MARYLAND STATE IMPROVEMENT GRANT
PERFORMANCE REPORT
SY 2001-2002

STATE AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS REPORT

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Achievement Matters Most

DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION/EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES
MAY 2003

Thirteen years ago Maryland embarked on a statewide systemic school reform effort to raise the achievement of all students, including students with disabilities. With the passage of the Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act in April of 2002, the Maryland General Assembly supported Maryland's school reform movement by providing a comprehensive framework of funding that focuses on the acceleration of achievement for all students, and aims to bridge the gap among all students.

During the last four years, the Maryland State Improvement Grant (MSIG) has supported the integration of students with disabilities into educational reform. The MSIG is a five-year grant that was competitively awarded to the Maryland State Department of Education by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. This grant contains performance goals and indicators that are aligned with Maryland's educational reform, which are designed to ensure, through participation in accountability measures, that all students have innovative and challenging educational programs. Upon completion of the grant's implementation strategies, Maryland will be able to demonstrate the strides made in the achievement of students with disabilities within the state educational reform movement.

This annual report documents the progress schools and students with disabilities are making toward meeting Maryland's rigorous standards. Included in the report are areas aligned to our performance goals and indicators, as well as the identification of specific areas needing improvement. Additionally, school systems that have demonstrated program improvement by meeting or maintaining the MSIG indicators have been identified. In accordance with grant requirements, several areas are identified for continued monitoring.

Students with disabilities participate in all statewide and local assessments. This year our newly developed statewide assessments were administered to ensure compliance with the accountability requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. These requirements have impacted our data collection and analysis, particularly in terms of baseline and information trends.

Our teachers, therapists, paraprofessionals, and administrators are to be commended for their continued efforts to reach state standards. Improvements are the result of the collaborative efforts of local early intervention systems, school team initiatives, and the support from administrators, teachers, children and youth, service providers, parents, businesses and the community.

Thank you for reviewing this report and demonstrating your interest in special education and early intervention in Maryland.

Carol Ann Baglin
May 2003

MARYLAND SPECIAL EDUCATION / EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES
ANNUAL STATE IMPROVEMENT PERFORMANCE REPORT

This report presents information and the standards of performance that provide the basis for school improvement for the Maryland State Improvement Grant (MSIG). Included are baseline results and comparisons to previous years. These include:

DEFINITIONS

Attendance Rate: The percentage of students present in school for at least half the average school day during the school year.

Dropout Rate: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who withdrew from school before graduation or before completing a Maryland approved educational program during the July-to-June academic year.

Exempt: Students who are not pursuing a Maryland High School Diploma are not required to pass the Maryland Functional Tests. The only students who can be exempted from MSPAP are those who are not pursuing the Maryland Learning Outcomes. Exemptions must be based on the student's IEP (See MSDE Accommodations document for complete explanation). Students exempted from MSPAP must participate in IMAP (alternate assessment).

General Education Classroom: Includes students with disabilities enrolled in a comprehensive school who receive special education and related services outside the general education classroom for less than 21% (12/1 Child Count) of the school day. **Preschool:** Any combination of regular early childhood settings with no pullout, e.g., EEEP, Headstart, or other early childhood settings.

Non-General Education Classroom: Includes students who receive greater than 50% (12/1 Child Count) of instruction at home, hospital setting, public separate day school, private separate day school, public or private residential facility.

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP): Annual tests that require students in grades 3, 5, and 8 to apply what they know about reading, writing, language usage, mathematics, science and social studies. Unlike the Functional Tests, which measure basic knowledge, the MSPAP tests set high expectations and demand high levels of performance.

Standards:

Maryland Functional Tests	Grade Tested	Satisfactory	Excellent
Reading	Grade 9	95%	97%
	Grade 11	97%	99%
Mathematics	Grade 9	80%	90%
	Grade 11	97%	99%
Writing	Grade 9	90%	96%
	Grade 11	97%	99%
Citizenship	Grade 11	97%	99%
Passed All Tests	Grade 11	90%	96%
MSPAP Grades 3, 5, and 8			
All tests*		70%*	25%
Attendance (Yearly)		94%	96%
Drop-out (Grades 9-12)		3.00%	1.25%

- A school meets the excellent standard on the MSPAP only when **70% or more** of its students achieve at the satisfactory level or above and 25% or more of its students achieve at the excellent level.

Verification of Data:

School system data contained in this report was submitted to the Maryland State Department of Education by local school systems. Local superintendents agreed with data reconciliation reached by local school system and State Department of Education personnel. Data was gathered from the Special Education Census Data report, Analysis of Professional Salaries report, Maryland School Performance Report and US Office of Education Report to Congress.

Data Sources:

Children Entering School Ready to Learn – School Readiness Information, published by The Maryland State Department of Education

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent satisfactory: from School System Student Performance Data 2001-2002, 2002 Performance Report website (http://msp.msde.state.md.us/)

Maryland Functional Tests (MFT) – Percent passing: from School System Student Performance Data 2000-2001, 2002 Performance Report website (http://msp.msde.state.md.us/)

Percent Regular (out <21%), Percent Resource (out 21-60%), Percent Separate (out >60%): from data in Table 12, Maryland Special Education Census Data, December 1, 2002), published by The Maryland State Department of Education

Attendance and Drop Out: from School System Student Participation Data 2001-2002, 2002 Performance Report website (http://msp.msde.state.md.us/)

Per Pupil Cost: from School System Demographics and Other Supporting Facts 2001-2002, Wealth, Expenditures, Staffing, Length of Year, 2002 Performance Report website (http://msp.msde.state.md.us/)

Professional Instructional Staff (average salaries): from data on Page 8, Table 1, Analysis of Professional Salaries, Maryland Public Schools, October 2002, published by The Maryland State Department of Education

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: calculated from data on Page 18, Table 12, Maryland Special Education Census Data, December 1, 2002, published by The Maryland State Department of Education

MSIG Goal: <u>By the year 2005, students with disabilities will perform at the satisfactory level on statewide assessments.</u>

MSIG Goal 1

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

<u>Objective 1-1</u>

To analyze and report data on the results of students with disabilities on statewide and district performance tests; on their participation in general education; and on their high school completion with diplomas and certificates.

<u>Indicators 1-1</u>

1.1.1   The percent of kindergarten-age children with disabilities participating in the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment Program will increase annually.

