

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) assigned staff from across the six branches within the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) to 20 internal teams, to correspond to the 20 Part B Indicators for use in developing the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each team was expected to gather, analyze and interpret the data, and review available information about potential issues related to policies, procedures, and practices that may influence or explain the data. Draft information and data for each SPP Indicator were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

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

The Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) assists MSDE in examining data and advising MSDE on improvement in specific areas. SESAC is comprised of 22 members. Twelve members represent parents/individuals with disabilities (51%). SESAC is comprised of the following stakeholders:

- Parents of students with disabilities
- Individuals with disabilities
- General or Special Education Teachers
- Representatives of Institutions of Higher Education (IHE's)
- State and local education officials, including officials who carry out activities under McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
- Administrators of programs for students with disabilities
- Representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to students with disabilities
- Representatives of nonpublic and public charter schools
- At least one representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to students with disabilities
- Representative from State child welfare agency responsible for foster care
- Representative from the State juvenile and adult correction agencies

Prior to meeting with the SESAC in September 2005, the DSE/EIS, Part B Program Manager, met with the SESAC officers to discuss and review the SPP indicators and develop a presentation for the full SESAC.

In October 2005, the Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services introduced the State Fall Leadership Conference with a presentation to the IDEA Part B local directors of special education, Part C local lead agencies, SESAC members, SICC members on the Part C and Part B SPP Indicators and requested their input on establishing rigorous and measurable targets and identifying suggested activities to improve State performance. At the November 2005 SESAC

meeting the group reviewed the SPP indicators and provided input for targets and improvement activities.

Maryland participates in the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) IDEA Partnership. The purpose of the IDEA Partnership is to facilitate sharing our work with stakeholders in meaningful ways, promote collaboration, build State and local capacity, and develop mutual trust among decision-makers and those affected by decisions. The IDEA Partnership focused on developing professional development for stakeholders on the reauthorization of IDEA and SPP requirements. The MSDE IDEA Partnership Team reviewed the drafts and provided suggestions/input for targets, and improvement activities. The MSDE IDEA Partnership Team is comprised of the following stakeholders:

- Parents of students with disabilities
- Individuals with disabilities
- General or Special Education Teachers
- Representatives of Institutions of Higher Education (IHE's)
- State and local education officials
- Administrators of programs for students with disabilities (School Bldg. Admin.)
- Representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to students with disabilities
- Representatives of nonpublic schools
- Representatives of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to students with disabilities
- Representative from State child welfare agency responsible for foster care
- Representative from the State juvenile and adult correction agencies
- Related service providers
- Other Advocacy groups
- Parents' Place of Maryland, Inc. Representatives
- Representative of Maryland Teacher Association
- Directors of Special Ed / Coordinators / Professional Development staff
- Special Education State Advisory Committee Members
- Local Special Education Citizen's Advisory Committee (SECAC) Members

MSDE embraces a birth to five framework to positively effect smooth transition from Part C to Part B Preschool. Given this framework the Part B 619 Program Specialist participates monthly with the Maryland Infants and Toddlers State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). At the September, October, and November 2005 SICC meetings, the Part B 619 Program Specialist shared draft information and data with the SICC membership and requested their input on Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12.

Upon OSEP approval of the SPP, it will be sent via email to local superintendents of schools, local

directors of special education in each local school system (LSS), Parents' Place of Maryland, Inc., Families Involved Together, Inc., SESAC members, and IDEA Partnership Team members. Additionally, the SPP will be posted on the MSDE Web site. Presentations about the SPP will be made at state leadership meetings.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maryland offers one type of high school diploma. The Maryland State Board of Education establishes performance standards for graduation applicable to all students. Graduation rate is one of the targets used to determine whether the State, local school systems, and/or schools achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). Maryland established a goal that by 2014, 90% of all students will graduate from high school with a Maryland high school diploma. Please see Indicator #3 for additional information relative to local school system AYP and performance and participation of students with disabilities on Statewide assessments.

Maryland defines the graduation rate as the percentage of students who receive a Maryland high school diploma during a reported school year. This is an estimated cohort rate. It is calculated by dividing the number of high school graduates by the sum of the dropouts for grades 9 through 12 respectively in consecutive years plus the number of high school graduates. Maryland uses this measurement for all students.

Maryland high school graduation requirements for the class of 2005 included:

Subject Area	Credit Requirement	High School Assessment	NCLB Test
English	4 Credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for English 2.	Maryland High School Assessment for English 2
Math	3 credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for algebra/data analysis.	Maryland High School Assessment for geometry.
Science	3 credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for biology.	
Social Studies	3 credits	Students must take the Maryland High School Assessment for government.	
Fine Arts	1 credit		
Physical Education	½ credit		
Health	½ credit		
Technology Education	1 credit		
Foreign language or Advanced Technology and electives	2 credits 3 credits		
Or State approved Career & Technology Program and elective	4 credits 1 credit		

In addition to required course credits, all students are to complete 75 hours of student service. These credit requirements for a Maryland High School Diploma apply to all students. Local school systems may establish additional credit requirements or add endorsements to the diploma as incentives for students to meet locally established requirements beyond the minimums specified by the State. All students are required to take the High School Assessments as a graduation requirement. The requirements related to passing these assessments in order to graduate take effect beginning with the graduating class of 2009.

In April 2002, the Maryland General Assembly enacted the Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act (BTE). This law restructured Maryland's public school finance system and increased State aid to public schools. As a result, Maryland embraced a standards-based approach to public school financing. Under this approach, and consistent with the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) the State sets academic content and student achievement standards to ensure that school and students have sufficient resources to meet those standards and holds local school systems accountable for student performance. In 2003, each local school system submitted a comprehensive master plan that included goals and strategies to promote academic excellence among all students and to eliminate performance gaps that persist based on student race, ethnicity, socioeconomic circumstances, disability, and native language. Each local school system must demonstrate annual progress toward achieving Maryland's academic content and student achievement standards. Staff members from the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services serve on departmental review teams that review each local school system's annual Master Plan Update. Each update includes goals, objectives, and activities to address local data, information, and progress toward achieving established state performance goals for the subgroup of students with disabilities. Below is a table that demonstrates a correlation between State BTE performance goals aligned with the applicable NCLB performance goals and indicators that also align with the following State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators:

BTE Performance Goal	SPP Indicator
<p>Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>	<p>Indicator 3 - Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards. C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.
<p>Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.</p>	<p>Indicator 4 - Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and B. Percent of districts identified by the State as

	<p>having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. (NEW)</p> <p>Indicator 5 - Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. <p>Indicator 6 - Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>Indicator 7 - Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
<p>Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.</p>	<p>Indicator 1 - Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>Indicator 2 - Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p>

The State Board of Education approved a resolution in March 2004 to authorize the State Superintendent of Schools to convene a task force to examine comparable methods of measuring student skills and knowledge in the subjects of English, algebra/data analysis, government, and biology and make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding the feasibility of implementing one or more of those options as a part of the assessment requirements for high school graduation. The Comparable Testing Methods for the Maryland High School Assessments Task

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Force (Comp HSA Task Force) is charged to present final recommendations to the State Board of Education by September 2007.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is State level graduation data. The data can be found at www.mdreportcard.org

Statewide FFY 2004 (School Year 2004-2005) Graduation Rate			
	Comprehensive % (all students)	Special Education %	Regular Education %
Statewide Percentage	84.83	74.80	85.60

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The State graduation rate intermediate goal for the 2004-2005 school year was 83.24%. The State target of 83.24% remains constant for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. The graduation rate of students with disabilities is 8.44% below the established target.

Students in the graduating class of 2009 shall be required to pass the Maryland High School assessments for English, algebra/data analysis, biology and government. The students must achieve one of the following: (1) the passing score on each test, (2) a minimum score for each test and a combined overall score, (3) a specific score on a MSDE-approved comparable assessment(s), or (4) a passing score on the four High School Assessments by a combination of (1) and (3). These requirements may have an impact on the graduation rate of students with disabilities. DSE/EIS staff will monitor the progress of LSS in meeting graduation targets and provide technical assistance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	83.24% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2006 (2006-2007)	83.24% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2007 (2007-2008)	85.50% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2008 (2008-2009)	85.50% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2009 (2009-2010)	85.50% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
2010 (2010-2011)	87.75% of youth with disabilities will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to lead to improving the graduation rate of students with disabilities and achieving Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)	Annually	DSE/EIS staff Division of Student and School Services (DOSSS) staff Local School System (LSS) staff
Monitor LSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities in increasing the graduation rate of students with IEPs as reported in their annual self evaluation.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Collaborate with the Division of Career Technology and Adult Learning (CTAL) to develop a career awareness instructional framework to be infused into the Voluntary State Curriculum.	2005 – 2006 school year	DSE/EIS staff Division of Career Technology and Adult Learning (CTAL) staff
Develop professional development activities for LSS on the usage of the career awareness instructional framework.	2006-2007 school year	DSE/EIS staff CTAL staff
Participate in MSDE professional development on the usage of the career awareness instructional framework.	2006-2007 school year and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff CTAL staff LSS staff
Award discretionary grants to LSS to increase graduation rate of students with disabilities.	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Work with the two LSS to develop best practices that can be sustained after the grant period.	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Develop a Guide to Best Practices to Improve Graduation Rate.	2005 – 2006 school year	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Co-sponsor a Transition Conference that includes a	December 2005	National and Local experts DSE/EIS staff National Center on Dropout

SPP Template – Part B (3)

presentation on increasing graduation rate		Prevention for Students with Disabilities LSS staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices that assure the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions, assure access to and participation in general curriculum and assessments, and promote high school graduation with a Maryland high school diploma	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Provide technical assistance on the identification and implementation of appropriate strategies and practices to improve the graduation rate of students with disabilities.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff Division of Instruction (DI) Division of Accountability and Assessment (DAA) Office of Academic Policy Consultants LSS staff
Provide professional development on the identification and implementation of appropriate strategies and practices to improve the graduation rate of students with disabilities.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DI staff DAA staff Office of Academic Policy Consultants LSS staff
Participate on the Maryland Comp HSA Task Force	July 1, 2005 through September 2008	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Board of Education establishes the performance standard for dropout rate applicable to all students. Dropout rate is one of the targets the state uses in combination with graduation rate to determine whether the state, local school systems, or schools achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). Maryland established a goal that by 2014, no more than 3.00% of all students will dropout of high school. See page 2-3, "Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process" for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland's BTE Master Plan process.

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

The dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of students in grades 9 through 12 served by schools. Students who re-enter school during the same year in which they dropped out of school are not counted as dropouts. The computation is the same for all youth.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The data source is the Maryland State Department of Education. This is State level dropout rate data. The data can be found at www.mdreportcard.org.

Statewide FFY 2004 (School Year 2004-2005) Dropout Rate				
	2004-2005 Intermediate Target (%)	Comprehensive % (all students)	Special Education %	Regular Education %
Statewide Percentage	3.81	3.69	5.50	3.50

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The State intermediate dropout rate goal for the 2004-2005 school year was 3.81%. The State target of 3.81% remains constant for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. The dropout rate of all students statewide (3.69%) was 0.12% below the intermediate target of 3.81%. For the 2004-2005 school year, the dropout rate of students with disabilities (5.5%) was 1.69% above the established target of 3.81%. The dropout rate of students with disabilities is 2.0% higher than the dropout rate of their nondisabled peers (3.5%).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.81% or less.
2006 (2006-2007)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.81% or less.
2007 (2007-2008)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.54% or less.
2008 (2008-2009)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.54% or less.
2009 (2009-2010)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.54% or less.
2010 (2010-2011)	The dropout rate of students with disabilities will be 3.27% or less.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to lead to reducing the dropout rate of students with disabilities and achieving Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff LSS staff
Monitor LSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities in reducing the dropout rate of students with disabilities as reported in their annual self evaluation.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Develop a Guide to Best Practices in Dropout Prevention.	2005 – 2006 school year	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Sponsor dropout prevention professional development activities for LSS staff.	2006-2007 school year	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Co-sponsor a Transition Conference that includes a presentation on dropout prevention highlighting best practices.	December 2005	National and Local experts DSE/EIS staff National Center on Dropout Prevention for Students with Disabilities LSS staff
Award discretionary grants to LSS to address dropout prevention.	2005-2006 school year and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Identify and implement best practices for dropout prevention that can be sustained after the grant period.	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Track the success of local initiatives in preventing dropouts.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices that assure the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions, and assure access to and participation in general curriculum and assessments that contribute to dropout prevention.	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Provide technical assistance to identified best practices that contribute to dropout prevention of students with disabilities.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = # of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total # of districts in the State times 100.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

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

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

C. Proficiency rate =

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

In Maryland, consistent with IDEA and the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, entitled the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), all students with disabilities are included in all general state and district wide assessments. IDEA emphasizes providing students with disabilities access to the general curriculum. All students, including students with disabilities, are expected to receive instruction consistent with Maryland's Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC), based on the Maryland Content Standards and Core Learning Goals, and must be assessed on their attainment of grade level reading and math content. To determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) under NCLB, all students, including students with disabilities, are assessed in reading and math in grades 3 through 8, and during one grade in high school.

Students with disabilities are expected to participate in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) unless the IEP team determines that even with accommodations the student is to participate in an alternate assessment. Alternate assessments must be available for those students who cannot participate in the MSA with accommodations as indicated in their IEPs. The alternate assessments include the following:

- Alternate MSA (Alt-MSA) for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are participating on alternate academic achievement standards (limited to reporting 1% of those scoring proficient); or
- Modified MSA (Mod-MSA) for students with academic disabilities who with access to the general education curriculum will participate in modified academic content and achievement standards (limited to reporting 2% of those scoring proficient).

Maryland is to increase the achievement of all students, including students with disabilities. To reach the target of 100% proficiency by 2014 at the state, local school system and school level, Maryland has established rigorous annual measurable objectives (AMO) to increase the percentage of students with disabilities who make AYP in reading and in mathematics and reduce the gap between the performance of special education students and their non-disabled peers.

Should a system or school fail to make AYP for one subgroup of students, such as students with disabilities only, the system or school will not make AYP overall. Failure to make AYP may cause a system or school to be identified for improvement status, even if the only subgroup that fails to make AYP is students with disabilities. If a local school system does not meet the annual performance targets for each subgroup, a provision called Safe Harbor still allows a school system to make AYP if the system meets all performance targets in the aggregate, and the subgroup meets the other academic indicator; and the percentage of students achieving below the proficient level in that subgroup decreases by ten percent.

Maryland publicly reports on the participation and performance of all students, including students with disabilities, by grade and content areas from the 24 local school systems, three schools operated by Edison Schools, Inc., and Special Placement Schools for the MSA and Alt-MSA. The MSA and Alt-MSA assessments conducted at grades 3 through 8 for reading and math and the English 2 and geometry during high school are the assessments used for reporting under NCLB. All students, including students with disabilities, must participate in either the MSA or the Alt-MSA. Through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) decision-making process, each student's IEP team determines in which statewide assessments the student will participate. The student's IEP includes documentation of that decision.

