given information about the curriculum and materials used with my child.	98%	77%
Q24 The school and/or school system explains what options I have if I disagree with a decision of the school.	93%	73%
Q7 I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	95%	68%
Q23 The school and/or school system provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.	88%	66%
Q22 The school and/or school system offers me training about special education issues.	92%	60%

Note: [†] Table is sorted in descending order of the percentage of participants agreeing with each statement.

3.3 OSEP Indicator 8 School-Age Estimates

While we present a summary of responses to each question in the section above, NCSEAM recommends that the value of Indicator 8 be calculated using Rasch analysis. In Rasch analysis, each item on a scale (in this case the Survey) has a calibration value. The value is an indication of how challenging the item is

to agree with. Items with lower calibration values are easier to agree with than items with higher values. The Rasch Analysis uses these calibration values and converts a person's responses to all items on the Survey (the scale) into a single number or "measure." NCSEAM recommends that states report the percentage of respondents who have a measure at or above the NCSEAM established cut point measure of 600.

For the 2014-15 school year, 43% of parents had measures that exceeded the cut point measure. **Therefore, the value of OSEP Indicator 8 for parents of school-age students during the 2014-15 school year is 43%.** This means that 43% of parents, statewide, agree that their child's school facilitated parent involvement. The 95% confidence interval for this Indicator is from 42% to 44%.

Another way to analyze survey responses is to look at the mean of respondents' measures. The mean of the measure statewide was 581. This means that parents are by and large agreeing strongly, or very strongly, with all the items on the survey up to the item that has a calibration value at around 581. If the state would like to increase its mean measure, one thing it could do is focus its efforts on getting parents to agree with statements with calibration values above 581, such as:

- *The School and/or School System gives me enough information to know whether or not my child is making adequate progress. (Q21)*
- *I was given information about the curriculum and materials used with my child. (Q11)*
- *I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs. (Q2)*
- *The school explains what options I have if I disagree with a decision of the school. (Q24)*

Exhibit 3.5 presents the estimates of the Indicator for school-age children by LSS or PA as well as the upper and lower 95% confidence limits of that estimate. Estimates are not reported where there are fewer than 10 respondents.

Exhibit 3.5: 2014-15 Estimates for OSEP Indicator 8 – School-Age Survey

Jurisdiction	Estimate of Indicator 8	Number of Valid Responses	Std. Error	Lower CI	Upper CI
Statewide	43%	8,895*	.01	42%	44%
Allegany	71%	113	.04	62%	79%
Anne Arundel	39%	1,139	.01	36%	42%
Baltimore City	43%	280	.03	37%	48%
Baltimore County	40%	806	.02	37%	43%
Calvert	47%	169	.04	40%	55%
Caroline	70%	66	.06	59%	81%
Carroll	46%	268	.03	40%	52%
Cecil	44%	179	.04	36%	51%
Charles	56%	80	.06	45%	67%
Dorchester	45%	42	.08	30%	60%
Frederick	56%	430	.02	51%	60%
Garrett	36%	47	.07	22%	50%
Harford	40%	514	.02	35%	44%
Howard	47%	202	.04	40%	54%
Kent	20%	20	.09	2%	38%
Montgomery	44%	1,680	.01	42%	47%
Prince George's	35%	1,542	.01	32%	37%
Queen Anne's	51%	69	.06	39%	63%
Saint Mary's	52%	354	.03	46%	57%
Somerset	45%	88	.05	35%	56%
Talbot	67%	52	.07	55%	80%
Washington	42%	191	.04	35%	49%
Wicomico	47%	146	.04	38%	55%

Jurisdiction	Estimate of Indicator 8	Number of Valid Responses	Std. Error	Lower CI	Upper CI
Worcester	67%	96	.05	57%	76%
SEED School	-	6	-	-	-
MD School for the Blind	45%	20	.11	23%	67%
MD Schools for the Deaf†	37%	57	.06	24%	49%

Note:† Results are aggregated for the Frederick and Columbia campuses. *Of the respondents with valid data for this calculation, 239 did not report the LSS or PA with which they are affiliated.

4. Historical Trends

The value of Indicator 8 for school years 2005-06 through 2014-15 are summarized in Exhibit 4.1. The pattern of change over these ten years is similar in the preschool and school-age population – increases each year between 2005-06 and 2008-09, a significant decrease in 2009-10, and an increase in 2010-11. The value of Indicator 8 on the Preschool Survey this year (2014-15) is one percent greater than last year (48% vs. 47%). Likewise, the value of the Indicator on the School-Age Survey this year is four percent greater than last year (43% vs. 39%). Thus, both have been within five percentage points for the past five years, and continue to hover just below 50 percent for preschool and around 40 percent for school-age.

Exhibit 4.1: Estimates for OSEP Indicator 8 from School Year 2005-06 to 2014-15