1.1.2   The results of the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment performance indicators will be used for measuring and improving school readiness of students entering kindergarten with an IEP.

1.1.3   The percent of students with disabilities passing the Maryland Functional Tests will increase by 1.5% annually.

1.1.4   The percent of students with disabilities scoring at satisfactory on the MSPAP will increase by 3.0% annually.

1.1.5   Average scores of students with disabilities on norm-referenced tests will increase by 0.5% annually over the base.

1.1.6   The percentage of time that students with disabilities participate in general education classrooms will increase by 2% annually.

1.1.7   The percentage of students with disabilities who receive high school diplomas will increase by 2%.

<u>Objective 1-2</u>

To organize, analyze, and report data on post-high school employment and participation in post-secondary education among students with disabilities.

<u>Indicators 1-2</u>

1.2.1   Post-high school employment of students with disabilities will increase by 2% annually.

1.2.2   Participation of students with disabilities in post-secondary education will increase annually.

Objective 1-3

To organize, analyze, and report data on the performance of eligible students on alternative assessments.

Indicators 1-3

1.3.1   The percent satisfactory on IMAP will increase by 3% annually.

1.3.2   By 2001, no student in Maryland will be exempted or excluded from statewide performance assessment.

Objective 1-4

Within local school systems, the significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities as compared to the general student population will decrease.

Indicators 1-4

1.4.1   Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving long-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.

1.4.2   Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving short-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.

1.4.3   Functional behavioral assessments (as defined) will decrease by 10% annually.

1.4.4   Placements of students in non-general education classrooms will decrease by 10% annually.

Objective 1-5

To organize, analyze, and report data on attendance and dropout rates of students with disabilities.

Indicators 1-5

1.5.1   Average attendance rates of students with disabilities will improve by .2% annually.

1.5.2   Dropout rates of students with disabilities will decrease by 0.5% annually.

Objective 1-6

Within local school systems, the percentage of African American students with disabilities and African American students in the total student population will be proportionate.

Indicators 1-6

1.6.1   Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as students with a disability will decrease annually.

1.6.2   Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as mentally retarded (MR), emotionally disturbed (ED), learning disabled (LD), and "other disabilities" (as an aggregated category) will decrease.

Objective 1-7

To use data on performance results and other outcomes of students with disabilities to establish and monitor long-term State, regional, and local priorities for professional development; pre-service development, recruitment and retention; and technical assistance leading to instructional development.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

<u>Objective 1-1</u>
To analyze and report data on the results of students with disabilities on statewide and district performance tests; on their participation in general education; and on their high school completion with diplomas and certificates.

Baseline Results for Goal Indicators 1.1.1 and 1.1.2

1.1.1 The percent of kindergarten-age children with disabilities participating in the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment Program will increase annually.

1.1.2 The results of the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment performance indicators will be used for measuring and improving school readiness of students entering kindergarten with an IEP.

School Readiness Baseline Information (State)
Percent of Students at the School Readiness Levels (1.1.2)

	Full Readiness		Approaching Readiness		Developing Readiness	
	SY 01-02	SY 02-03	SY 01-02	SY 02-03	SY 01-02	SY 02-03
Special Education Students	30%	30%	50%	49%	20%	21%
Regular Education Students	48%	53%	44%	40%	7%	7%

Kindergarten Work Sampling System Participation (1.1.1)

Local School System	Special Education students for whom assessment ratings were completed		Special Education Kindergarten Enrollment	
	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Dec. 1, 2001	Dec. 1, 2002
Allegany	102	80	100	85
Anne Arundel	210	305	329	406
Baltimore City	355	365	573	557
Edison Schools	*	6	7	15
Baltimore County	451	524	724	778
Calvert	74	92	96	103
Caroline	28	38	47	48
Carroll	101	144	197	227
Cecil	76	112	135	157
Charles	79	89	92	118
Dorchester	0	24	22	28
Frederick	144	30	176	193
Garrett	16	10	34	23
Harford	36	177	268	273
Howard	188	101	252	267
Kent	134	9	7	13
Montgomery	216	289	699	763
Prince George's	351	353	531	548
Queen Anne's	35	44	42	48
Saint Mary's	76	102	111	171
Somerset	10	*	10	10
Talbot	17	22	21	28
Washington	101	119	118	118
Wicomico	20	43	53	78
Worcester	*	21	35	60
STATE	2,825	3,103	4,679	5,115

* Fewer than 5 students

Trend Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.3

1.1.3 The percent of students with disabilities passing the Maryland Functional Tests will increase by 1.5% annually. (For example, if 80% of students with disabilities passed during the 1997-98 baseline year then 1.5% more would have to pass the next year, for a total of 81.5%, to meet the MSIG annual goal.)

Computation Methodology

Identify the percent of students with disabilities who pass the Maryland Functional Tests at the 9th and 11th grade level. Compare current results with the previous year and determine if there was a 1.5 percentage point gain (e.g. If Cecil Co. had an 87% pass rate in the previous year, they would need 88.5% the next year). State Satisfactory and Excellent percentages are:

Maryland Functional Tests	Grade	Satisfactory	Excellent
Reading	Grade 9	95%	97%
	Grade 11	97%	99%
Mathematics	Grade 9	80%	90%
	Grade 11	97%	99%
Writing	Grade 9	90%	96%
	Grade 11	97%	99%

Shading identifies systems meeting the Maryland State Improvement Grant (MSIG) targeted increase of 1.5 percentage points.