The Maryland report card includes the number of students tested, rates of participation and performance data for students with disabilities. Data relative to the participation and performance of students in Special Placement Schools are available on the report card and are included as part the student's local school district's performance data. Comparisons between the performance of students with disabilities and other subgroups of students, including nondisabled students in general education

are presented in detail. These reports are on the Maryland State Department of Education website at www.marylandreportcard.org.

Definitions

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)

The Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA) is the Maryland assessment in which students with disabilities participate if through the IEP process it has been determined they cannot participate in the Maryland State Assessment (MSA) even with accommodations. The ALT-MSA assesses and reports student mastery of individually selected indicators and objectives from the reading and mathematics content standards or appropriate access skills. A portfolio is constructed of evidence that documents individual student mastery of the assessed reading and mathematics objectives.

Students with disabilities in grades 3-8 and 10 must participate in either MSA or ALT-MSA. The decision for which assessment is appropriate for an individual student is made by each student's IEP team. A student with a significant cognitive disability will participate in ALT-MSA if he or she meets each of the following criteria:

- The student is learning extended Maryland reading (at emerging, readiness, or functional literacy levels) and extended Maryland mathematics content standards objectives; **AND**
- The student requires explicit and ongoing instruction in a functional life skills curriculum including personal management, community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational, communication/decision making/interpersonal; **AND**
- The student requires extensive and substantial modification (reduced complexity of objectives and learning materials, and more time to learn) of general education curriculum. The curriculum differs significantly from that of their non-disabled peers. They learn different objectives, may use different materials, and may participate in different learning activities; **AND**
- The student requires intensive instruction and may require extensive supports, including physical prompts, to learn, apply, and transfer or generalize knowledge and skills to multiple settings; **AND**
- The student requires extensive support to perform and participate meaningfully and productively in daily activities in school, home, community, and work environments; **AND**
- The student cannot participate in the MSA even with accommodations.

Students not meeting the criteria above will participate in the Maryland School Assessment, with or without accommodations, as appropriate, based on their IEP.

Annual Yearly Progress (AYP)

Annual Yearly Progress means the gain that schools, school systems, and states must make each year in the proportion of students achieving proficiency in reading and math. AYP replaces the School Performance Index as the method by which Maryland tracks academic progress and makes accountability decisions.

To make AYP, schools and school systems must meet the annual measurable objective in reading and mathematics for students in the aggregate and for each student subgroup, in graduation rate for high school or attendance in elementary and middle school for students in the aggregate, and meet

the testing participation requirement of 95%. See Indicator #1 for more information relative to graduation rate.

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO)

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) means State established performance targets that assess the progress of student subgroups, schools, school districts, and the state annually. This annual measurement ensures that 100% of students achieve proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics by the end of the school year in 2013-2014.

Between the 2002-2003 baseline and the 2013-2014 goal of 100% proficiency, the state will establish annual performance targets. These targets, or annual measurable objectives, are set for reading, mathematics, attendance, and graduation rate. Every school and school system will be held to the same annual measurable objectives, although those objectives will be adjusted to each school's grade-level enrollment and structure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, K-8, K-12). Schools with grade structures that do not include tested grades will still be accountable for student performance; e.g., the performance of third-graders who come from K-2 schools will count for both the current school and the K-2 school previously attended.

Confidence Interval

Statistical procedures used in all tests of AYP determinations to ensure that decisions take into account inherent measurement error present in all accountability systems. The confidence interval is a statistical tool used in Maryland AYP determinations to ensure accurate and reliable accountability decisions. Because the accuracy of scores depends on the number of students in each group, the state uses a statistical test to help ensure that they make fair and valid AYP decisions for groups with different numbers of students.

Maryland School Assessment (MSA)

The Maryland School Assessment requires students in grades 3 through 8 to demonstrate what they know about reading and math and grade 10 students in reading. It is also given in geometry after students complete a high-school geometry course. The MSA test measures basic as well as higher level skills. Science will be added to the assessment requirement in grades 3, 5, and 8 as early as 2008.

The Maryland School Assessment is reported with three statewide performance standards. These standards are divided into three levels of achievement: Basic, Proficient and Advanced.

Modified Maryland School Assessment (Mod-MSA)

A student who would have been eligible for the Mod-MSA would be identified based on their individual evaluation information and the instructional and service information on their IEPs. The student would be identified as appropriate for instruction and assessment using modified academic content standards. The student would have been identified as meeting **each** of the following criteria:

- The student is learning using modified academic content standards in reading and mathematics; **AND**
- The student requires modifications during assessments and instruction, in addition to specific accommodations. These testing/assessment and instructional modifications may include: reduced complexity of language, reduced number of test items, reduced amount of content to learn, paraphrasing of reading passages, embedded scaffolding for a written response such as sentence stems, guided response outline, guided questioning to generate response, software such as Co-Writer and Write Outloud, use of calculator, and spell check; **AND**

- The student requires the use of a modified general curriculum that is aligned with the Maryland Content Standards for the student's grade level but is modified (reduced amount to learn, reduced complexity, reduced output) so the student can access the content and demonstrate what he/she has learned; **AND**
- The student must have had at least three consecutive years of individualized intensive instruction in reading and mathematics consistent with his/her IEP (beginning with the most recent), and although progress toward grade level standards was made, he/she is not yet making progress at grade level; **AND**
- The student must demonstrate that he/she cannot attain proficiency in actual grade level MSA, even with accommodations.

Participation Rate for AYP

This rate reflects the number of students enrolled on the day of testing. The rate is computed for each subgroup, and in the aggregate, for each of the reading and mathematics assessments by dividing the number of students presenting each testing group by the number of enrolled students in that group. Maryland requires 95% as the minimum criteria to meet the testing participation requirement for AYP.

In March 2004, the U.S. Department of Education announced new flexibilities in calculating participation rates. States are now able to average participation rates over a three-year period. Students who are unable to take the test during the testing and make-up windows because of a medical emergency will not count against the schools participation rate.

Data from the previous one or two years may be used to average the participation rate data for a school and/or subgroup, as needed. If this two- or three-year average meets or exceeds 95 percent, the AYP requirement will be met.

Performance Level Standards

Standards are measures of performance against which yearly results are compared. Standards help to examine critical aspects of instructional programs; help to ensure that all students receive quality instruction; hold educators accountable for quality instruction; and help to guide efforts toward school improvement. Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) performance standards were determined through deliberative processes by educators with involvement of critical stakeholders such as the legislators and members of the business community. The State Board of Education adopted all standards.

Maryland standards are divided into three levels of achievement:

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

Student performance is reported in terms of these achievement levels:

Reading:

Basic: Students at this level are unable to adequately read and comprehend grade appropriate literature and informational passages.

Proficient: Students at this level can read grade appropriate text and demonstrate the ability to comprehend literature and informational passages.

Advanced: Students at this level can regularly read above-grade level text and demonstrate the ability to comprehend complex literature and informational passages.

Mathematics:

Basic: Students at this level demonstrate only partial mastery of the skills and concepts defined in the Maryland Mathematics Content Standards.

Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate an understanding of fundamental grade level skills and concepts and can generally solve entry-level problems in mathematics.

Advanced: Students at this level can regularly solve complex problems in mathematics and demonstrate superior ability to reason mathematically.

Geometry:

Basic: Students at this level demonstrate only partial mastery of the skills and concepts defined in the Maryland Geometry Core Learning Goals.

Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate an understanding of fundamental geometry skills and concepts and can generally solve entry-level problems in geometry.

Advanced: Students at this level can regularly solve complex geometry problems and demonstrate superior ability to reason mathematically.

Safe Harbor

Safe Harbor means that if a school does not meet the annual performance targets for each subgroup, a provision called Safe Harbor still allows a school to make AYP if the school meets all performance targets in the aggregate, and the subgroup meets the other academic indicator; and the percentage of students achieving below the proficient level in that subgroup decreases by ten percent. Safe Harbor is calculated using the last two years of test administration data.

Special Placement Schools

Special Placement Schools means schools that are not a part of the 24 regular Maryland school systems. These schools provide educational opportunities appropriate to their student population's abilities and needs. Examples of schools in this category include, Kennedy Krieger Middle and High Schools, the Maryland School for The Deaf, the Maryland School for the Blind, Department of Juvenile Justice schools and centers.

For a school to achieve AYP, it must achieve all of the AMO in a particular year. Nineteen group and subgroup checks for AMO must be met in order for a school to achieve AYP. Not all schools failing to achieve AYP will be placed in School Improvement. For example, in some instances, a school will not achieve the target or AMO in one reported area (reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) in one particular year. The next year the school may make the target in that same reported area but miss the target in another reported area. Such schools will not typically be designated for School Improvement.

In June 2005 MSDE received approval of a request submitted to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) to develop and implement alternate assessments against grade level standards in reading and math for all tested grades. The Modified MSA, (Mod-MSA) is for students with serious academic disabilities. MSDE will implement a modified assessment in 2006 based on modified academic content and achievement standards. As the Mod-MSA has not yet been developed an interim appeals process was designed and approved by ESEA.

In the interim, for 2005, MSDE gave school systems the opportunity to appeal the AYP status for an individual school if that school did not achieve AYP in the special education subgroup only. Schools failing to achieve AYP for multiple subgroups are not permitted to appeal. Schools whose 2005 AYP status directly affects their 2006 School Improvement status would be eligible for appeal as well as schools that did not achieve AYP for a special education subgroup for the first time in 2005.

The 2005 interim AYP determination (announced by USDE on May 10, 2005) introduced a procedure that essentially simulates the impact a modified assessment might have had on AYP results for 2005 only. It permits a school to determine if its failure to achieve AYP in the special education subgroups (reading and mathematics) is due to students who would have been eligible to take the modified assessment if it had been in place in 2005.

If the school meets the following criteria, the local school system may submit an appeal of the school's AYP status with supporting evidence:

- It did not achieve AYP in 2005 for special education subgroup(s) only,
- It has students who would have been eligible to take the modified assessment, and
- The number of students eligible to take the modified MSA and not passing the MSA is adequate to have caused the school to achieve AYP had those students achieved a proficient score on the modified assessment.

Consistent with the requirements of the individualized education program (IEP) process, the IEP Team will apply the policy to a review of the IEPs to determine that the students who would have been eligible for the Mod-MSA would be identified based on their individual evaluation information and the instructional and service information on their IEPs. To ensure that the students eligible to participate in the Mod-MSA have received access to the general curriculum and content standards, a rigorous process has been developed, reviewed, and revised to reflect the federal guidance. The Mod-MSA is based on modified academic content standards for students with disabilities. These are students who are not proficient, even with full access to the general education curriculum. The students who would be eligible would participate in the Mod-MSA in grades 3-8 and score proficient and will be capped at 2%.

Mod-MSA results are to be reported at three proficiency levels (Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) as part of the State accountability program. Results from the Mod-MSA will be aggregated with those from the MSA and Alt-MSA for accountability purposes.

The local school system may be able to appeal their AYP status, based on those individual students attending schools that did not achieve their federally mandated AYP targets for 2005, but missed those targets exclusively in the special education category. If, after reviewing required documentation submitted by the local school system, MSDE determines that the student would have been eligible for the Mod-MSA that student is considered proficient on the alternate grade level and the school's AYP is recalculated. Decisions regarding appeals for reading and math for grades 3 through 8 have been completed.

Appeals are reviewed by MSDE, and if it is determined that documentation is adequate to demonstrate that the students being appealed would have been eligible to take the Mod-MSA, and if the AYP recalculation shows that the school now meets AYP, then the school will be declared as making AYP. School Improvement decisions will be made based on existing decision rules using the updated AYP status.

Measurement - Baseline data for the FFY 2005 (2004-2005)

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

State level AYP data is currently unavailable. See discussion of baseline data below.

B. Participation rate

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7609	7600
4	8242	8239
5	8656	8645
6	8596	8601
7	8930	8939
8	8949	8960
10	6634	6536
Total	57,626	57,520

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

Maryland did not collect data on this item during the 2004–2005 school year. For the 2004-2005 school year all students with IEPs in a regular assessment are counted as having accommodations.

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7047	7041
4	7645	7651
5	7905	7903
6	7740	7693
7	7972	7896
8	8107	8042
10	TBD*	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of Mod-MSA appeals.

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	37	30
4	56	47
5	60	50
6	63	116
7	48	134
8	36	75
10	TBD*	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of Mod-MSA appeals.

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	527	527
4	542	542
5	686	686
6	793	793
7	910	910
8	842	842
10	859	859

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

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

Math (b+ c+ d+ e ÷ a x100 = Percentage)							
Grade	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
3	0	7047	37	527	7611	7609	100%
4	0	7645	56	542	8243	8242	100%
5	0	7905	60	686	8651	8656	100%
6	0	7740	63	793	8596	8596	100%
7	0	7972	48	910	8930	8930	100%
8	0	8107	36	842	8985	8949	100%
10	0	TBD*	TBD*	859	TBD*	6634	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of Mod-MSA appeals.

Reading (b+ c+ d+ e ÷ a x100 = Percentage)							
Grade	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
3	0	7041	30	527	7598	7600	100%
4	0	7651	47	542	8240	8239	100%
5	0	7903	50	686	8639	8645	100%
6	0	7693	116	793	8602	8601	100%
7	0	7896	134	910	8940	8939	100%
8	0	8042	75	842	8959	8960	100%
10	0	TBD*	TBD*	859	TBD*	6536	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of Mod-MSA appeals.

C. Proficiency rate

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	7609	7600
4	8242	8239
5	8656	8645
6	8596	8601
7	8930	8939
8	8949	8960
10	6634	6536

C.b. Number of Children with IEPs in Grades Assessed who are Proficient or Above as Measured by the Regular Assessment with No Accommodations

Maryland did not collect data on this item during the 2004–2005 school year. For the 2004-2005 school year all students with IEPs in a regular assessment are counted as having accommodations.

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	3509	3634
4	3645	4318
5	2869	3525
6	1685	2558
7	1434	2268
8	1376	2231
10	TBD*	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed proficient or advanced in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of English 2 and geometry Mod-MSA appeals.

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	37	30
4	56	47
5	60	50
6	63	116
7	48	134
8	36	75
10	TBD*	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed proficient or advanced in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of English 2 and geometry Mod-MSA appeals.

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

Grade	Math	Reading
3	388	378
4	383	393
5	495	509
6	530	547
7	592	617
8	567	576
10	537	567

Overall Percentage = (b + c + d + e) ÷ a x 100

Math (b+ c+ d+ e ÷ a x100 = Percentage)							
Grade	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
3	0	3509	37	388	3934	7609	51.7%
4	0	3645	56	383	7729	8242	93.7%
5	0	2869	60	495	3424	8656	39.5%
6	0	1685	63	530	2278	8596	26.5%
7	0	1434	48	592	2074	8930	23.2%
8	0	1376	36	567	1979	8949	22.1%
10	0	TBD*	TBD*	537	TBD*	6534	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed proficient or advanced in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of English 2 and geometry Mod-MSA appeals.