MARYLAND FUNCTIONAL TESTS GRADE 9
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES PERCENT PASSING (1.1.3)

	Reading (Satisfactory-95%)			Math (Satisfactory-80%)			Writing (Satisfactory-90%)		
SCHOOL YEAR	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	98.6	98.7	98.8	87.0	84.5	84.4	94.5	93.8	92.4
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	86.7	86.5	87.1	71.7	67.5	66.8	74.3	68.7	65.5
Local School System									
Allegany	93.9	88.9	94.4	·88.0	·80.9	79.4	74.5	68.5	65.4
Anne Arundel	88.7	89.5	90.0	78.5	75.6	·84.4	85.6	73.5	66.7
Baltimore City	61.3	62.7	65.8	31.0	30.3	29.5	33.3	31.2	32.4
Baltimore Co.	93.6	92.3	92.2	·91.4	·83.2	75.7	84.4	81.6	75.4
Calvert	·95.9	·96.5	·97.5	·95.2	·91.4	·91.4	·93.0	·96.4	·90.8
Caroline	85.4	78.3	94.9	·82.9	71.7	·82.1	75.0	68.9	78.9
Carroll	94.8	94.9	91.2	·87.8	·84.2	74.5	·95.5	·95.2	82.5
Cecil	·100.0	·100.0	·100.0	75.5	60.0	67.6	·91.9	88.1	75.6
Charles	89.0	88.8	87.2	·82.7	77.6	71.2	81.5	79.7	74.1
Dorchester	78.9	69.8	75.0	23.7	27.9	42.9	59.0	48.8	36.4
Frederick	94.6	90.7	92.8	·85.2	77.7	79.1	86.6	76.2	75.9
Garrett	91.8	·95.3	94.6	77.6	79.5	76.8	89.8	73.8	87.5
Harford	89.8	89.9	90.5	76.1	76.9	73.7	77.8	78.4	77.9
Howard	92.5	·96.6	·99.4	78.4	·84.1	·91.6	81.3	81.9	88.5
Kent	92.6	50.0	91.7	74.1	33.3	75.0	84.6	33.3	78.3
Montgomery	93.4	93.7	92.2	·80.6	·80.6	78.0	83.5	73.7	71.8
Prince George's	86.6	85.6	85.3	55.2	48.1	43.5	61.3	61.7	56.3
Queen Anne's	94.5	91.4	·95.6	72.6	75.4	·85.6	73.9	70.8	70.0
Saint Mary's	88.3	87.4	94.0	61.3	48.6	62.9	68.8	72.2	66.0
Somerset	76.5	84.6	62.5	61.8	69.2	68.8	78.8	73.1	62.5
Talbot	85.7	85.7	90.2	·85.7	69.0	73.2	72.7	65.9	45.0
Washington	92.7	·95.6	·97.5	·85.0	·87.7	·88.3	80.2	79.6	79.5
Wicomico	93.5	86.7	94.6	69.4	67.0	63.4	78.1	56.3	66.3
Worcester	93.5	90.9	88.9	·80.6	·96.4	·80.6	88.7	81.8	75.0

Met MSIG Indicator of a 1.5 percentage point gain over the previous year.   · Met General Education standard.

MARYLAND FUNCTIONAL TESTS GRADE 11
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES PERCENT PASSING (1.1.3)

	Reading (Satisfactory-97%)			Math (Satisfactory-97%)			Writing (Satisfactory-97%)		
SCHOOL YEAR	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	99.7	99.7	99.7	96.3	95.2	94.5	98.8	98.7	98.3
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	96.8	96.1	95.1	92.5	89.8	88.3	92.3	90.2	88.1
Local School System									
Allegany	·98.7	·98.9	·97.6	91.1	91.2	·97.6	87.2	94.4	91.6
Anne Arundel	96.7	96.3	95.7	94.5	94.8	96.3	94.7	93.0	93.2
Baltimore City	88.2	83.8	80.0	66.1	57.7	53.5	67.7	60.0	54.5
Baltimore Co.	·99.0	·99.2	·97.9	·98.3	·97.6	95.6	96.0	96.6	94.3
Calvert	·100.0	·98.5	·100.0	·98.4	·98.5	·100.0	·98.4	·100.0	·99.2
Caroline	·100.0	·100.0	92.0	·100.0	77.8	92.6	·100.0	·100.0	88.0
Carroll	96.9	·99.5	96.1	·97.3	·97.0	96.0	·98.4	·99.0	95.6
Cecil	·100.0	·100.0	·100.0	94.3	95.7	90.4	·100.0	·98.6	·100.0
Charles	96.8	·97.5	96.7	95.7	95.0	96.0	96.8	93.2	92.0
Dorchester	87.5	93.3	·100.0	93.8	90.0	85.0	93.8	86.7	·100.0
Frederick	95.4	·98.3	·97.1	94.0	96.6	93.4	90.7	91.1	92.9
Garrett	96.2	·97.3	96.0	92.3	·100.0	84.0	96.0	94.4	92.0
Harford	·98.8	·98.1	96.2	·98.0	·98.1	90.8	96.5	96.5	89.1
Howard	·98.1	·97.7	·97.8	93.8	·97.2	94.3	93.2	94.9	91.2
Kent	·100.0	85.7	93.8	·100.0	78.6	93.8	·100.0	85.7	87.5
Montgomery	·98.5	·99.1	·97.7	95.9	95.7	91.9	·97.0	96.3	93.5
Prince George's	·97.3	94.4	95.0	90.1	81.5	81.3	93.1	88.2	83.2
Queen Anne's	·98.2	93.5	·100.0	·98.2	91.3	·97.6	92.7	91.3	95.2
Saint Mary's	93.9	95.3	·97.8	90.9	88.7	91.3	83.3	87.7	88.0
Somerset	95.0	82.4	90.0	·100.0	82.4	75.0	·100.0	·100.0	95.0
Talbot	·100.0	94.1	·100.0	·100.0	94.1	·100.0	84.6	88.2	·100.0
Washington	·98.4	·100.0	·99.2	·99.2	·98.4	96.8	94.5	95.2	95.9
Wicomico	·100.0	·100.0	·100.0	93.5	100.0	91.9	93.6	·100.0	95.2
Worcester	·100.0	·100.0	94.7	92.3	96.4	·98.2	94.9	90.9	94.7

Met MSIG Indicator of a 1.5 percentage point gain over the previous year.   · Met General Education standard.

GRADE 9 STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS RANKED BY PERCENT PASSING
2001-2002 FUNCTIONAL TEST RESULTS

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Writing
Cecil	100.0	Howard	91.6	Calvert	90.8
Howard	99.4	Calvert	91.4	Howard	88.5
Calvert	97.5	Washington	88.3	Garrett	87.5
Washington	97.5	Queen Anne's	85.6	Carroll	82.5
Queen Anne's	95.6	Anne Arundel	84.4	Washington	79.5
Caroline	94.9	Caroline	82.1	Caroline	78.9
Garrett	94.6	Worcester	80.6	Kent	78.3
Wicomico	94.6	Allegany	79.4	Harford	77.9
Allegany	94.4	Frederick	79.1	Frederick	75.9
Saint Mary's	94.0	Montgomery	78.0	Cecil	75.6
Frederick	92.8	Garrett	76.8	Baltimore Co.	75.4
Baltimore Co.	92.2	Baltimore Co.	75.7	Worcester	75.0
Montgomery	92.2	Kent	75.0	Charles	74.1
Kent	91.7	Carroll	74.5	Montgomery	71.8
Carroll	91.2	Harford	73.7	Queen Anne's	70.0
Harford	90.5	Talbot	73.2	Anne Arundel	66.7
Talbot	90.2	Charles	71.2	Wicomico	66.3
Anne Arundel	90.0	Somerset	68.8	Saint Mary's	66.0
Worcester	88.9	Cecil	67.6	STATE	65.5
Charles	87.2	STATE	66.8	Allegany	65.4
STATE	87.1	Wicomico	63.4	Somerset	62.5
Prince George's	85.3	Saint Mary's	62.9	Prince George's	56.3
Dorchester	75.0	Prince George's	43.5	Talbot	45.0
Baltimore City	65.8	Dorchester	42.9	Dorchester	36.4
Somerset	62.5	Baltimore City	29.5	Baltimore City	32.4

GRADE 11 STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS RANKED BY PERCENT PASSING
2001-2002 FUNCTIONAL TEST RESULTS

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Writing
Calvert	100.0	Calvert	100.0	Cecil	100.0
Cecil	100.0	Talbot	100.0	Dorchester	100.0
Dorchester	100.0	Worcester	98.2	Talbot	100.0
Queen Anne's	100.0	Allegany	97.6	Calvert	99.2
Talbot	100.0	Queen Anne's	97.6	Washington	95.9
Wicomico	100.0	Washington	96.8	Carroll	95.6
Washington	99.2	Anne Arundel	96.3	Queen Anne's	95.2
Baltimore Co.	97.9	Carroll	96.0	Wicomico	95.2
Howard	97.8	Charles	96.0	Somerset	95.0
Saint Mary's	97.8	Baltimore Co.	95.6	Worcester	94.7
Montgomery	97.7	Howard	94.3	Baltimore Co.	94.3
Allegany	97.6	Kent	93.8	Montgomery	93.5
Frederick	97.1	Frederick	93.4	Anne Arundel	93.2
Charles	96.7	Caroline	92.6	Frederick	92.9
Harford	96.2	Montgomery	91.9	Charles	92.0
Carroll	96.1	Wicomico	91.9	Garrett	92.0
Garrett	96.0	Saint Mary's	91.3	Allegany	91.6
Anne Arundel	95.7	Harford	90.8	Howard	91.2
STATE	95.1	Cecil	90.4	Harford	89.1
Prince George's	95.0	STATE	88.3	STATE	88.1
Worcester	94.7	Dorchester	85.0	Caroline	88.0
Kent	93.8	Garrett	84.0	Saint Mary's	88.0
Caroline	92.0	Prince George's	81.3	Kent	87.5
Somerset	90.0	Somerset	75.0	Prince George's	83.2
Baltimore City	80.0	Baltimore City	53.5	Baltimore City	54.5

Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.4

1.1.4 The percent of students with disabilities scoring at satisfactory on the MSPAP will increase by 3.0% annually. (For example, if 40% of students with disabilities achieved satisfactorily during the previous year, then 3% more would have to achieve satisfactory the next year, for a total of 43%, to meet the MSIG annual goal.)

Computation Methodology

Identify the percent of students with disabilities at the satisfactory performance level on the MSPAP Tests at each grade level, 3rd, 5th and 8th. Compare current results with the previous year and determine if there was a 3-percentage point gain. Satisfactory percentages are:

MSPAP Grades 3, 5, and 8	
Satisfactory All Tests	70%

Shading identifies systems meeting the Maryland State Improvement Grant (MSIG) targeted increase of 3 percentage points.

2001-2002 MSPAP THIRD GRADE
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY (1.1.4)

	Reading	Writing	Language Use.	Math	Science	Social Sty.
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	31.5	40.0	42.7	30.1	29.0	28.6
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	21.4	27.6	24.4	18.7	21.7	20.5
Local School System						
Allegany	31.1	41.5	26.7	33.3	33.3	32.2
Anne Arundel	23.9	22.1	19.1	15.4	17.6	17.7
Baltimore City	8.5	10.7	9.8	7.3	8.3	8.4
Baltimore County	32.2	39.5	42.3	30.2	37.0	33.9
Calvert	24.6	24.7	27.2	17.3	16.0	14.2
Caroline	27.6	48.3	28.6	35.0	46.7	46.7
Carroll	17.3	32.1	22.2	23.4	24.1	24.1
Cecil	28.0	49.5	32.9	30.6	37.8	35.2
Charles	19.1	30.5	25.2	20.8	22.1	13.6
Dorchester	25.9	36.2	26.9	14.9	21.3	19.1
Frederick	14.4	19.7	13.3	14.4	13.7	13.7
Garrett	5.0	22.2	10.4	17.5	15.9	20.6
Harford	18.6	28.5	26.8	17.9	20.1	18.8
Howard	36.3	30.0	34.5	19.5	24.5	22.0
Kent	53.3	59.0	31.3	61.5	66.7	61.5
Montgomery	23.4	29.9	31.0	17.7	20.8	20.9
Prince George's	9.9	19.9	16.6	11.4	13.1	12.7
Queen Anne's	17.1	16.0	15.6	9.3	10.7	18.7
Saint Mary's	29.5	36.7	32.5	21.4	33.7	25.0
Somerset	15.8	21.4	20.8	7.1	14.3	10.7
Talbot	18.8	27.6	31.3	10.3	24.1	20.7
Washington	30.2	38.3	30.6	26.4	29.5	24.9
Wicomico	17.6	29.0	28.4	24.6	26.8	24.6
Worcester	22.2	22.2	22.2	19.0	15.9	19.0

Met MSIG Indicator of a 3-percentage point gain over the previous year.