Reading (b+ c+ d+ e ÷ a x100 = Percentage)							
Grade	b	c	d	e	Total	a	Percent
3	0	3634	30	378	4042	7600	53.1%
4	0	4318	47	393	4758	8239	57.7%
5	0	3525	50	509	4084	8645	47.2%
6	0	2558	116	547	3221	8601	37.4%
7	0	2268	134	617	3019	8939	33.7%
8	0	2231	75	576	2882	8960	32.1%
10	0	TBD*	TBD*	567	TBD*	6536	TBD*

*The number of students with IEPs who were assessed proficient or advanced in math and reading at grade 10 is not yet available pending final resolutions of English 2 and geometry Mod-MSA appeals.

Discussion of Baseline Data

A. **AYP**

MSDE is unable to determine State level AYP until the final resolution of the Mod-MSA appeals. Local school systems were able to make Mod-MSA appeals in reading and/or math. Decisions regarding appeals for reading and math for grades 3 through 8 have been completed. Mod-MSA appeals are pending for English 2 and geometry. Geometry assessment scores were released in August 2005 along with graduation rate data for the high school data set. In November 2005

English 2 assessment results were released along with the individual final AYP determinations for high schools. Local school systems have until December 8, 2005 to make a Mod-MSA appeal of the high school, English 2 and/or geometry MSA results. Maryland will not have final state level AYP results until early 2006. As soon as the Mod-MSA appeal review process is complete the percent of local school systems achieving the State's AYP objectives for disability subgroup will be determined. MSDE will revise its SPP baseline data.

B. Participation

Participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments is 100%. The State established 95% participation rate for schools, local school systems and the State. This participation rate is applicable to all students, including students with disabilities. All students must participate in MSA, Mod-MSA, or Alt-MSA. Through the decision making process, the IEP team determines which statewide and district-wide assessments in which the child will participate. The IEP includes documentation of that decision.

Students with disabilities are expected to participate in Statewide assessments. Student count and rate of participation are calculated based on the school enrollment on the day of testing and publicly reported on the MSDE website by subgroup, grade, content area, and assessment. All students are provided several opportunities to take the MSA or the Alt -MSA as per individual student IEPs. A student that fails to take the assessment during these make-up times is assigned a basic score. The differences in numbers of students who took the mathematics and reading tests in grades 3 – 8 are due to the fact that the two content area tests are administered over a 12-day period (8 days from which local school systems select 4 days to schedule a primary administration of reading and mathematics, and an additional 4-day period for make-up testing for both contents). Due to student mobility in Maryland, students come in and out of various schools and school systems during the testing period. While overall it would be expected that approximately the same number of students would take both content areas, because of student withdrawals and enrollments during the testing window, the two content areas are never exactly the same. A student may take reading, for example, and then move out of state, etc. To date, there have been no parental exceptions reported.

MSDE did not collect data on the number of students with IEPs that received accommodations. For the 2004-2005 school year, all students with IEPs in a regular assessment are counted as having accommodations. MSDE developed a process for the collection of this data beginning with the 2005-2006 school year for all assessments.

C. Proficiency

Proficiency Levels are determined on a yearly basis. Proficiency can be met in one of two ways, the first is to meet or exceed the AMO; the second is through performance within its confidence interval. The confidence interval widens the target around the AMO and varies by the size of the group, such that the smaller the group tested the larger the interval. Progress in reading and in mathematics is measured by AMO in the aggregate and for student subgroups. AMO are the same for disabled and non-disabled students. AMO have been established for each grade level and content area. The state-established AMO are performance targets that assess annual progress for every student subgroup, school, school system, and the State. Maryland's AMO increase each year and are designed to ensure that 100% of students achieve proficiency in reading and mathematics by the end of the school year in 2013-2014.

Progress in reading and in mathematics is measured by Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) in the aggregate and for student subgroups. AMO are the same for disabled and non-disabled students. AMO have been established for each grade level and content area. The state-established AMO are performance targets that assess annual progress for every student subgroup, school, school system, and the state. Maryland's AMO increase each year and are designed to ensure that 100% of students achieve proficiency in reading and mathematics by the end of the school year in 2013-2014. The AMO for 2005 was a significant increase over the AMO

for 2004. The 2005 state AMO for math was 44.1%. The 2005 state AMO for reading was 54.8%. The impact of these increases on the number of student subgroups, schools and districts making AYP will be known when the final state and local school system AYP results are released following completion of the Mod-MSA appeals process for English 2 and geometry.

Using the overall percentage chart for the math portion of all assessments (MSA, Mod-MSA, and Alt-MSA), students in the fourth grade demonstrate the highest rate of 93.7% proficient or above. Students in the eighth grade demonstrate the lowest rate of 22.1% proficient or above. Grades 3, 4, and 5 demonstrate higher rates of proficiency in math than grades 6, 7, and 8.

Using the overall percentage chart for the reading portion of all assessments (MSA, Mod-MSA, and Alt-MSA), students in the fourth grade demonstrate the highest rate of 57.7% proficient or above. Students in the eighth grade demonstrate the lowest rate of 32.1% proficient or above. Grades 3, 4, and 5 demonstrate higher rates of proficiency in math than grades 6, 7, and 8.

As stated previously, as soon as the final Mod-MSA appeals of English 2 and geometry are finalized MSDE will have complete data that will revise the SPP.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets

2005-2010

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target																											
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>A. 66% of the State’s local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with disabilities will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the content area AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="524 1207 1192 1493"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>56.96%</td> <td>50.91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>56.71%</td> <td>65.35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>47.15%</td> <td>57.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>38.08%</td> <td>59.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>35.47%</td> <td>57.25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>33.75%</td> <td>53.36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td>40.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>40.68%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	56.96%	50.91%	4	56.71%	65.35%	5	47.15%	57.05%	6	38.08%	59.50%	7	35.47%	57.25%	8	33.75%	53.36%	10		40.00%	12	40.68%	
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	56.96%	50.91%																										
4	56.71%	65.35%																										
5	47.15%	57.05%																										
6	38.08%	59.50%																										
7	35.47%	57.25%																										
8	33.75%	53.36%																										
10		40.00%																										
12	40.68%																											
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>A. 70% of the State’s local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="524 1745 1192 1871"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Mathematics AMO</th> <th>Reading AMO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>66.53%</td> <td>61.82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>66.33%</td> <td>73.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>58.89%</td> <td>66.59%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO	3	66.53%	61.82%	4	66.33%	73.05%	5	58.89%	66.59%															
Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO																										
3	66.53%	61.82%																										
4	66.33%	73.05%																										
5	58.89%	66.59%																										

		6	51.84%	68.50%
		7	49.81%	66.75%
		8	48.45%	63.73%
		10		52.17%
		12	38.56%	
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p> <p>A. 75% of the State’s local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p>				
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p> <p>A. 79% of the State’s local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p>				
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p> <p>A. 83% of the State’s local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.</p> <p>C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:</p>				

		10		72.67%		
		12	64.89%			
2010 (2010-2011)	A. 87% of the State’s local school systems will meet AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities.					
	B. 95% of students with will participate in the Statewide assessment system.					
	C. Student with disabilities will meet the AMO as follows:					
		Grade	Mathematics AMO	Reading AMO		
		3	85.65%	83.64%		
		4	85.57%	88.45%		
		5	82.38%	85.68%		
		6	79.36%	86.50%		
		7	78.49%	85.75%		
		8	77.91%	84.45%		
	10		79.50%			
	12	73.67%				

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to improve the performance of students with disabilities that will lead to achieving AMO, AYP and established targets.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff LSS staff
Collect data on students with disabilities with accommodations	July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DAA staff Local Accountability Coordinators
Complete Mod-MSA appeals process	July 1, 2005 – January, 2006	DSE/EIS staff Consultants
Advise LSS and Special Placement Schools of actions taken by the State Board of Education and Department relative to Statewide Assessments	August 2005 – June 2006 and Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DAA staff Office of Academic Policy State Board of Education
Provide professional development modules regarding IDEA 2004 changes	July 2005	DSE/EIS staff Division of Instruction (DI) staff Johns Hopkins University, Center of Technology and Education (JHU-CTE)

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

Provide professional development modules to LSS and PA on differentiation of instruction, interventions, the Voluntary State Curriculum	July, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS staff DI staff JHU-CTE
Collaborate with general and special educators at the state, local and school levels.	July, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS staff DI staff JHU-CTE
Provide technical assistance to local school systems regarding the instruction and achievement of students with disabilities	July, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS staff DI staff
Award capacity building achievement grants that support promising practices to accelerate the performance of students with disabilities	September 2005 – June 2006	DES/EIS staff
Expand the web-based statewide IEP system currently being piloted to increase development of quality IEP goals and objectives based on the student's present levels of academic performance, and aligned with the VSC indicators.	July 2005 – June 2006	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Develop and disseminate "A Guide to Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating the Use of Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment of Students with Disabilities"	September 2005 – July 2006	DAA staff DSE/EIS staff Local Accountability Coordinators
Continue the development of the www.md.k12 website	July 2005 – June 2006	DSE/EIS staff
Develop and disseminate Technical Assistance Bulletins as needed	July 2005 – June 2006	DSE/EIS staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**Indicator 4A**

Beginning with the suspension data for the 2000-2001 school year, Maryland has identified local school systems (LSS) with a significant discrepancy in suspension rates for five school years. Two separate analyses of the suspension data at the State level and the local level have been performed to compare the percentages of children with disabilities suspended to the rates for non-disabled children. The first analysis compares the percentages of each population that had single "extended" suspensions greater than 10 days in duration. The second analysis compared the percentages of each population that had "multiple" suspensions summing to greater than 10 days in duration. The analyses of both extended suspensions and multiple suspensions used a "comparative ratio" approach in analyzing the percentages between the two populations. The percentage of students with disabilities was divided by the percentage of non-disabled students. If the resulting ratio was greater than one (1.00), this indicated that the students with disabilities were suspended at a higher rate than their non-disabled peers. MSDE decided to use a ratio of greater than or equal to 2 to 1 (2.00+) as the first criterion for flagging an LSS as having a significant discrepancy. Since extended suspensions as well as multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days are relatively infrequent occurrences, the problem of small numbers in LSS groups required a further criterion. MSDE decided to use a rule that both groups needed to have at least 20 students in each cell for a finding of a significant discrepancy to be identified by MSDE.

See page 2-3, “Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process” for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland’s BTE Master Plan process.

Indicator 4B

Beginning in the 2005-2006 school year analysis of the rates of suspension and expulsion will be modified to include the analysis of the data by race and ethnicity. When the suspension data is disaggregated by race and ethnicity the numbers in the various cells will frequently be substantially smaller. In order to conduct a more meaningful analysis by race and ethnicity Maryland will investigate combining extended suspensions of greater than 10 days and multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days into a single total of “suspensions and expulsions of students greater than 10 days” which will include all suspensions summing to greater than 10 days. Maryland will continue to compare the rates of suspension of students with disabilities to those of non-disabled students.

With the July 1, 2005 effective date of IDEA 2004 Maryland examined and analyzed available LSS data on suspension by race/ethnicity and identified five LSS required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B allocation for early intervening services in accordance with 20 U.S.C. §1418(d)(2)(B). Data collection and an analysis will be conducted for all students suspended, combining extended suspensions and multiple suspensions, as well as separate analyses for students by each race and ethnicity. In each analysis, students with disabilities will be compared to non-disabled students. Otherwise the methodology used in this process will remain the same as at present. MSDE will conduct this combined analysis for the 2005-2006 school year to support the establishment of appropriate targets for future years.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See the attached suspension data charts. Chart 1 reports “Extended Suspensions Greater Than 10 Ten Days.” Chart 2 reports “Multiple Suspensions Summing to Greater Than 10 Days”. Chart 3 shows the affect of combining “Extended and Multiple Suspension Summing to Greater than 10 Days.” As noted in the preceding section, MSDE has conducted a combined analysis for the 2004-2005 so as to be able to establish appropriate targets for future years. The baseline data for 2004-2005 compared with subsequent years closely resembles the 2004-2005 data for “multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days”.

Section B of this indicator is new and baseline and targets are to be provided in the FFY 05 APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since Table V for the 2004-2005 suspension data still requires separate reporting for suspensions summing to greater than 10 days and since the data reported in the SPP is to match the Table V data, the 2004-2005 data, we will follow the same format as in the previous four years in reporting the suspension data. Our reporting format will change with the 2005-2006 suspension data to match the requirements in the proposed revisions to Table V for 2005-2006.

Maryland has identified 8.33% (2) of the local school systems as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of single extended suspensions of greater than 10 days of students with disabilities compared with non-disabled students during the 2004-2005 school year. As for rates of multiple suspensions summing to greater than 10 days, 29.17% (7) of the local school systems have been identified as having a significant discrepancy. Only three of these seven LSS were among the seven that were identified with a significant discrepancy during 2003-2004. This is indicative of the tremendous variances in the data from one year to another particularly in the smaller school systems. However, three LSS have been consistently identified with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>A. No more than six (6) or 25% of the LSS will show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students .</p> <p>B. <i>This is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i></p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>A. No more than five (5) or 20.83% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students .</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>A. No more than four (4) or 16.67% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students .</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>A. No more than three (3) or 12.5% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students .</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>A. No more than two (2) or 8.33% of the LSS show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students .</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>A. No LSS (0) or 0% will show a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities to provide safe learning environments and reduce the suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities.</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff LSS staff</p>
<p>Monitor LSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities to decrease the suspension/expulsion of students</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff Consultant DOSSS staff LSS staff</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

with disabilities and increase the usage of positive behavior interventions and supports.		
Review of LSS student suspension records and report findings to LSS superintendent	Annually	DSE/EIS staff Consultant DOSSS staff LSS staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices relative to suspension/expulsion.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff LSS staff
Require the revision of LSS policies, procedures, and practices, as appropriate, when a significant discrepancy is identified in the rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities as compared to nondisabled peers.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff LSS staff
Provide technical assistance to LSS related to positive student behavior interventions.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Continue collaboration with Division of Student and School Services (DOSSS) to implement positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) within LSS.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Identify and implement best practice relative to reducing/eliminating suspension of students with disabilities.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems
Provide professional development to LSS staff on issues related to suspension of students with disabilities	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff Johns Hopkins University Sheppard Pratt Health Systems

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maryland’s LRE data are collected annually for the October child count and reported in the Maryland Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables document. This document permits local school systems (LSS) and public agencies (PA) to review data, refer to past documents to establish trends, and plan for improvement.

See page 2-3, “Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process” for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland’s BTE Master Plan process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day (57,343) divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs (100,160) times 100
(57,343/100,160) x 100 = 57.25%

Total # Students with Disabilities, 6-21*	Number	%
100,160	57,343	57.25%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

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

Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day (17,749) divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs (100,160) times 100.
(17,749/100,160) x 100 = 17.72%

Total # Students with Disabilities *	Number	%
100,160	17,749	17.72%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

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

Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements (7,930) divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs (100,160) times 100.
(7,930/100,160) x 100 = 7.92%

Total # Students with Disabilities*	Number	%
100,160	7,930	7.92%

	Home	Hospital	Public Day	Private Day	Public Residential	Private Residential	Total
Number	286	17	3,407	3,861	47	312	7,930
Percent	0.29%	0.02%	3.40%	3.85%	0.05%	0.31%	7.92%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Placement of students and youth ages 6-21 in general education has shown improvement in all areas over time. However, while placement in the most restrictive placement, separate school, has shown improvement over time, it continues to remain high when compared to other states and is an area of concern and focus for the State.