• Met General Education standard; Satisfactory - 70%   Note: See Appendix A for exemption data

12

2001-2002 MSPAP FIFTH GRADE
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY (1.1.4)

	Reading	Writing	Language Use	Math	Science	Social Sty.
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	43.7	44.4	59.1	43.1	60.5	53.1
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	24.8	23.3	29.2	20.4	40.0	20.5
Local School System						
Allegany	25.8	32.3	27.2	28.1	54.5	49.1
Anne Arundel	27.6	22.2	29.3	18.9	41.8	34.7
Baltimore City	6.6	8.1	13.2	8.9	16.8	12.9
Baltimore Co.	36.8	34.7	41.6	30.1	55.0	48.0
Calvert	31.8	31.4	41.4	23.9	47.3	33.2
Caroline	35.5	40.6	29.4	43.5	69.6	68.1
Carroll	29.8	33.5	39.3	26.3	51.7	41.9
Cecil	43.4	40.1	31.7	25.8	59.9	50.8
Charles	28.8	22.4	24.2	14.6	30.2	30.7
Dorchester	20.0	25.0	18.2	21.2	44.2	38.5
Frederick	21.8	17.0	25.0	22.5	37.8	27.8
Garrett	21.8	16.5	24.7	20.0	32.9	20.0
Harford	28.0	27.2	38.6	27.2	46.7	39.2
Howard	37.4	26.7	35.1	24.9	48.7	37.7
Kent	20.0	19.4	26.9	22.6	38.7	29.0
Montgomery	26.6	23.6	40.8	23.2	41.1	36.1
Prince George's	13.7	16.7	24.1	10.3	27.5	20.6
Queen Anne's	35.5	10.1	18.2	18.0	47.2	37.1
Saint Mary's	41.2	35.6	32.8	24.5	50.9	40.3
Somerset	12.5	21.4	18.2	10.7	35.7	25.0
Talbot	7.1	14.6	10.0	2.1	14.6	18.8
Washington	33.3	28.2	33.9	24.9	54.9	40.7
Wicomico	26.3	28.6	29.3	26.0	48.7	33.8
Worcester	16.4	20.3	20.3	8.7	29.0	20.3

Met MSIG Indicator of a 3-percentage point gain over the previous year.

• **Met General Education standard; Satisfactory - 70%**   **Note: See Appendix A for exemption data**

2001-2002 MSPAP EIGHTH GRADE
STUDENTS WITH DISABLITIES PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY (1.1.4)

	Reading	Writing	Language Use	Math	Science	Social Sty
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	25.5	46.6	42.7	39.2	45.6	45.1
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	4.8	12.1	8.1	8.3	10.4	10.1
Local School System						
Allegany	3.1	7.1	6.7	7.9	11.0	9.4
Anne Arundel*						
Baltimore City	1.1	5.6	3.7	1.9	3.3	3.3
Baltimore Co.	7.8	18.8	14.0	11.5	16.3	14.9
Calvert*						
Caroline*						
Carroll*						
Cecil*						
Charles	9.5	15.1	9.1	10.4	11.8	11.8
Dorchester	11.1	12.2	10.5	8.2	12.2	8.2
Frederick*						
Garrett	2.4	9.8	6.8	29.5	26.2	26.2
Harford*						
Howard	12.3	22.5	17.1	21.3	24.6	25.4
Kent	11.8	23.1	11.5	23.1	7.7	11.5
Montgomery*						
Prince George's	3.0	9.2	5.4	4.8	5.9	5.3
Queen Anne's	16.7	18.0	20.5	17.0	14.0	17.0
Saint Mary's	4.5	10.7	14.6	12.0	17.3	19.3
Somerset*						
Talbot*						
Washington*						
Wicomico*						
Worcester	5.4	15.9	6.7	15.9	11.6	15.9

Met MSIG Indicator of a 3-percentage point gain over the previous year.   * Opted out of 8th grade administration

• Met General Education standard; Satisfactory - 70%   Note: See Appendix A for exemption data

THIRD GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS RANKED BY PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY
2001-2002 MSPAP RESULTS

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Writing	Local School System	Lang. Use.	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Science	Local School System	Social Studies
Kent	53.3	Kent	59.0	Baltimore Co	42.3	Kent	61.5	Kent	66.7	Kent	61.5
Howard	36.3	Cecil	49.5	Howard	34.5	Caroline	35.0	Caroline	46.7	Caroline	46.7
Baltimore Co	32.2	Caroline	48.3	Cecil	32.9	Allegany	33.3	Cecil	37.8	Cecil	35.2
Allegany	31.1	Allegany	41.5	Saint Mary's	32.5	Cecil	30.6	Baltimore Co	37.0	Baltimore Co	33.9
Washington	30.2	Baltimore Co	39.5	Kent	31.3	Baltimore Co	30.2	Saint Mary's	33.7	Allegany	32.2
Saint Mary's	29.5	Washington	38.3	Talbot	31.3	Washington	26.4	Allegany	33.3	Saint Mary's	25.0
Cecil	28.0	Saint Mary's	36.7	Montgomery	31.0	Wicomico	24.6	Washington	29.5	Washington	24.9
Caroline	27.6	Dorchester	36.2	Washington	30.6	Carroll	23.4	Wicomico	26.8	Wicomico	24.6
Dorchester	25.9	Carroll	32.1	Caroline	28.6	Saint Mary's	21.4	Howard	24.5	Carroll	24.1
Calvert	24.6	Charles	30.5	Wicomico	28.4	Charles	20.8	Carroll	24.1	Howard	22.0
Anne Arundel	23.9	Howard	30.0	Calvert	27.2	Howard	19.5	Talbot	24.1	Montgomery	20.9
Montgomery	23.4	Montgomery	29.9	Dorchester	26.9	Worcester	19.0	Charles	22.1	Talbot	20.7
Worcester	22.2	Wicomico	29.0	Harford	26.8	STATE	18.7	STATE	21.7	Garrett	20.6
STATE	21.4	Harford	28.5	Allegany	26.7	Harford	17.9	Dorchester	21.3	STATE	20.5
Charles	19.1	Talbot	27.6	Charles	25.2	Montgomery	17.7	Montgomery	20.8	Dorchester	19.1
Talbot	18.8	STATE	27.6	STATE	24.4	Garrett	17.5	Harford	20.1	Worcester	19.0
Harford	18.6	Calvert	24.7	Carroll	22.2	Calvert	17.3	Anne Arundel	17.6	Harford	18.8
Wicomico	17.6	Garrett	22.2	Worcester	22.2	Anne Arundel	15.4	Calvert	16.0	Queen Anne's	18.7
Carroll	17.3	Worcester	22.2	Somerset	20.8	Dorchester	14.9	Garrett	15.9	Anne Arundel	17.7
Queen Anne's	17.1	Anne Arundel	22.1	Anne Arundel	19.1	Frederick	14.4	Worcester	15.9	Calvert	14.2
Somerset	15.8	Somerset	21.4	Prince George's	16.6	Prince George's	11.4	Somerset	14.3	Frederick	13.7
Frederick	14.4	Prince George's	19.9	Queen Anne's	15.6	Talbot	10.3	Frederick	13.7	Charles	13.6
Prince George's	9.9	Frederick	19.7	Frederick	13.3	Queen Anne's	9.3	Prince George's	13.1	Prince George's	12.7
Baltimore City	8.5	Queen Anne's	16.0	Garrett	10.4	Baltimore City	7.3	Queen Anne's	10.7	Somerset	10.7
Garrett	5.0	Baltimore City	10.7	Baltimore City	9.8	Somerset	7.1	Baltimore City	8.3	Baltimore City	8.4

FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS RANKED BY PERCENT AT SATISFACTORY
2001-2002 MSPAP RESULTS

Local School System	Reading	Local School System	Writing	Local School System	Lang. Use.	Local School System	Math	Local School System	Science	Local School System	Social Studies
Cecil	43.4	Caroline	40.6	Baltimore Co	41.6	Caroline	43.5	Caroline	69.6	Caroline	68.1
Saint Mary's	41.2	Cecil	40.1	Calvert	41.4	Baltimore Co	30.1	Cecil	59.9	Cecil	50.8
Howard	37.4	Saint Mary's	35.6	Montgomery	40.8	Allegany	28.1	Baltimore Co	55.0	Allegany	49.1
Baltimore Co	36.8	Baltimore Co	34.7	Carroll	39.3	Harford	27.2	Washington	54.9	Baltimore Co	48.0
Caroline	35.5	Carroll	33.5	Harford	38.6	Carroll	26.3	Allegany	54.5	Carroll	41.9
Queen Anne's	35.5	Allegany	32.3	Howard	35.1	Wicomico	26.0	Carroll	51.7	Washington	40.7
Washington	33.3	Calvert	31.4	Washington	33.9	Cecil	25.8	Saint Mary's	50.9	Saint Mary's	40.3
Calvert	31.8	Wicomico	28.6	Saint Mary's	32.8	Howard	24.9	Howard	48.7	Harford	39.2
Carroll	29.8	Washington	28.2	Cecil	31.7	Washington	24.9	Wicomico	48.7	Dorchester	38.5
Charles	28.8	Harford	27.2	Caroline	29.4	Saint Mary's	24.5	Calvert	47.3	Howard	37.7
Harford	28.0	Howard	26.7	Anne Arundel	29.3	Calvert	23.9	Queen Anne's	47.2	Queen Anne's	37.1
Anne Arundel	27.6	Dorchester	25.0	Wicomico	29.3	Montgomery	23.2	Harford	46.7	Montgomery	36.1
Montgomery	26.6	Montgomery	23.6	STATE	29.2	Kent	22.6	Dorchester	44.2	Anne Arundel	34.7
Wicomico	26.3	STATE	23.3	Allegany	27.2	Frederick	22.5	Anne Arundel	41.8	Wicomico	33.8
Allegany	25.8	Charles	22.4	Kent	26.9	Dorchester	21.2	Montgomery	41.1	Calvert	33.2
STATE	24.8	Anne Arundel	22.2	Frederick	25.0	STATE	20.4	STATE	40.0	STATE	32.8
Frederick	21.8	Somerset	21.4	Garrett	24.7	Garrett	20.0	Kent	38.7	Charles	30.7
Garrett	21.8	Worcester	20.3	Charles	24.2	Anne Arundel	18.9	Frederick	37.8	Kent	29.0
Dorchester	20.0	Kent	19.4	Prince George's	24.1	Queen Anne's	18.0	Somerset	35.7	Frederick	27.8
Kent	20.0	Frederick	17.0	Worcester	20.3	Charles	14.6	Garrett	32.9	Somerset	25.0
Worcester	16.4	Prince George's	16.7	Dorchester	18.2	Somerset	10.7	Charles	30.2	Prince George's	20.6
Prince George's	13.7	Garrett	16.5	Queen Anne's	18.2	Prince George's	10.3	Worcester	29.0	Worcester	20.3
Somerset	12.5	Talbot	14.6	Somerset	18.2	Baltimore City	8.9	Prince George's	27.5	Garrett	20.0
Talbot	7.1	Queen Anne's	10.1	Baltimore City	13.2	Worcester	8.7	Baltimore City	16.8	Talbot	18.8
Baltimore City	6.6	Baltimore City	8.1	Talbot	10.0	Talbot	2.1	Talbot	14.6	Baltimore City	12.9

**In 2002, twelve school systems did not administer MSPAP in grade eight.
Statewide ranking of eighth grade scores is therefore not provided.**

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES SECOND GRADE MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK
COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (1.1.5)

	Reading		Language		Math		Language Mechanics		Math Computation	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	58	59	60	60	60	60	66	66	68	68
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	34	34	27	27	29	29	40	38	40	42
Local School System										
Allegany	27	26	30	22	32	29	38	36	36	42
Anne Arundel	35	35	26	26	31	26	45	45	31	31
Baltimore City	24	24	18	18	15	15	27	27	24	24
Edison Schools	14	22	16	17	6	13	28	18	24	48
Baltimore Co.	42	46	33	45	36	42	49	49	62	53
Calvert	39	46	40	46	47	53	50	49	66	57
Caroline	17	35	18	39	18	34	33	52	19	33
Carroll	27	33	23	31	29	49	38	47	36	55
Cecil	55	34	43	27	52	22	55	36	58	31
Charles	40	31	33	22	37	21	56	36	46	42
Dorchester	22	22	16	16	9	14	20	20	18	25
Frederick	31	32	26	23	31	32	37	38	26	27
Garrett	33	38	39	39	48	36	45	46	42	34
Harford	46	47	39	36	38	40	40	43	43	52
Howard	28	21	27	18	23	13	42	42	33	19
Kent	32	32	23	27	39	32	57	36	56	28
Montgomery	34	40	27	27	29	35	45	45	40	49
Prince George's	30	26	22	16	23	17	27	27	32	42
Queen Anne's	35	50	24	33	29	34	38	53	44	45
Saint Mary's	32	41	23	31	25	33	28	38	36	47
Somerset	58	57	37	17	26	29	38	33	20	27
Talbot	26	30	24	30	16	23	24	33	19	22
Washington	30	30	28	28	44	44	56	45	50	50
Wicomico	33	32	36	29	46	30	45	34	54	41
Worcester	37	27	37	23	47	39	47	38	63	45