- A. LRE data from the October 2004 child count (FFY 2004) indicate that 57.25% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. This is a 2.18% increase over the October 2003 child count and met the Maryland target to increase the number of students in settings designed primarily for students without disabilities. According to 2003 Annual Data Table, published by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education programs, on the IDEA data website at <https://www.ideadata.org/index.html>, Maryland’s data in this category was 55% compared to the national baseline of 50%.
- B. LRE data from the October 2004 child count (FFY 2004) indicate that 17.72% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. This is a 0.37% decrease over the October 2003 child count. According to 2003 Annual Data Table, published by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education programs, on the IDEA data website at <https://www.ideadata.org/index.html>, Maryland’s data in this category was 19% compared to the national baseline of 18%.

- C. LRE data from the October 2004 child count (FFY 2004) indicate that 7.92% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, receive specialized instruction and related services in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital settings. No significant changes in the data were noted from the previous year. Although the data has improved over time, Maryland’s data, particularly in public/private separate day schools, the current available national data collected and published by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education on the IDEA data website at <https://www.ideadata.org/index.html> indicates the national average is 2.8% for this category, while Maryland was at 7.1% in this category.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>A. 57.75% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 17.47% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 7.67% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>A. 58.25% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 17.22% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 7.42% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>A. 58.75% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 16.97% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 7.17% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>A. 59.25% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 16.72% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 6.92% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>

	placements.
2009 (2009-2010)	<p>A. 59.75% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 16.47% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 6.67% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
2010 (2010-2011)	<p>A. 60.25% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p> <p>B. 16.22% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. 6.42% of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed to educate students with disabilities in the general curriculum in learning environments that are conducive to learning through the provision of supplementary aids, services, supports, strategies, and accommodations.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff LSS staff
Include LRE data for students ages 6-21 in local school system report cards.	January 2006- June 2006	IT Staff
Explore the impact of the State funding mechanism for students for whom nonpublic placement is sought.	November 2005-June 2006	Data/Finance
Explore arrangements made with public and private institutions to implement LRE placement options for students with disabilities such as memorandums of agreements or special implementation procedures for those arrangements. (34 CFR 300.118)	January 2005 – January 2006	LSS staff PA staff Other agencies

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to least restrictive environment.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Review and revise, as appropriate, the Statewide IEP to ensure all requirements related to LRE determination are included and include special provisions for preschool students.	January 2006 - June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JJHU-CTE
Utilize the implementation of the Statewide IEP to review application of IEP decision making requirements to determine the LRE.	January 2006 – June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Explore the use of a data mining program to disaggregate LRE data for preschool for use in improvement planning.	October 2005 – June 2006	Data Mining Program JHU-CTE
Continue the directed use of grant funds toward LRE initiatives.	March 2006- September 2007	DSE/EIS staff
Review LSS policies and procedures for practices to assure the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions to assure access to and participation in general curriculum in the LRE.	2005-2006 and ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Provide technical assistance to identify best practices that promote provision of services in the LRE.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maryland’s LRE data is collected annually for the October count and reported in the Maryland Special Education/ Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables document. This document permits LSS/PA to review data, refer to past documents to establish trends, and plan for improvement. For 3-5 year olds, the data is reported by each age group as well as in the aggregate. Accuracy in coding practices remains a problem. LSS/PA continue to struggle with the consistent application of codes.

See page 2-3, “Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process” for Indicator 1 for a description of the integration of the SPP Indicator with Maryland’s BTE Master Plan process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Total 3-5 year olds*	Settings with typically developing peers	Home	Early Childhood	Combined	Total
12,227	Number	119	2,402	2,436	4,957
	Percent	0.97%	19.65%	19.92%	40.54%

*From October 2004 Special Education Child Count; revised October 28, 2005

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For 3-5 year olds, the data is reported by each age group as well as in the aggregate. LRE data for students ages 3-5 has not demonstrated the desired change the State expects.

LRE data from the October 2004 Child Count (FFY 2004) indicate that 40.54% of students with disabilities receive specialized instruction and related services in early childhood general education settings. The October 2003 Child Count indicated that 37.38% of such students were served in early childhood general education settings. This is a 3.16% increase over the October 2003 Child Count

and met the Maryland target to increase the number of students in settings designed primarily for students without disabilities. LRE data from the October 2004 Child Count (FFY 2004) indicate that 23.46% of students with disabilities receive specialized instruction and related services in early childhood special education settings. This is a 2.15% decrease over the October 2003 Child Count. In 2003, Maryland ranked -8 below the national baseline for this category. Maryland continues to explore and promote the use of community based options for preschool students.

Placement of students ages 3-5 in environments with typical peers continues to prove difficult because there are relatively few school based general classes for this age group. The State is working to expand community based options. The State is also looking forward to changes in coding of this population. Consistent and accurate coding for preschool students continues to be a problem. The State will address this issue during data manager training and within its monitoring activities.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	41.00% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2006 (2006-2007)	41.50% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2007 (2007-2008)	42.00% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2008 (2008-2009)	42.50% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2009 (2009-2010)	43.00% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2010 (2010-2011)	43.50% of preschool children with disabilities receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Hire additional state level staff to provide technical assistance to LSS on the preschool LRE continuum and effective strategies to strengthen community partnerships with other public and private early childhood programs	December 2005	DSE/EIS staff MSDE Human Resources Office
Provide technical assistance to LSS and community early childhood programs to implement effective strategies of LRE for 3-5 year olds in community settings	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Participate in MSDE review of LSS BTE Annual Master Plan Updates to review objectives and activities designed for the participation of students with disabilities in appropriate early learning activities with nondisabled peers in environments that are conducive to learning.	Annually	DSE/EIS staff DOSSS staff LSS staff
Include LRE data for students ages 3-5 in local school system report cards.	January 2006- June 2006	DSE/EIS staff MSDE IT staff DAA staff
Explore the impact of the State funding mechanism for students for whom nonpublic placement is sought.	November 2005-June 2006	DSE/EIS staff
Explore arrangements made with public and private institutions to implement LRE placement options for students with disabilities such as memorandums of agreements or special implementation procedures for those arrangements. (34 CFR 300.118)	January 2005 – January 2006	DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA/Other agencies staff
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

related to least restrictive environment.		
Review and revise, as appropriate, the State-wide IEP to ensure all requirements related to LRE determination provisions for preschool students are included.	January 2006 - June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Utilize the implementation of the Statewide IEP to review the application of IEP decision making requirements to determine the LRE.	January 2006 – June 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Explore the use of a data mining program to disaggregate LRE data for preschool data for use in improvement planning.	October 2005 – June 2006	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Continue the directed use of grant funds toward LRE initiatives.	March 2006- September 2007	DSE/EIS staff
DSE/EIS will review LSS policies and procedures for practices that assure access to and participation in general curriculum and appropriate preschool activities in the LRE with the provision of services, supports, aids, accommodations, and interventions as determined appropriate by each child's IEP team.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff LSS staff
Post local program preschool LRE best practices descriptions and related resources/products developed on Early Childhood Gateway website (EC Gateway framework has been developed; links to professional development modules on the IFSP and EC Transition have been incorporated)	Initiate March 2006 & Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Design and develop on-line professional development module on the LRE decision-making process for preschool students with disabilities for access by local school system preschool special education	July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE Content Specialist Consultant

SPP Template – Part B (3)

<p>personnel, community early childhood program staff, and families (link to this module will be on EC Gateway website)</p>		
<p>Provide technical assistance and professional development resources and activities to local Family Support Services Coordinators in each LSS to build their capacity to support and strengthen family involvement in the LRE decision-making process.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Family Support Services Coordinators DSE/EIS staff Local Preschool Partners</p>
<p>Technical assistance to LSS to identify and implement best practices to increase the provision of services in the settings with nondisabled peers.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff</p>

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

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

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improve functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

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

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool

children with IEPs assessed times 100.

- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Department of Education is currently developing an Early Childhood Accountability System (ECAS) for measuring outcomes for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities and their families. Through the ECAS, MSDE will:

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

Through its General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG), MSDE is building a system that is based on child and family change, using a measurement system that is based on valid and reliable assessment tools and instruments, creating a data collection system for aggregating, analyzing, and reporting outcome data, and implementing a professional development system to support full implementation of the ECAS.

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

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

Maryland has established the Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR), a framework that incorporates components of the WSS for 4 and 5 year olds, aligns the WSS with a Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC), supports related annual statewide professional development activities, and utilizes a voluntary system for evaluating and accrediting early childhood programs. The WSS is an age-anchored early childhood assessment that provides a picture of a child's development in relation to typical peers. It is a nationally validated instrument, with established protocols for administering and scoring. The WSS takes an individualized approach to learning and assessment, and yields child-specific information that can assist with modifying instruction. It evaluates progress as well as performance, thus allowing children with special needs to demonstrate growth even in areas where their performance is delayed. It is the required instrument for use by all of Maryland's local school systems for the annual fall kindergarten readiness assessment, and is voluntarily used by the majority of local school systems throughout the school year in pre-k and kindergarten programs. With the exception of the annual statewide kindergarten readiness assessment, the MMSR accommodates a few local school systems' use of locally developed early childhood assessment systems, as long as the measured outcomes align with standards and indicators included in the appropriate age level VSC. There is currently no VSC for three year old children. However, several local schools systems are pursuing development of standards for 3 year olds that align with the VSC for potential use by all

local school systems. In addition, the Maryland Department of Human Resources (DHR) developed, with the assistance of an interagency workgroup which included representation from MSDE, "Guidelines for Healthy Child Development and Care for Young Children (Birth – Three ½ Years of Age)." These guidelines are consistent with the MMSR and VSC.

As part of the scope of work done through Maryland's GSEG, the decision was made to build on existing efforts, and to include the ECAS for Young Children with Disabilities as part of the broader MMSR. The ECAS will use the WSS in local school systems that do not have their own early childhood assessment system and, consistent with the approach of the MMSR, accommodate the use of local early childhood assessments that align with the VSC.

Individual indicators in all domains included in the WSS have been linked as measures for one or more of the three broad child outcomes established by OSEP. This linkage will also be completed in early 2006 for any locally developed early childhood assessments.

Information on child performance gained through the implementation of the ECAS will be used to inform local program improvement efforts and State level focused monitoring and technical assistance activities. For individual children, this information will also be used to update current levels of performance on the IEP as well as assist with the development of goals and associated instructional strategies as part of each annual review.

Stakeholder involvement by local school system preschool special education administrators, families, other community early childhood program directors, and the State Interagency Coordinating Council (birth-focus) for the design of the ECAS has been ongoing. In addition to large group presentations, GSEG project staff have also met with teams of local school system staff representing both general and special education programs, and Family Support Services coordinators (coordinators are parents of a child with a disability) to gain feedback on the feasibility of proposed ECAS elements. Modifications to proposed elements have been completed based on this feedback.

The ECAS will have two child performance data measurement points:

- Status at Entry – "New" to preschool special education services; 3, 4 and 5 year old children with disabilities who enter the preschool program with an initial IEP. The first Status at Entry data collection will occur during Spring 2006 (FFY 05) in selected local school systems whose populations are representative of the State. The first reporting of Status of Entry data to OSEP is due February 7, 2007; data to be reported will include the percentage of children entering at the level of same-aged peers, and the percentage of children entering at a level below same-aged peers, for each of the three outcomes.
- Progress Data at Exit: Data to be reported will include: a) the percentage of children who reached or maintained functioning comparable to same-aged peers; b) the percentage of children who improved functioning (not included in a); and c) the percentage of children who do not improve functioning. The first Progress at Exit data collection will occur for children for whom Status at Entry data was collected in FFY 05, who exited from the preschool program during the 2006-2007 school year (FFY 06), and who participated in the preschool program for at least six months.

Professional Development System (support to local program administrators and program staff):

- MSDE has procedures and protocols in place for training staff that currently administer the WSS to students, ages 4 and five, including students with IEPs.
- GSEG project and Part B 619 staff are currently identifying the resources needed to expand training to teachers and specialists who work with the 3 year old population, and who have not participated in any WSS trainings to date.
- A professional development plan will be developed and implemented in January-February 2006.

Other Timelines and Activities:

- Selection of LSS representatives of the State for the first collection of Status at Entry data. (November 2005)
- Develop & deliver Professional Development to selected LSS (January-February 2006)
Collection and aggregation of first Status at Entry data for “new” 3, 4, and 5 year olds (Summer & Fall 2006)
- Roll out plan for collection of Status at Entry data for remaining LSS (Summer 2006)
- Report first Status at Entry data to OSEP (February 1, 2007)
Report first Progress at Exit data to OSEP (February 1, 2008)

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will report status upon entry and be provided in APR due February 1, 2007. In following years (starting with 2/1/08) data will include a report of progress from entry to exit or other naturally occurring point near exit for students who have received preschool services for 6 months or more.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, a discussion of the baseline data reporting status upon entry will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p><i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i></p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has developed and submitted (11/11/05) a Request for Consultant Services (RFQ #R00R) to provide a "Comprehensive Design and Implementation of a System to Collect, Validate, Aggregate, Analyze, and Report Parent Outcome Data." This system will allow the State to collect data on the percent of parents participating in Part B (ages 3 through 21) who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. This contract shall begin on December 15, 2005 and conclude on December 14, 2006.

Nature of Work for the Consultant includes:

- 1) Use the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Family Survey measurement tools for parents of students with disabilities ages 3 through 21.
- 2) Provide information to the MSDE, DSE/EIS, Part B Program Manager, related to collecting, aggregating, and analyzing valid and reliable data as it relates to parents participating in special education services.
- 3) Use the NCSEAM Parent Survey as a measurement tool.
- 4) Revise survey items as needed.
- 5) Customize the measurement instrument to include Maryland specific requirements, including cultural/diversity issues.
- 6) Establish and deliver a sampling plan with an appropriate degree of accuracy and confidence level (95% Confidence with 5% confidence interval per local school system) with a total of 111,565 students as reported on 10/29/04.
- 7) Mail the survey to every parent in the sample with return reply at no cost to the parent.
- 8) Monitor the returns and re-contact parents who have not replied in order to achieve the desired confidence levels.
- 9) Complete processing the data and verify the data from the survey.
- 10) Produce an electronic filing system for the DSE/EIS.
- 11) Generate an on-line report that includes benchmarks, goal setting, and action planning.
- 12) Provide assistance in interpreting the survey data, compiling final reports, and analyzing data to improve services.

MSDE has initiated programs focused on parental involvement. DSE/EIS has funded Special Education Citizen’s Advisory Committees for each LSS in Maryland. There is continued funding for teams of parents and school staff in each jurisdiction as Partners for Success, and a State Partnership Committee including parents and professionals meeting on a monthly basis. The survey being developed will provide a broad base response to the level of satisfaction parents have with the services provided. The SE-SAC will use the information to advise the Division as it prepares policies and regulations for the local school systems. The survey will provide clear, quantifiable baseline data to utilize in developing action plans for the local school systems.