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.5% gain over previous year.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES FOURTH GRADE MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK
COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (1.1.5)

	Reading		Language		Math		Language Mechanics		Math Computation	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	59	60	62	64	59	61	61	61	62	62
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	31	31	27	27	23	23	27	28	31	33
Local School System										
Allegany	28	29	28	27	23	23	27	26	26	25
Anne Arundel	27	31	24	27	25	31	26	32	30	30
Baltimore City	14	14	13	13	12	13	15	15	18	18
Edison Schools	14	14	12	10	18	17	18	19	24	46
Baltimore Co.	33	35	30	34	28	28	35	35	37	45
Calvert	37	38	37	36	33	32	35	40	45	44
Caroline	16	22	13	21	21	19	24	24	30	27
Carroll	28	29	26	28	27	27	33	33	26	34
Cecil	44	28	42	20	42	17	47	21	40	18
Charles	30	32	27	16	25	18	26	21	31	31
Dorchester	24	25	22	27	14	19	21	21	38	38
Frederick	32	33	28	28	30	23	27	27	25	26
Garrett	32	26	27	35	34	25	32	26	25	31
Harford	41	39	34	34	31	29	30	32	36	36
Howard	39	30	38	25	27	23	30	24	21	21
Kent	36	35	34	27	49	18	30	18	43	21
Montgomery	45	41	40	33	37	29	40	40	45	53
Prince George's	25	27	22	22	14	17	21	21	25	31
Queen Anne's	35	36	26	29	23	32	31	33	22	29
Saint Mary's	28	40	23	28	23	31	27	27	33	34
Somerset	59	61	23	34	8	20	16	21	17	19
Talbot	23	27	20	20	15	13	24	24	27	21
Washington	22	30	22	27	23	34	26	32	31	38
Wicomico	26	32	22	25	23	27	35	37	32	29
Worcester	26	18	28	23	27	20	33	27	33	33

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.5% gain over previous year.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES SIXTH GRADE MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK
COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (1.1.5)

	Reading		Language		Math		Language Mechanics		Math Computation	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
STATE AVERAGE REGULAR	58	58	57	60	60	59	53	52	53	54
STATE AVERAGE SPECIAL	19	22	20	21	18	19	17	18	25	27
Local School System										
Allegany	20	22	21	20	19	15	18	18	20	22
Anne Arundel	16	22	17	21	16	18	17	24	19	27
Baltimore City	8	12	7	11	8	9	10	9	19	21
Edison Schools	N/A	13	N/A	11	N/A	18	N/A	17	N/A	26
Baltimore Co.	20	21	22	20	20	17	19	17	27	26
Calvert	27	28	26	26	24	22	23	28	25	29
Caroline	13	9	12	13	12	10	21	15	23	20
Carroll	24	25	26	25	25	24	23	25	26	22
Cecil	32	22	30	21	25	20	29	18	31	16
Charles	14	14	18	16	19	14	14	18	25	28
Dorchester	4	13	7	12	5	13	7	13	14	12
Frederick	27	28	25	27	27	29	23	25	25	28
Garrett	30	43	29	31	20	28	17	18	30	34
Harford	29	29	25	27	24	26	26	24	21	22
Howard	26	27	28	26	24	26	26	31	29	26
Kent	9	13	16	16	19	11	29	13	18	12
Montgomery	27	31	29	31	31	32	22	33	42	54
Prince George's	17	22	20	24	14	15	14	18	25	28
Queen Anne's	22	25	18	29	18	22	17	23	28	28
Saint Mary's	12	22	16	20	15	24	14	19	20	17
Somerset	61	19	23	19	10	11	14	19	14	15
Talbot	17	12	15	18	10	16	16	12	23	16
Washington	21	16	20	20	18	19	17	24	25	28
Wicomico	23	21	22	20	17	11	22	14	19	11
Worcester	18	13	16	17	15	15	18	13	31	17

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.5% gain over previous year.

Trend Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.6

1.1.6   The percentage of time that students with disabilities participate in general education classrooms will increase by 2% annually.

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 6 THROUGH 21 IN GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS (1.1.6)

Local School System	Dec. 1, 2001			Dec. 1, 2002		
	Out <21% (LRE A)	Out 21-60% (LRE B)	Out >60% (LRE C)	Out <21% (LRE A)	Out 21-60% (LRE B)	Out >60% (LRE C)
Allegany	48.99%	43.68%	1.37%	61.28	25.00	11.72
Anne Arundel	58.44%	16.50%	15.43%	58.45	16.54	19.22
Baltimore City	32.14%	19.59%	36.74%	35.30	24.27	29.36
Edison Schools	49.30%	9.86%	40.85%	50.24	13.27	36.49
Baltimore County	47.21%	17.52%	27.40%	50.75	12.70	28.02
Calvert	44.82%	32.39%	16.47%	48.38	39.24	6.95
Caroline	57.39%	32.35%	8.40%	59.38	24.22	15.47
Carroll	72.80%	15.14%	7.03%	69.62	17.51	6.97
Cecil	60.03%	22.94%	14.78%	59.46	23.32	14.81
Charles	53.01%	23.28%	20.35%	62.02	17.50	17.55
Dorchester	77.42%	9.34%	12.90%	81.97	4.36	13.28
Frederick	71.96%	16.37%	7.22%	76.30	13.72	4.79
Garrett	51.16%	29.19%	19.36%	54.31	28.14	16.94
Harford	45.96%	44.69%	4.81%	55.77	36.29	3.05
Howard	48.40%	38.32%	7.06%	58.20	27.19	10.02
Kent	58.62%	18.50%	21.32%	67.79	13.50	17.18
Montgomery	39.16%	20.81%	32.17%	43.77	18.57	30.20
Prince George's	43.13%	25.42%	20.72%	41.02	24.54	23.12
Queen Anne's	72.43%	22.76%	2.74%	76.48	19.26	2.35
Saint Mary's	52.86%	32.86%	13.02%	57.49	28.59	12.15
Somerset	70.90%	13.84%	12.15%	74.40	11.61	11.90
Talbot	65.52%	23.22%	8.97%	65.78	26.21	7.77
Washington	74.94%	12.24%	5.34%	72.46	13.71	6.68
Wicomico	67.39%	12.42%	18.10%	70.41	12.09	16.84
Worcester	73.02%	17.20%	8.29%	76.04	15.67	7.64
STATE AVERAGE	48.66%	22.62%	21.07%	51.68	20.92	20.22