The baseline data will be reviewed by SESAC. The consultants in developing and administering this instrument will be part of the discussion teams. The baseline data will be collected during FFY 2005 (2005-2006).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, a discussion of the baseline will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p><i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i></p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Measurement:

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

To address Part B Monitoring Indicator #9, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will:

- Contract with an outside consultant to review and analyze LSS data to recommend a risk ratio index to be used to define significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.
- Designate a State team to review available data to determine how districts are identified as having significant disproportionate representation.
- Utilize the State team to report, make recommendations, and acquire recommendations from the SESAC and the IDEA Partnership Team related to how the State will make determinations of overall significant disproportionate representation.
- Collaborate with the State team to make recommendations for data views and other appropriate data sources to use in analyzing overall significant disproportionate representation at the State and LSS level.
- Utilize QAM with assistance and review by the State team, to develop a written overview and self-assessment rubric for use by LSS that have been determined to be significantly disproportionate.
- Utilize the State team to determine how significant disproportionate representation will be used to trigger the identification of LSS that will be required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for early intervening services.

- Provide training to LSS identified as significantly disproportionate to complete self-assessment activities and generate a written report of findings to MSDE.
- Review LSS written reports and verify the findings.
- Report the percent of districts that have significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, a discussion of the baseline data will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p><i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i></p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

With the July 1, 2005 effective date of IDEA 2004, Maryland examined and analyzed available LSS data on identification of students as students with disabilities by three disability categories by race/ethnicity and identified five LSS required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B allocation for early intervening services in accordance with 20 U.S.C. §1418(d)(2)(B).

To address Part B Monitoring Indicator #10, the MSDE DSE/EIS will:

- Contract with an outside consultant to review and analyze LSS data to recommend a risk ratio index to be used to define significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Designate a State team to review available data to determine how LSS are identified as having significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Utilize the State team to report, make recommendations and acquire recommendations from the SESAC and the IDEA Partnership Team related to how the State will make determinations of significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Collaborate with the State team; make recommendations as to data views and other appropriate sources to be used by the State and LSS in analyzing significant disproportionate representation within disability categories.
- Utilize QAM, with assistance and review by the State team to develop a written overview and self-assessment rubric for use by LSS that have been determined to be significantly disproportionate within disability categories.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

- Utilize the State team to determine how significant disproportionate representation will be used to trigger the identification of LSS that will be required to use 15% of their IDEA Part B funds for early intervening services.
- Provide training to LSS identified as significantly disproportionate within disability categories to complete self-assessment activities and generate a written report of findings to MSDE.
- Review LSS written reports and verify the findings.
- Report the percent of LSS that have significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, a discussion of the baseline will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i>
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This requirement was effective July 1, 2005. DSE/EIS did not collect this data during FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005). The State is now required to collect valid and reliable data on all students, ages 3 to 21 years old. DSE/EIS staff members, in collaboration with Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU-CTE) identified existing data fields within the new Enhanced Special Services Information System (SSIS) that contribute to this measurement and additional fields to be added to the data system to assure accurate data collection. See Indicator #20 for more information relative to the Enhanced SSIS data system. The Enhanced SSIS data system will be revised to include the additional data fields. In addition to the Enhanced SSIS data system, the Statewide IEP and Online IEP will be revised to include all necessary data fields.

In addition to defining and developing a data matrix for the collection of quantifiable data, DSE/EIS staff will collaborate with QAM staff, LSS data managers, and local directors of special education to develop methods for accounting for reason for any delays that resulted in the evaluation not being completed within 60 days for parental consent.

While the data system is being revised, DSE/EIS Data Specialists will collaborate with QAM staff to identify methods and activities to complete during the 2005-2006 school year in connection with scheduled monitoring visits in order to collect data for the development of baseline and targets to be reported in the APR due February 1, 2007.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, a discussion of the baseline will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i>
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. |
|---|

<p>Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays.</p>
--

<p>Percent = c divided by a – b times 100.</p>
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

MSDE has implemented multiple strategies to address the requirement that students transitioning from Part C who are determined eligible for Part B will have an IEP in effect by their third birthday. The most critical aspect of achieving compliance for this SPP indicator lies in the capacity of a statewide data collection and reporting system to collect, aggregate and report this data to inform local lead agency and LSS improvement efforts in conjunction with the State quality assurance and monitoring system activities. In Spring 2005, the SSIS data system was modified to collect data to track the effective dates of initial IEPs for students transitioning from Part C. Data fields were added to the system to identify a child transitioning from Part C, the initial IEP meeting date, and the date Part B services will be initiated. Statewide data on the number of students transitioning from Part C to Part B whose IEPs were in effect by their third birthday will be available following the October 2005 SSIS data collection from local school systems. The State recognizes that in addition to gathering and reporting data on the number of IEPs in effect by the third birthday, it must also address the expanded requirement for this SPP Indicator of reporting the total number of students referred by local Part C lead agencies to Part B for eligibility determination, and of those students referred, how many were determined to be NOT eligible for Part B prior to their third birthdays. This information will ultimately be collected through the demographics section of the online IEP, which will document the outcome of the eligibility determination process for all children and youth referred to Part B. This data will not be collected through the Statewide SSIS system, as this system reports on students with active IEPs as of the end of October of each year. For the purpose of including baseline data on the number of children found to be NOT eligible prior to the third birthday out of the total number of children referred by Part C to Part B, the State will utilize data captured through the online IFSP/Part C component of the statewide database. Although this field on the IFSP was to have been eliminated it will now be temporarily retained to collect this data for Part B reporting of baseline data for the SPP, with the demographics section of the online IEP fully implemented by June 30, 2006.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

**Statewide Transition Summary Data* for
Children Turning 3 from January 1 – June 30, 2005**

	Children Who Turned 3 from 1/1-6/30/05	Parents Wish to Consider Part B	Parents Do Not Wish to Consider Part B	Part B Unknown	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligibility Unknown
Statewide Totals	1663	13	134	1516	1052	178	433

*Data provided through online Part C component of MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services statewide database.

Note: Statewide data on the number of children transitioning from Part C to Part B whose IEPs were in effect by their third birthday will be available following the October 2005 SSIS data collection from local school systems.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Revised State policies and procedures for transition at age three went into effect October 25, 2004. Baseline data therefore reflects information reported in conformance with the revised State level requirements and guidelines. Columns 3 through 5 report data collected directly by Part C as a part of the Transition Planning meeting by service coordinators and entered – or not – into each on-line IFSP, and aggregated for statewide totals. “Part B Unknown” indicates that nothing was entered for either of the prior two columns. Columns 6 through 8 reflect data that were dependent on Part B personnel returning completed forms (part of the IFSP) on the eligibility determination status for each child referred by Part C to Part B for eligibility determination.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2010	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, and who are found eligible for

SPP Template – Part B (3)

(2010-2011)	Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
-------------	--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Joint Part C/Part B process for conducting shared monitoring of Early Childhood Transition will be developed.	October 2005 – January 2006	MITP Part C Monitoring staff DSE/EIS staff
Joint Part C/Part B process for conducting shared monitoring of Early Childhood Transition implemented, including coordinating oversight of associated corrective action plans.	February 2006 and Ongoing	MITP Part C Monitoring staff DSE/EIS staff
New demographics data collection section of the Statewide IEP implemented.	January 2006	DSE/EIS staff JHU-CTE
Completed revision of joint Part C/Part B state technical assistance bulletin on Early Childhood Transition,	January 2006	DSE/EIS staff MITP Part C staff
Early Childhood Transition data will be included in local lead agency and local school system report cards	January – June 2006	DSE/EIS staff MITP Part C staff
Provide training and technical assistance to local school system data managers, local directors of special education, and local preschool special education coordinators related to reporting Early Childhood Transition data.	January – June 2006	DSE/EIS staff
Continue to monitor, direct improvement planning, verification of data, training, technical assistance, and other program development activities related to Early Childhood Transition.	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff MITP Part C Monitoring staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

To collect the data required to establish a baseline during FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006) MSDE will evaluate the feasibility and validity of existing data sources in order to identify the procedures the State and LSS shall use to gather the required data. DSE/EIS will solicit participation and input from a variety of stakeholders, including DSE/EIS, CTAL, and DORS staff members, LSS transition coordinators, local directors of special education, advocates, SESAC members, and the IDEA Partnership Team to review existing sources of data, methods of data collection and reporting in order to assure the collection of accurate, valid, and reliable data. Information and existing procedures to consider include, but are not limited to the consideration of:

- Modification of the SSIS to add a data field to identify transition goals and activities on the IEP of students with disabilities, age 16 and older;
- Review of self-assessment, validation, verification, and monitoring results, including findings as the result of due process hearings, and written complaints relative to IEP content of transition goals and activities. This review will document whether there is non-compliance in this area;
- Participation of transition specialists on on-site monitoring teams;
- Review of LSS policies and procedures relative to secondary transition; and
- Data from the Maryland Exit Document on transition goals and activities.

To evaluate the efficacy of various data sources Maryland will review transition probes within the State's policies and procedures to assure it includes appropriate secondary transition probes that will lead to accurate, valid, and reliable data. This includes the following documentation:

- A statement of the transition service needs of the student that focuses on the student's course of study;
- Measurable post secondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, when appropriate independent living skills;
- A description of transition services;
- Course of study;
- Student preferences and interests are included;

SPP Template – Part B (3)

- Strategies to promote access to and progress in academic (e.g. math, language arts, science, etc.) and nonacademic content (e.g. career development, community access, travel training, etc.) are incorporated into transition planning; and
- Plans for collaboration with other agencies to ensure the delivery of transition services are incorporated in transition planning.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, ,a discussion of the baseline will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p><i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i></p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

On November 10, 2005 Maryland received permission from OSEP to use the data generated by the Maryland Longitudinal Transition Study (MDLTS) as the baseline for the percent of youth in competitive employment, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both. The Maryland Study is a companion to the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 funded by the USDE and conducted by SRI Inc. The state level study will be identical to the national study, with a few exceptions in sample construction and the timing of initial data collection activities. The MDLTS was begun in December 2000. The MDLTS is investigating the number of domains that influence student achievement and post school outcomes. The domains include student characteristics, family characteristics, school characteristics and policies, school programs, and non-school factors.

The sampling approach for the MDLTS had two goals:

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

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

Montgomery, Prince George’s Counties and Baltimore City each have total student populations that exceed 50,000.

SRI Inc. will report to MSDE in January 2006 the data that will be submitted as baseline. The data will address the post school outcomes of study participants as of August 2005. The report will contain data on the number of young adult participants enrolled in postsecondary education, the number employed, and the number who had dropped out and earned a GED.

DSE/EIS will release a Request for Proposal (RFP) to provide a “Comprehensive Design and Implementation of a System to Collect, Validate, Aggregate, Analyze, and Report on Postsecondary Outcomes.” DSE/EIS will consult with the National Center on Postsecondary Outcomes during the development of the RFP.

Nature of RFP includes:

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

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, a discussion of the baseline will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p><i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i></p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

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

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

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = b divided by a times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.</p> <p>B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = b divided by a times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.</p> <p>C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. # of findings of noncompliance made.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = c divided by b times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.</p>

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The MSDE, DSE/EIS monitoring functions cross branches within the Division. As a result of an OSEP March 2005 visit, an office dedicated to coordinating activities for monitoring LSS and PA was established. The DSE/EIS, Office of QAM was established on March 21, 2005 and reports directly to the State Assistant Superintendent in the DSE/EIS. At that time the QAM office consisted of two full time appointed employees, and three part-time employees that were assigned to specific tasks. Between March 24, 2005 and June 17, 2005 QAM staff met eleven times and focused efforts on developing the self-assessment form, self-assessment verification desk-audit instrument, policies and procedures manual and revision of the record-review form. Meetings have been scheduled between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006. In Maryland, the monitoring for continuous improvement and results (MCIR) process has undergone significant changes and is designed to ensure improved performance results for students with disabilities and compliance with IDEA 2004, Part B requirements. The MSDE structure encompasses a cyclical system of general supervision, verification, program improvement, monitoring for compliance, public reporting and enforcement. The LSS and PA engage in MCIR activities listed below in their efforts to increase the performance results for students with disabilities and ensure compliance with the IDEA 04 requirements:

- Self-Assessment of performance on priority indicators;
- Collect accurate quantitative and qualitative data;
- Involve broad stakeholder input in self-assessment and improvement planning;
- Develop and submit to MSDE, DSE/EIS a Local Performance Plan (LPP) and subsequent Local Annual Performance Report (LAPR);
- Participate in MSDE, DSE/EIS monitoring activities;
- Complete required "Corrective Action Plans" (CAP) or requirements based on MSDE monitoring functions; and,
- Report local performance annually to the public.

On April 29, 2005 the Office of QAM held a statewide technical assistance meeting in Columbia, Maryland. LSS and PA attended this meeting to learn about the revised monitoring process which emphasizes the Self-Assessment as the foundation for future improvement activities. As a follow up to the meeting the same power-point presentation developed and used by MSDE was made available to all LSS and PA for the purpose of providing LSS or PA on-site technical assistance training for staff. Self-assessments were submitted as required by all LSS and PA in June 2005. Self-assessments were reviewed by July 2005 and meetings were scheduled for an on-site overview of the self-assessment and provide technical assistance prior to the desk audit to verify information. All self-assessments will be reviewed on-site by December 31, 2005. As of December 2, 2005, 21 on-site visits will be completed and the desk audit verifications for LSS will begin on October 11, 2005. The order in which LSS and PA were selected to be visited was based on a rank order of self-assessment information provided and the need for technical assistance in addressing priority areas and initiatives. Those LSS identified in the need of the most technical assistance and supervision were scheduled to be visited first.

In June 2004, the Program Administration and Staff Development (PASD) Branch of DSE/EIS completed the first Enhanced Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (EMCIR) report for one LSS concerning the 2003-2004 school year. Staff from MSDE and THE LSS developed the initial CAP through extensive negotiation. The initial CAP was scheduled for completion by October 9, 2005. This represented a one-year timeline for implementation of the agreed upon CAP. Although the LSS completed the activities required to address the findings, sufficient progress toward the goals was not realized. Additional technical assistance, redirection and restriction of funds and other sanctions have been imposed upon the system.

DSE/EIS continues to monitor the system in the same areas and expands its activities where additional areas of noncompliance are identified. Additional monitoring reports were issued in

January and June of 2005. A new CAP based on the June 2005 EMCIR report has been developed with a completion date of June 13, 2006.

In September 2005, the Maryland State Superintendent of Schools appointed an Intensive Management and Capacity Improvement (IMCI) team. The IMCI team consists of nine members in key areas of special education and financial management to oversee and provide on-site technical assistance to the LSS. Due to continued noncompliance, DSE/EIS redirected the use of the LSS carryover funding to address noncompliance identified through monitoring or written complaints. DSE/EIS requested a resubmission of the SFY 2006 Local Application of Federal Funds to include modifications necessary to implement CAP. DSE/EIS will continue to monitor provision of FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE), the provision of related services, grants management, discipline, student achievement, and exit data and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Annually, the Maryland State Department of Education and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene monitor 24 LSS for compliance with the Medicaid health related services requirements. A standardized monitoring instrument is utilized that includes frequency of service on the IEP, dates of service provided, provider qualifications and description of service. At the conclusion of each monitoring visit, a written monitoring report is provided to each LSS and the report is shared with QAM staff. The report describes the team procedures, the local self-monitoring process, the sufficiency of record documentation, findings, and a CAP, if appropriate.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification.

During the period July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005, eight of 24 LSS were monitored for compliance with requirements for the placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and the provision of related services in accordance with individual student IEPs. Of these, five had findings of noncompliance. Completion of corrective actions and findings, based on verification of correction, will be reported in the APR due February 2007.

Time Period	Total # Number of LSS in MD	Total # LSS Monitored for FAPE in the LRE	# LSS Monitored Compliant	# LSS Monitored Noncompliant	# LSS Monitored with CAP for LRE and/or related services	# with completed CAPs
July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005	24	8	3	5	6 ^{*^}	1 [^]

**One CAP of the State's monitoring was added as the result of a LSS self-assessment.*

^One CAP in the State's monitoring was added as a result of the EMCIR process. One CAP was completed for this system. Desired progress was not achieved and an additional CAP and other sanctions are being implemented.

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant LRE	CAP Completion Date
06-01-05	√	06-01-06
01-18-05	√	01-18-06
03-01-05	√	03-01-06
03-11-05	√	03-11-06
04-14-05	√	04-14-06
06-30-04	√	10-09-05+

+ CAP completion date is one year from the negotiated start date. Subsequent CAPs for this system are limited to one year from the report date identifying the area of noncompliance.

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant Suspensions	CAP Completion Date
01-18-05	√	01-18-06
06-30-04	√	10-09-05

B . Noncompliance related to areas not included in the above priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

During the period July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005, 14 LSS and PA were monitored by the QAM Office and/or PASD Branch in areas not included in the State’s priority areas. The following chart shows areas of noncompliance outside of the monitoring priority areas. In addition, one LSS self-identified the provision of related services as noncompliant and self-initiated a CAP.

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant Related Services	CAP Completion Date
06-01-05	√	06-01-06
01-18-05	√	01-18-06
03-01-05	√	03-01-06
03-11-05	√	03-11-06
04-14-05	√	04-14-06
06-14-05	√	06-13-06
06-14-05	√	06-13-06

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant	CAP Completion Date
03-01-05	-IEP team participation -IEP content -IEP team responsibilities	03-01-06
04-13-05	-Assessment/Reevaluation	04-13-06
06-13-05	-IEP team responsibilities IEP content	06-13-06
06-14-05	Grants Management	06-13-06

During the period July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005, the Maryland State Department of Education and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene monitor all local school systems (24) for compliance with the Medicaid health related services requirements.

Date of Monitoring Report	Identified Noncompliant Related Services	CAP Completion Date
03-22-05	✓	03-22-06
04-01-05	✓	04-01-06
05-13-05	✓	05-13-06
05-31-05	✓	05-31-06
06-06-05	✓	06-06-06
06-13-05	✓	06-13-06
06-20-05	✓	06-20-06
07-13-05	✓	07-13-06
07-15-05	✓	07-15-06
07-15-05	✓	07-15-06
07-15-05	✓	07-15-06
08-18-05	✓	08-18-06
08-29-05	✓	08-29-06
09-08-05	✓	09-08-06
09-09-05	✓	09-09-06

FFY 04 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005) complaint data

Number of complaint investigations and corrective actions

This report is based on data as of August 30, 2005 for all complaints filed with MSDE between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 (FFY 04)

	# of Part B Complaints Received	# withdrawn	# with Corrective Actions	# Actions Completed year from the date of identification	# not complete due by August 30 2005	# complete more than 1 year	# pending, not due by August 30, 2005
FY05	162	19	105	30*	0	0	75
				*1 due on 8/30/05			

Cases with corrective actions due as of August 30, 2005

As of August 30, 2005 there was one case with corrective actions that were due as a result of complaint investigations that were completed for complaints filed between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. These corrective actions were completed within one year of the finding of noncompliance.

LSS and PA have, however, provided documentation of completion of corrective actions for 30 complaint investigations that were filed between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005.

Progress

Based on the data reported in the previous section of this report, MSDE has met the targets established through the corrective action plan approved by OSEP.

MSDE has implemented the strategies identified through the CAPs that were submitted to OSEP in September 2004. MSDE continues to require LSS and PA to provide documented evidence of actions taken to address identified corrective actions. MSDE provides technical assistance and monitors and verifies correction of noncompliance through telephone contacts, site visits, review of multiple data sources, including complaints, due process hearings and MCIR self assessment data, and verification data.

Individual corrective actions are addressed within one year 100% of the time as required. **Correction of all identified noncompliance is completed within one year for 93 % of all complaint investigations.** In all cases LSS and PA have CAP in place and MSDE continues to follow-up to ensure compliance. Ongoing follow-up is demonstrated by completion of corrective actions for 3 additional cases filed in FY 04 in September 2005. In addition, a report of systemic correction of noncompliance is included in Section C of this report and reflects similar results.

C. Correction of systemic noncompliance not identified through Monitoring for Continuous Improvement. Status as of August 30, 2005.

Data is based on complaints filed between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2004 (FFY 03), and hearing decisions that were issued between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2004. The completion of corrective actions required by these complaint investigations and due process hearing decisions were due between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 (FFY 04).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B		
Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation
#15 C		
General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearing etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.		25 systemic findings were identified in 13 agencies through the state complaint system, Of those four are addressed through monitoring for continuous improvement or enhanced monitoring for continuous improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 agency had 2 findings regarding provision of transportation, and provision of FAPE during disciplinary removal that are addressed through EMCIR • 1 agency had a finding regarding provision of related services addressed through MCIR speech services • 1 agency had a finding regarding the provision of prior written notice <u>and are reported as part of 15 A and B</u>
Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:		Of the findings of systemic noncompliance the following are not addressed through monitoring: 2 agencies - implementation of behavior intervention regulations 1 agency – C to B transition IEP in effect 1 agency – FAPE during disciplinary removal 2 agencies -ESY proper, timely determination 1 agency – IEE proper procedures 1 agency - IEP development parent participation 3 agencies- IEP implementation (timely) 2 agencies - accommodation district wide testing 4 agencies - proper procedures home and hospital teaching
a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms	a = 12	1 agency -related services speech
b. # of findings of noncompliance made	b = 21	2 agencies related services transportation (MSD, nonpublic schools) 1 agency - implementation of settlement agreements 1 agency - proper written notice
c. # of corrections	c = 19	

completed as soon as possible by in no case later than one year from identification	19/21 = 90%	
---	-------------	--

Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation
#15 C		
Due process hearings % of noncompliance identified through due process hearing decisions		Due process hearings Noncompliance was identified in 6 public agencies through 23 due process hearing decisions. Actions for individual students were ordered in each case. 3 decisions have been appealed. Of the 20 remaining cases, actions have been completed within the required timeline and in no case in longer than one year.
a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms	a = 6	
b. #of findings of noncompliance made	b = 20	
c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification	c = 20	
	20/20 = 100%	

Findings of noncompliance

Data is based on complaints filed between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 (FFY 04), and hearing decisions that were issued between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. The actions required by these complaint investigations and due process hearing decisions are due between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006.

Findings of systemic noncompliance that are not addressed through monitoring activities were identified in 7 LSS/PA primarily as a result of complaint investigations that were issued during FFY 04 (July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005). There were 10 findings in 8 areas. These corrections are due in FFY 05 (July 1 2005 to June 30, 2006). The following were identified as of August 30, 2005:

- Behavior intervention, implementation
- Proper identification – 2 agencies
- IEP development, parent participation
- IEP implementation FAPE
- IEP implementation timely
- Home and hospital instruction proper procedures – 2 agencies
- Proper written notice
- Transportation of parentally place students private schools

Noncompliance was identified in 9 public agencies through 15 due process hearing decisions. Actions for individual students were ordered in each case. 2 decisions have been appealed. Of the 13 remaining cases, actions have been completed in 9 cases and are pending in 4 cases.

As of August 30, 2005, no corrective actions were due. MSDE will continue to follow-up to ensure correction.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A. Noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification.

The LSS CAPs for the monitoring priority areas of LRE and suspensions are not required to be completed at the time of this report. Therefore, the State can not provide documentation verifying that correction of noncompliance has occurred. Data and analysis to support the conclusion that the identified noncompliance by MSDE related to LRE and suspensions have been corrected will be reported in the February 2007 APR and in correspondence to OSEP as required by special conditions in the MSDE FFY 2005 Grant Award. Data and analysis of corrections associated with CAPs of other monitored indicators will also be provided, as appropriate.

B. Noncompliance related to areas not included in the above priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification

MSDE continues to implement the strategies identified through the CAP that was submitted to OSEP in September 2004. MSDE continues to require public agencies to provide documented evidence of actions taken to address identified corrective actions. MSDE provides technical assistance, monitors, and verifies correction of noncompliance through telephone contacts, site visits, review of multiple data sources, including written complaints, due process hearings and monitoring for continuous improvement self assessment data, and verification data.

Individual corrective actions are addressed within one year 100% of the time as required. Correction of all identified noncompliance is completed within one year for 93 % of all complaint investigations. In all cases public agencies have corrective action plans in place and MSDE continues to follow-up to ensure compliance. Ongoing follow-up is demonstrated by completion of corrective actions for 3 additional cases filed in FY 04 in September 2005. In addition, a report of systemic correction of noncompliance is included in section C of this report and reflects similar results.

Noncompliance relative to Medicaid health related services, identified by Interagency Medicaid Monitoring Team, requires an LSS to submit a CAP within 45 days of the monitoring report. All noncompliance is required to be corrected within one year of identification.

C. Correction of systemic noncompliance not identified through Monitoring for Continuous improvement. Status as of August 30, 2005.

MSDE will continue to ensure correction of systemic noncompliance through Division wide activities to enhance general supervisory capacity. MSDE will continue to implement processes that involve staff from all branches of the Division in order to track status of identification and correction of noncompliance, needs for and provision of technical assistance and monitoring activities to address correction of systemic noncompliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of corrective actions identified through monitoring, complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc. will be corrected within one year from the date of identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Projected Timelines	Resources
Increase dedicated Quality Assurance and Monitoring staff by three full time positions and three part-time positions for a total of five full time and six part time staff members.	July 1, 2005- December 30, 2005	Position Approval
MSDE will continue to enhance general supervisory capacity through coordinated planning activities that involve staff from all branches of the division to enhance coordinated tracking of data, TA and monitoring to address correction of systemic noncompliance.	July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS Staff
Focused Monitoring activities for LRE and the provision of related services will be conducted by MSDE in 10 additional local school systems	July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

<p>during the period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 (for a total of 17 of 24 local school systems). Corrective Action Plans (CAP) will be assigned to those local school systems with systemic findings of noncompliance.</p>		
<p>On-site verification of the results of Corrective Action Plans will be conducted by MSDE within six months of the close of the CAP as per revised monitoring procedures.</p>	<p>July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006</p>	<p>DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams</p>
<p>24 of 24 local school systems will have self-monitoring systems in place to ensure compliance with all requirements associated with FAPE in the LRE and the delivery of related services.</p>	<p>November 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006</p>	<p>DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams</p>
<p>Upon completion of the Self-Assessment Desk Audit and On-Site Review, the LSS and PA will be required to submit Local Performance Plans (LPP). MCIR and Focused Monitoring procedures will define required actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement to be applied to those LSS and PA with sustained noncompliance.</p>	<p>September 2005 - June 2006</p>	<p>DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams</p>
<p>The State will complete its focused monitoring for LRE and the provision of related services and select additional monitoring priority areas for focused monitoring.</p>	<p>January 2006 – June 2007</p>	<p>SESAC IDEA Partnership Team</p>
<p>The revised MCIR manual will be distributed to all LSS and PA.</p>	<p>January 2006 – March 2006</p>	<p>DSE/EIS Monitoring Teams</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

MSDE has adopted written procedures for investigating IDEA complaints. The MSDE Special Education Complaint Resolution Procedures for Part B complaints have been widely disseminated may be found on the MSDE web site. Once the regulations implementing IDEA 2004 are finalized, MSDE will review and revise these procedures to ensure they are consistent with federal requirements.

Pursuant to the MSDE procedures, the complaint must be in writing and signed and meet the criteria identified in 34 CFR §300.662 in order to constitute an IDEA complaint filed with the Department for investigation. In completing IDEA complaint investigations, MSDE utilizes a collaborative approach, consulting with appropriate Department staff and the Office of the Attorney General, as necessary, to ensure consistency in the interpretation of federal and State regulation and policies.

The MSDE has procedures to ensure that alleged violations of IDEA and State special education law are investigated in a thorough manner to identify noncompliance. Complaints are generally resolved within 60 days of the date that the written complaint is received unless exceptional circumstances exist with respect to a particular complaint. The need for an extension of the timeline is documented in the complaint file and a written explanation is provided in the Letter of Findings.

The MSDE procedures address the correction of noncompliance identified through complaint investigations. Pursuant to those procedures, all noncompliance identified through the investigation must be remediated and corrected, regardless of whether the original complaint contained an allegation that the particular requirement was not met. The Letter of Findings explicitly states the timeframe in which the corrective actions must be taken to redress the violations for the individual student(s) as well as any school-based and/or systemic corrective action. The timeline for remediating the denial of appropriate services to the individual student is generally 30-60 days, depending on the circumstances and nature of the violation determined.

The Letter of Findings states that technical assistance is available to the parties regarding implementation of the required actions and identifies the name of the MSDE staff person responsible for following up to ensure that required actions are satisfactorily completed in a timely manner. The Letter of Findings states that the public agency is required to provide documentation to MSDE to

demonstrate satisfactory completion of the corrective actions. MSDE has designated one full-time staff person who is responsible for ensuring completion of the required actions. This individual conducts on-site visits with public agencies and provides technical assistance to public agency staff and complainants to ensure timely and effective implementation of complaint decisions. As part of this process, the individual reviews data concerning violations identified through complaint investigations and due process hearings with public agency staff, to determine if there is pattern that suggests systemic noncompliance.

Systemic findings of noncompliance determined through complaint investigations are shared and reviewed through the State's monitoring process. Data and analysis concerning follow up to complaint findings of noncompliance is provided in Indicator #15 of this report.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See Attachment 1. During this reporting period, MSDE received 162 written complaints. Nineteen (19) of these were withdrawn or dismissed. As of the closing date (August 29, 2005), two (2) investigations were pending. Of the 141 Letters of Findings for complaints received between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005, 138 were issued within required timelines (98%).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Between July 1, 2004 and November 15, 2004, MSDE had five (5) full-time complaint investigators. From November 15, 2004 through the end of the reporting period for complaint investigations (August 29, 2005), MSDE had four (4) full-time complaint investigators. The fifth complaint investigator position has been abolished due to State budgetary constraints. Because the complaint investigation staff is highly skilled with extensive experience and a deep commitment to ensuring timelines are met, MSDE was able to achieve a marked improvement in completing IDEA complaint investigations within required timelines. Unfortunately, one of our most experienced investigators resigned effective September 26, 2005, bringing the number of full-time complaint investigators to three (3). MSDE staff has taken immediate steps under the State's hiring procedures to fill the vacant position.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

2010 (2010-2011)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines.
----------------------------	---

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Review and revise, as appropriate complaint resolution procedures to ensure consistency with IDEA 2004 and its implementing regulations.	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS staff OSEP Contact MSRRC Contact AG Office
Recruit and retain qualified personnel needed to ensure complaint investigations are conducted within proper timelines.	July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006	DSE/EIS staff HR Staff
Provide professional development to DSE/EIS staff to ensure staff members are properly trained and knowledgeable of the requirements of IDEA 2004 and State special education law.	Annually	DSE/EIS Staff MSRRC Contact AG Office

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maryland State Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) is responsible under State Law to conduct all special education due process hearings. OAH works closely with MSDE in developing policies and procedures in administration of the hearing procedures and in determining agenda for the training of the administrative law judges (ALJ) in various special education topics. MSDE collects, maintains, and reports all data required under the IDEA and other relevant data determined necessary to meet the State's general supervisory responsibility.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See Attachment 1. During the FFY 2004 reporting period (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005) of the 79 hearing requests that were fully adjudicated, 9 decisions were not issued within the required timelines. The measurement was $70 / 79 = 88.61\%$.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

It is noted that in FFY 03 the closing date for the data collection was August 14, 2004 which was 45 days after the close of the fiscal year and when we designated the end of the reporting period. For the SPP in Attachment 1, we are required to end the reporting period on June 30, 2005 and therefore we lose approximately 45 days of data from the report.

MSDE is able to report that during the 1st quarter of FFY 05 (July 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005), there were 81 requests for due process hearing. As of November 29, 2005, MSDE is in receipt of 9 due process hearing requests that resulted in fully adjudicated decisions being issued. Of the 9 due process hearing requests, 8 were issued within timelines or within timelines extended.

MSDE continues to closely monitor the timeliness of hearing decisions. Activities include analyzing and disseminating monthly timeline reports, and conducting meetings with the OAH staff on a quarterly basis, or more frequently if the need arises. Additionally, due to changes within IDEA 2004 due process complaint forms required revisions and in order to continue to strive toward 100% of hearings rendered within timelines, some revisions will still need to be made.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of all due process hearings are completed within the required timelines.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Meet regularly with OAH	Ongoing	DSE/EIS Staff AG Office Staff
Provide OAH with monthly timeliness reports for all hearing decisions rendered	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff
Evaluate each ALJ on the timeliness of their decisions.	Ongoing	OAH staff
Provide professional development to ALJs and OAH staff on legal updates and revisions to federal and state policies and procedures, as appropriate	Annually	ALJs, OAH staff DSE/EIS staff AG Office staff Consultant

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In preparation for the implementation of the new procedure for impartial due process hearings required under Section 615 regarding Resolution Sessions, MSDE provided training in June 2005 to public agencies, advocacy organizations, attorneys who represent parents, and administrators of non-public schools that serve students with disabilities. MSDE has also revised the Procedural Safeguards/Parental Rights document and the State’s Guidelines for Special Education Mediations and Due Process Hearings. Both of these documents are available on the MSDE website. MSDE is accomplishing the collection of Resolution Session data by requiring public agencies to complete a form, entitled “Notice of Outcome of Resolution Session”, and is currently monitoring this new process to ensure smooth implementation, and analyzing the data to ensure compliance with 20 U.S.C. §1415.

MSDE has also revised its database to include capturing the relevant information on Resolution Sessions, taking into consideration Section C of the Attachment 1 provided for this reporting period. MSDE is prepared to provide the data as indicated in Section C of the Attachment 1, and the data will be included in the next reporting period.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, a discussion of the baseline will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p><i>Since this is a new indicator, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in APR due February 1, 2007.</i></p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Under State law, OAH is designated to conduct all mediations filed under the IDEA and State special education requirements. All mediation sessions must be held in a manner that does not deny or delay a parent's right to a due process hearing. Although MSDE and OAH continue to strive to reach a mediation agreement for each mediation session conducted, the primary goal continues to be that mediation sessions are conducted in a timely manner so as to ensure no delay or denial of a due process hearing occurs, and that parents are aware of the opportunity to resolve disagreements through mediation and may seek mediation at any time. We continue to work toward increasing resolutions through mediation and dispute resolution sessions which should decrease those disputes that must be resolved at due process hearings. MSDE will continue to work closely with public agencies and parent groups to encourage the use of mediation and the advantage of resolving disputes as early as possible.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See Attachment 1

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.

(120 + 118) divided by 299 x 100 = 80%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The closing date for data collection was changed from 8/14/2005 to 6/30/2005. Therefore, any mediation that was conducted and settled between 6/30/2005 and 8/14/2005 is not captured in this report. Our data is collected and maintained through the data system that was developed during the 2003–2004 school year (FFY 2003). Based on national data on mediation provided by CADRE (MD APR 2002-2003) Maryland had the 5th highest number of mediations held; and the 4th highest number of mediated agreements in the nation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2006 (2006-2007)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2007 (2007-2008)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2008 (2008-2009)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2009 (2009-2010)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.
2010 (2010-2011)	Maintain 75% - 85% rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Meetings with Office of Administrative Hearing (OAH) staff	Quarterly	DSE/EIS staff
Encourage public agency's attendance at conferences which encourage and discuss the use of mediation and other less formal means of dispute resolution.	Prior to conferences such as CADRE's Bi-annual conference.	DSE/EIS staff
Review and analyze mediation data to ensure public agencies are offering mediation to resolve disputes.	Quarterly	DSE/EIS staff
Train mediators through attendance at conferences and workshops.	Bi-Annually in accordance with Court Rules	DSE/EIS staff Consultants

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See the narrative prior to Indicator #1.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

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

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

Measurement:

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

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

These collaborations include the following:

- MSDE continues to develop the Part B Report Writer System. The Report Writer will permit end users to compare and contrast data from other offices within MSDE using a unique student identifier. The system is designed to support public agencies in performing online data analysis.
- Public agencies complete cross reference documentation between special education data collection and other required state data submissions, including attendance, enrollment, suspension & discipline, and post-graduation data. Refer to Indicator 4.
- Maryland measures academic progress from state assessments. Public agencies have the capacity to disaggregate MSA, HSA and Alt-MSA data for students with disabilities at the level of student data. The capability of online data analysis allows a user to view special education data side by side with general education data on the public MSDE State Report Card on the MSDE website. Each agency's data are linked at the State, school system, and school level. The Mdk12 website is available to assist schools and other interested parties to analyze state assessment data and guide them in making data-based instructional decisions that support improved performance for all students. Refer to Indicator 3.

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

- Maryland School Assessment (MSA) data relative to content areas, grade, and type of assessment in relationship to least restrictive environment (LRE) data on students with disabilities. At present MSDE is testing the ability to match the DSE/EIS Special Services Information System (SSIS) data collection on students with disabilities which generates LRE data with the MSA data collection system. The links are presently based on several logarithms and direct matches and student identifiers. Please refer to Indicators 3 and 5 for more information.
- Comparison of Section 618 data on students with disabilities exiting special education to general education data collections as compared to the number of students with disabilities exiting as high school graduates and dropouts. At present these relational links are being instituted in many local school systems (LSS), however, MSDE is not presently able to complete this transaction electronically but manual comparisons are occurring. This process will be used as check the validity of data reported in Indicator 2.
- Linkage of data from the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) data collection on children, birth to three years old, to SSIS for students with disabilities, ages three through 21 years old. MSDE has added the necessary fields to the SSIS which will be used to track the transition of children served under Part C into services for children under Part B at age 3. Please refer to Indicator 12 for further information.
- Report of student participation and performance in Statewide assessments under NCLB. Please refer to Indicator 3.

Most LSS and PA special education data collection elements are collected as a part of the daily information management for all students. However, Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), Adult Correction Education (ACE), and Maryland State Department of Education Juvenile Correctional Education Program (MSDE/JCEP) provide reports on data entry forms and have no electronic web-based management of special education records.

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

The SSIS presently functions as the centralized data submission system for Section 618 data. LSS and PA utilize electronic file transfers twice a year to an MSDE secure server for web-based data submission of the annual child count, census data, and exit data. Personnel data are collected annually in excel spreadsheets.

The accuracy of the data is dependent upon the accuracy of the school level data. Questions and discrepancies in the data are always verified by MSDE staff with the LSS/PA. The LSS/PA SSIS Database Manager corrects errors and resubmits the entire data file to MSDE to ensure that corrections are made in both the database and the error file.

Data on students with disabilities is submitted electronically from public agencies. Each LSS and PA is responsible for submitting data for each student using an electronic file transfer over a secure server website. Each of the data elements contained on the SSIS records are required and must be

accurately maintained. The database consists of two types of records: the SSIS Student Record that contains student demographic information; and the SSIS Service Record that contains information about the services provided to the student. Twice a year public agencies are required to submit an electronic file of SSIS data. These data submissions are for the last Friday of October Census Data, including the annual child count, and the June 30 Exit data. Local directors of special education are responsible for supervising the accurate and timely entry of data. The data manager within each LSS and PA is responsible for accurate and timely data submissions of records through an electronic file transfer into the MSDE secure server.

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

- The SSIS secure server is available 24 hours a day for file submissions. The secure server is backed up nightly and replicated off-site. Files posted are reviewed and edited in a timely manner.
- Files are loaded into the database which resides on a secure network and is backed up nightly using Storage Area Network (SAN) Disk.
- Part B Data Managers and other MSDE staff are available to provide support when needed.
- The SSIS Manual Appendix provides detailed information for public agencies to build mechanisms within their systems for data accuracy.
- MSDE runs edit reports of the files for the public agencies to correct and resubmit their files to MSDE.
 - Upon receipt of the SSIS data, each SSIS record is edited to be certain that the record is complete and valid codes have been used.
 - MSDE generates a report of the total count of active or exited students (October and June collections respectively) for each PA.
 - Each PA data manager receives a copy of the report for review and verification.

In the event that discrepancies are found, the PA makes corrections and resubmits the entire file. MSDE will produce an updated summary report and return this to the PA for review and signature. During the annual child count collection, MSDE produces two additional reports for the Superintendent's signature. One report lists students who's Individual Education Programs (IEPs) were developed more than 13 months prior to the last Friday of October. The second report lists the number of students who have not had a re-evaluation for more than three years.

To ensure validity, the MSDE SSIS manual provides data standardization for definitions and provides system edits similar to those suggested system edits provided by WESTAT. Validity of the data and consistency with OSEP data instructions is ensured throughout the data collection process by a number of practices and safeguards.

- MSDE produces the Census Publication and Related Tables from the data system which contains multiple tables and is posted on the MSDE web site. Additional internal reports produced are the 5% Analysis Report which highlights any LSS or PA with 5% or more population increases.
- MSDE uses the WESTAT Verification Reports to flag large changes in the data. Data is disaggregated to determine which PA are involved. When disaggregated data is suspect MSDE contacts the local director of special education. Directors of special education and MSDE staff work together to validate the data. The LSS or PA provides MSDE the reasons for large changes in data and that information is analyzed at MSDE and provided to WESTAT.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

- MSDE conducted a routine audit that compared Special Services Information System (SSIS) to Exit Data from each LSS/PA. The students were matched by using the student's social security number (SSN) as the link between two data collections. The MSDE required LSS/PA explain/revise data following an analysis of the students who were described as exited in the SSIS Exit Count, yet also reported as receiving services in the next SSIS Child Count Data. LSS/PA are required to provide to MSDE a summary analysis of findings for each category. All student records referenced in the detailed report provided to the LSS/PA may be included in a random audit of these records.
- MSDE periodically reviews records to support 618 data collections. MSDE annually monitors student records for IEPs that were more than 13 months prior to the last Friday of October and for students who have not had a re-evaluation for more than three years. Sampling is not used for the child count. However sampling may be used for monitoring purposes. PA data systems are student level systems and sampling may be required for audits and record reviews.
- MSDE Division of Budget and Management routinely audits LSS to determine whether: (1) students included on the State Aid for Special Education report are eligible; (2) applicable laws and regulations are complied with governing State Financial Assistance under Special Education Grant; and (3) accurate data is reported in claiming State funds.

Name of Report	Date Due	Date Submitted	Follow-up Questions from Westat or OSEP	Response to Follow-up	Flags
Table 5 Discipline	11/1/04	10/29/04	Data Error	Resubmitted 11/8/04	No
Table 4 Exit	11/1/04	10/29/04			
Table 2 Personnel	11/1/04	10/29/04			Yes***
Table 1 Child Count	2/1/05	1/31/05			Yes*
Table 3 LRE	2/1/05	1/31/05	LRE Data Error	Resubmitted 2/11/05	Yes**
FFY 03 (7/1/03-6/30/04 APR)	3/31/05	3/31/05	Requested additional information 9/22/05	Required response on 12/2/05	

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Data Error = Error in the spreadsheet sent to Westat. Data won't be loaded into their database.

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

* OSEP notified 4/14/05 FFY 04 child count and exit data being revised as a result of MSDE review of LSS/PA student records.

** Data corrected, no additional response

*** Continued verification of FFY 2003 and FFY 2004 personnel data

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

Each LSS and PA reported all required special education data for FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005). The submission dates were within the OSEP timeline requirements. MSDE will continue to provide technical assistance to LSS/PA to facilitate timely accurate data submission. The validity and reliability of student level data are high. MSDE uses validation rules to ensure that SSIS child count data records are error free. Validations include: Element level (e.g., dates within ranges), cross element level (e.g., grade X age relationship be consistent with acceptable age range for each grade), and agency level (e.g., duplications between or among agencies, types of internal validation routines).

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

In the 2004-2005 school year the pilot of a web-based standardized Individualized Education Program (IEP) was initiated and data collection submissions were tested during the October 28, 2005 child count data submission. The validation comparisons of the LSS web-based standardized IEP system parallel running of the SSIS will be completed during the 2005-2006 school year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

MARYLAND
State

<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>100% of State reported 618 data and annual performance reports, are accurate and submitted on or before due dates.</p>
------------------------------------	---

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Time	Resources
<p>Conduct professional development activities with LSS and PA data managers and LSS and PA directors of special education</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data managers</p>
<p>Integrate the SSIS Data Warehouse into MSDE existing it infrastructure.</p>	<p>July 1, 2005- June 30, 2006</p>	<p>JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff</p>
<p>Conduct MSDE internal parallel test of Enhanced SSIS System using LSS Child Count data</p>	<p>December 2005</p>	<p>JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff</p>
<p>Conduct pilot testing of Enhanced SSIS System using LSS data</p>	<p>January - February 2006</p>	<p>JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff</p>
<p>Conduct professional development for LSS/PA staff on Enhanced SSIS System and predefined reports created with the SSIS warehouse System</p>	<p>March – April 2006</p>	<p>JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff</p>
<p>Develop MSDE production usage of enhanced SSIS System for administrative section of online</p>	<p>October 2006</p>	<p>JHU-CTE DSE/EIS staff Consultants</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

SSIS system		DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers SSIS Advisory Committee MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Validate LSS/PA data submissions	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff
Participate in QAM monitoring of LSS/PA data collection and reporting, as appropriate	Annually	DSE/EIS staff LSS/PA data mangers
Technical assistance to LSS/PA on data submissions prior to submissions to OSEP/Westat	Ongoing	DSE/EIS staff Consultants DAA staff LSS/PA data mangers MSDE web-based servers MSDE IT staff

**Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings**

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	162
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	141
(a) Reports with findings	101
(b) Reports within timeline	130
(c) Reports within extended timelines	8
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	19
(1.3) Complaints pending	2
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	470
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	151
(i) Mediation agreements	120
(b) Mediations not related to due process	148
(i) Mediation agreements	118
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	171

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	429
(3.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	79
(a) Decisions within timeline	44
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	26
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	325

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	1
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	1
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

Multiple Suspensions - Summing to Greater Than Ten Days*
Maryland Public Schools
2004-05

	Number and Percentage of All Students Suspended			Number and Percentage of Students with Disabilities Suspended			Number and Percentage of Non-disabled Students Suspended			Evaluation						
	Total 9/30/2004 Enrollment	Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Percent	10/29/2004 SSIS Count*	Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Percent	Total	Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Percent	2003 Ratio	2004 Ratio	Current Ratio	1 Year Change	Ratio >= 2:1 [†]	Group >= 20 [†]	Significant Discrepancy
Total State	865,561	6,672	0.77%	111,565	1,461	1.31%	753,996	5,211	0.69%	1.79	1.80	1.89	0.10	No	Yes	
Allegany	9,840	96	0.98%	1,550	36	2.32%	8,290	60	0.72%	0.83	1.97	3.21	1.24	Yes	Yes	Yes
Anne Arundel	73,991	543	0.73%	10,028	58	0.58%	63,963	485	0.76%	0.96	1.26	0.76	-0.50	No	Yes	
Baltimore City	88,401	855	0.97%	14,904	298	2.00%	73,497	557	0.76%	1.13	1.51	2.64	1.13	Yes	Yes	Yes
Edison Schools	2,276	2	0.09%	160	0	0.00%	2,116	2	0.09%	0.00	9.70	0.00	-9.70	No	No	
Baltimore	107,701	655	0.61%	14,036	130	0.93%	93,665	525	0.56%	2.13	1.20	1.65	0.45	No	Yes	
Calvert	17,451	117	0.67%	2,337	27	1.16%	15,114	90	0.60%	2.36	2.94	1.94	-1.00	No	Yes	
Caroline	5,412	59	1.09%	705	1	0.14%	4,707	58	1.23%	1.67	2.47	0.00	-2.47	No	No	
Carroll	28,792	57	0.20%	3,695	15	0.41%	25,097	42	0.17%	2.45	3.29	2.43	-0.86	Yes	No	
Cecil	16,535	92	0.56%	2,510	4	0.16%	14,025	88	0.63%	0.45	0.25	0.25	0.00	No	No	
Charles	26,026	282	1.08%	2,426	37	1.53%	23,600	245	1.04%	1.64	1.50	1.47	-0.03	No	Yes	
Dorchester	4,788	137	2.86%	541	37	6.84%	4,247	100	2.35%	2.49	2.92	2.90	-0.01	Yes	Yes	Yes
Frederick	39,489	253	0.64%	4,895	62	1.27%	34,594	191	0.55%	2.62	1.91	2.29	0.38	Yes	Yes	Yes
Garrett	4,737	6	0.13%	690	2	0.29%	4,047	4	0.10%	2.28	3.05	0.00	-3.05	No	No	
Harford	40,294	550	1.36%	6,070	159	2.62%	34,224	391	1.14%	2.72	2.41	2.29	-0.12	Yes	Yes	Yes
Howard	48,219	119	0.25%	4,994	14	0.28%	43,225	105	0.24%	1.10	1.35	1.15	-0.20	No	No	
Kent	2,514	63	2.51%	359	21	5.85%	2,155	42	1.95%	2.13	1.41	3.00	1.59	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montgomery	139,393	472	0.34%	17,684	146	0.83%	121,709	326	0.27%	3.63	3.44	3.08	-0.35	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prince Georges	136,095	1,520	1.12%	14,828	289	1.95%	121,267	1,231	1.02%	1.88	2.07	1.92	-0.15	No	Yes	
Queen Annes	7,713	59	0.76%	1,018	18	1.77%	6,695	41	0.61%	2.81	1.58	2.89	1.31	Yes	No	
St. Mary's	16,567	232	1.40%	2,246	13	0.58%	14,321	219	1.53%	0.77	1.17	0.38	-0.79	No	No	
Somerset	2,952	79	2.68%	368	11	2.99%	2,584	68	2.63%	0.79	1.22	1.14	-0.08	No	No	
Talbot	4,505	18	0.40%	471	3	0.64%	4,034	15	0.37%	3.00	4.51	1.71	-2.80	No	No	
Washington	20,807	37	0.18%	2,664	3	0.11%	18,143	34	0.19%	1.67	0.47	0.60	0.13	No	No	
Wicomico	14,387	314	2.18%	1,666	64	3.84%	12,721	250	1.97%	2.41	2.10	1.95	-0.15	No	Yes	
Worcester	6,676	55	0.82%	720	13	1.81%	5,956	42	0.71%	3.40	2.68	0.00	-2.68	No	No	

*Sources: Maryland Public School Enrollment, September 30, 2004; Maryland Special Education Census Data, October 29, 2004, Table 1.

NOTE: Students who were disabled at the time of one suspension but not at the time of another suspension may be included in the all student column but may not be included in the disabled and/or non-disabled columns.

[†]MSDE Special Education defined criterion.

Extended Suspensions - Greater Than Ten Days*
Maryland Public Schools
2004-05

Jurisdiction	Number and Percentage of All Students Suspended			Number and Percentage of Students with Disabilities Suspended			Number and Percentage of Non-disabled Students Suspended			Evaluation						
	Total 9/30/2004 Enrollment	Suspended More Than 10 Days	Percent	10/29/2004 SSIS Count*	Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Percent	Total Suspended for 10 Days	Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Percent	2003 Ratio	2004 Ratio	Current Ratio	1 Year Ratio Change	Ratio >= 2:1 ¹	Group >= 20 ¹	Significant Discrepancy
Total State	865,561	4,994	0.54%	111,565	832	0.75%	753,996	3,862	0.51%	2.21	2.29	1.46	-0.84	No	Yes	
Allegany	9,840	14	0.14%	1,550	4	0.26%	8,290	10	0.12%	0.00	1.31	2.14	0.83	Yes	No	
Anne Arundel	73,991	267	0.36%	10,028	51	0.51%	63,963	216	0.34%	2.60	2.67	1.51	-1.17	No	Yes	
Baltimore City	88,401	1,525	1.73%	14,904	248	1.66%	73,497	1,277	1.74%	2.58	2.52	0.96	-1.56	No	Yes	
Edison Schools	2,276	7	0.31%	160	2	1.25%	2,116	5	0.24%	0.00	0.00	5.29	5.29	Yes	No	
Baltimore	107,701	685	0.64%	14,036	102	0.73%	93,665	583	0.62%	1.16	0.76	1.17	0.41	No	Yes	
Calvert	17,451	14	0.08%	2,337	1	0.04%	15,114	13	0.09%	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	No	No	
Caroline	5,412	0	0.00%	705	0	0.00%	4,707	0	0.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	No	
Carroll	28,792	62	0.22%	3,695	11	0.30%	25,097	51	0.20%	0.00	2.40	1.46	-0.94	No	No	
Cecil	16,535	70	0.42%	2,510	10	0.40%	14,025	60	0.43%	0.81	0.75	0.93	0.18	No	No	
Charles	26,026	86	0.33%	2,426	14	0.58%	23,600	72	0.31%	2.07	1.62	1.89	0.27	No	No	
Dorchester	4,788	23	0.48%	541	0	0.00%	4,247	23	0.54%	0.72	1.94	0.00	-1.94	No	No	
Fredrick	39,489	4	0.01%	4,895	3	0.06%	34,594	1	0.00%	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	No	
Garrett	4,737	0	0.00%	690	0	0.00%	4,047	0	0.00%	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	No	
Harford	40,294	318	0.79%	6,070	80	1.32%	34,224	238	0.70%	2.15	2.56	1.90	-0.66	No	Yes	
Howard	48,219	126	0.26%	4,994	25	0.50%	43,225	101	0.23%	1.32	2.22	2.14	-0.07	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kent	2,514	8	0.32%	359	1	0.28%	2,155	7	0.32%	0.00	0.00	0.86	0.86	No	No	
Montgomery	139,393	277	0.20%	17,684	68	0.38%	121,709	209	0.17%	2.06	2.34	2.24	-0.10	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prince George's	136,095	1,147	0.84%	14,826	205	1.38%	121,267	942	0.78%	1.66	2.00	1.78	-0.22	No	Yes	
Queen Anne's	7,713	1	0.01%	1,018	0	0.00%	6,695	1	0.01%	0.00	1.58	0.00	-1.58	No	No	
St. Mary's	16,567	1	0.01%	2,246	0	0.00%	14,321	1	0.01%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	No	
Somerset	2,952	1	0.03%	368	0	0.00%	2,584	1	0.04%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	No	
Talbot	4,505	43	0.95%	471	5	1.06%	4,034	38	0.94%	2.88	3.04	1.13	-1.92	No	No	
Washington	20,807	13	0.06%	2,664	2	0.08%	18,143	11	0.06%	4.14	0.00	1.24	1.24	No	No	
Wicomico	14,387	2	0.01%	1,666	0	0.00%	12,721	2	0.02%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	No	
Worcester	6,676	0	0.00%	720	0	0.00%	5,956	0	0.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	No	

* Sources: Maryland Public School Enrollment, September 30, 2003; Maryland Special Education Census Data, October 29, 2004, Table 1.

Disabled and non-disabled counts may not equal total students because students could have been counted in both categories, depending upon their special education status when suspended.

¹MSDE Special Education defined criterion.

**Extended Suspensions and Multiple Suspensions Summing to Greater Than Ten Days
Combined Analysis from Maryland Public Schools
2004-05**

	Number and Percentage of All Students Suspended			Number and Percentage of Students with Disabilities Suspended			Number and Percentage of Non-disabled Students Suspended			Evaluation					
	Total Suspended for 9/30/2004 Enrollment	More Than 10 Days	Percent	10/29/2004 SSIS Count*	Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Percent	Total Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Suspended for More Than 10 Days	Percent	2004 Ratio	Current Ratio	1 Year Ratio Change	Ratio >= 2:1	Group >= 20	Significant Discrepancy
Total State	865,561	10,768	1.24%	111,565	2,209	1.98%	753,966	8,559	1.14%	1.92	1.74	-0.17	No	Yes	
Allegheny	9,840	110	1.12%	1,550	40	2.58%	8,290	70	0.84%	1.95	3.06	1.10	Yes	Yes	Yes
Anne Arundel	73,991	754	1.02%	10,028	107	1.07%	63,963	647	1.01%	1.76	1.05	-0.71	No	Yes	
Baltimore City	88,401	2,233	2.55%	14,904	519	3.48%	73,497	1,734	2.36%	1.91	1.48	-0.44	No	Yes	
Edison Schools	2,276	9	0.40%	160	2	1.25%	2,116	7	0.33%	8.82	3.78	-5.04	Yes	No	
Baltimore	107,701	1,297	1.20%	14,036	229	1.63%	93,665	1,068	1.14%	1.02	1.43	0.41	No	Yes	
Calvert	17,451	128	0.73%	2,337	28	1.20%	15,114	100	0.66%	2.76	1.81	-0.95	No	Yes	
Caroline	5,412	59	1.09%	705	1	0.14%	4,707	58	1.23%	2.67	0.12	-2.56	No	No	
Carroll	28,792	108	0.38%	3,695	26	0.70%	25,097	82	0.33%	2.90	2.15	-0.75	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cecil	16,535	150	0.91%	2,510	13	0.52%	14,025	137	0.98%	0.39	0.53	0.14	No	No	
Charles	26,026	350	1.34%	2,426	50	2.06%	23,600	300	1.27%	1.58	1.62	0.04	No	Yes	
Dorchester	4,738	151	3.15%	541	37	6.84%	4,247	114	2.68%	2.79	2.55	-0.24	Yes	Yes	Yes
Frederick	39,489	256	0.65%	4,895	64	1.31%	34,594	192	0.56%	1.89	2.36	0.47	Yes	Yes	Yes
Garrett	4,737	6	0.13%	690	2	0.29%	4,047	4	0.10%	2.35	2.93	0.59	Yes	No	
Harford	40,294	763	1.89%	6,070	223	3.67%	34,224	540	1.58%	2.36	2.33	-0.04	Yes	Yes	Yes
Howard	48,219	233	0.48%	4,994	37	0.74%	43,225	196	0.45%	1.85	1.63	-0.22	No	Yes	
Kent	2,514	66	2.63%	359	23	6.41%	2,155	43	2.00%	1.33	3.21	1.88	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montgomery	139,393	722	0.52%	17,684	212	1.20%	121,709	510	0.42%	3.06	2.86	-0.20	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prince George's	136,095	2,502	1.84%	14,828	463	3.12%	121,267	2,039	1.68%	1.90	1.86	-0.05	No	Yes	
Queen Anne's	7,713	60	0.78%	1,018	18	1.77%	6,695	42	0.63%	1.43	2.82	1.38	Yes	No	
St. Mary's	16,567	232	1.40%	2,246	13	0.58%	14,321	219	1.53%	1.13	0.38	-0.75	No	No	
Somerset	2,952	80	2.71%	368	11	2.99%	2,584	69	2.67%	1.11	1.12	0.01	No	No	
Talbot	4,505	58	1.29%	471	7	1.49%	4,034	51	1.26%	3.43	1.18	-2.25	No	No	
Washington	20,807	50	0.24%	2,664	7	0.26%	18,143	43	0.24%	0.49	1.11	0.62	No	No	
Wicomico	14,387	316	2.20%	1,666	64	3.84%	12,721	252	1.98%	2.15	1.94	-0.21	No	Yes	
Worcester	6,676	55	0.82%	720	13	1.81%	5,956	42	0.71%	2.82	2.56	-0.26	Yes	No	

*Sources: Maryland Public School Enrollment, September 30, 2004; Maryland Special Education Census Data, October 29, 2004, Table 1.

NOTE: Students who were disabled at the time of one suspension but not at the time of another suspension may be included in the all student column but may not be included in the disabled and/or non-disabled columns.

¹MSDE Special Education defined criterion.