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of a 2-percentage point improvement over previous year.
Source: Maryland Special Education Census Data, Dec. 1 Child Count

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 6 THROUGH 21
IN GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS SY 2001-2002
COMPARISON TO STATE STANDARDS FOR LRE

Local School System	LRE A	State Goal: LRE A >= 60% * Gap *	LRE B	State Goal: LRE A + B >= 80% * Gap *	LRE C	State Goal: LRE C <= 15% * Gap *
Allegany	61.28%	1.28%	25.00%	6.28%	11.72%	3.28%
Anne Arundel	58.45%	-1.55%	16.54%	-5.02%	19.22%	-4.22%
Baltimore City	35.30%	-24.70%	24.27%	-20.43%	29.36%	-14.36%
Edison Schools	50.24%	-9.76%	13.27%	-16.49%	36.49%	-21.49%
Baltimore County	50.75%	-9.25%	12.70%	-16.54%	28.02%	-13.02%
Calvert	48.38%	-11.62%	39.24%	7.62%	6.95%	8.05%
Caroline	59.38%	-0.62%	24.22%	3.59%	15.47%	-0.47%
Carroll	69.62%	9.62%	17.51%	7.13%	6.97%	8.03%
Cecil	59.46%	-0.54%	23.32%	2.77%	14.81%	0.19%
Charles	62.02%	2.02%	17.50%	-0.48%	17.55%	-2.55%
Dorchester	81.97%	21.97%	4.36%	6.34%	13.28%	1.72%
Frederick	76.30%	16.30%	13.72%	10.03%	4.79%	10.21%
Garrett	54.31%	-5.69%	28.14%	2.45%	16.94%	-1.94%
Harford	55.77%	-4.23%	36.29%	12.06%	3.05%	11.95%
Howard	58.20%	-1.80%	27.19%	5.39%	10.02%	4.98%
Kent	67.79%	7.79%	13.50%	1.29%	17.18%	-2.18%
Montgomery	43.77%	-16.23%	18.57%	-17.66%	30.20%	-15.20%
Prince George's	41.02%	-18.98%	24.54%	-14.44%	23.12%	-8.12%
Queen Anne's	76.48%	16.48%	19.26%	15.74%	2.35%	12.65%
Saint Mary's	57.49%	-2.51%	28.59%	6.07%	12.15%	2.85%
Somerset	74.40%	14.40%	11.61%	6.01%	11.90%	3.10%
Talbot	65.78%	5.78%	26.21%	11.99%	7.77%	7.23%
Washington	72.46%	12.46%	13.71%	6.17%	6.68%	8.32%
Wicomico	70.41%	10.41%	12.09%	2.50%	16.84%	-1.84%
Worcester	76.04%	16.04%	15.67%	11.71%	7.64%	7.36%
STATE	**51.68%**	**-8.32%**	**20.92%**	**-7.40%**	**20.22%**	**-5.22%**

Met State goal.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 3 THROUGH 5
IN PRESCHOOL LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENTS (1.1.6)

Local School System	Home (LRE J)			Itinerant (LRE K)			Reverse Mainstreaming (LRE L)		
	Dec.'00	Dec.'01	Dec.'02	Dec.'00	Dec.'01	Dec.'02	Dec.'00	Dec.'01	Dec.'02
Allegany	0	0	*	111	98	21	0	0	7
Anne Arundel	34	10	11	277	336	382	8	8	5
Baltimore City	49	78	23	344	359	403	*	23	30
Edison Schools	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0
Baltimore County	0	0	*	0	0	145	0	0	0
Calvert	*	*	0	86	41	59	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0	*	33	30	20	0	0	0
Carroll	0	6	*	79	127	129	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0	*	28	34	36	0	0	0
Charles	*	*	*	134	171	190	0	*	*
Dorchester	0	*	*	11	6	*	0	0	0
Frederick	11	*	*	52	151	184	*	0	0
Garrett	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0
Harford	*	10	20	29	19	87	0	0	0
Howard	*	*	*	141	216	268	9	19	51
Kent	0	0	*	0	*	*	0	12	0
Montgomery	*	5	*	670	587	798	0	0	0
Prince George's	*	5	16	295	280	273	31	0	0
Queen Anne's	*	0	0	11	12	23	0	0	0
Saint Mary's	*	*	*	20	25	56	0	0	0
Somerset	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0
Talbot	0	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	0
Washington	*	0	0	24	37	0	*	*	0
Wicomico	*	*	*	140	93	76	0	0	0
Worcester	*	0	0	28	28	46	0	0	0
STATE TOTAL	120	129	95	2,513	2,652	3,206	56	67	97

* Fewer than 5 students

Home - includes preschooler for whom it is appropriate to receive services at home, not single service.

Itinerant - includes preschooler who receives only speech and/or language at school or other location.

Reverse Mainstreaming - includes preschooler who receives special education in class designed for disabled student where over 50% of the students are not disabled.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 3 THROUGH 5
IN PRESCHOOL LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENTS (1.1.6)

(continued) Local School System	Early Childhood (LRE M)			Early Childhood Special Ed. (LRE N)			Combined (LRE O)		
	Dec.'00	Dec.'01	Dec.'02	Dec.'00	Dec.'01	Dec.'02	Dec.'00	Dec.'01	Dec.'02
Allegany	33	85	127	13	25	23	38	25	5
Anne Arundel	202	237	189	214	270	424	68	73	73
Baltimore City	425	467	457	306	311	311	61	23	31
Edison Schools	13	10	20	*	0	0	*	0	0
Baltimore County	755	870	814	35	505	28	644	75	563
Calvert	69	83	8	41	25	64	30	42	67
Caroline	18	25	36	26	18	21	5	*	*
Carroll	100	80	123	85	83	102	5	13	19
Cecil	130	126	148	76	92	78	*	0	14
Charles	85	105	115	*	*	4	*	*	*
Dorchester	9	24	24	18	19	18	7	*	20
Frederick	146	139	137	87	38	64	60	19	14
Garrett	73	51	58	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	226	234	321	208	187	165	108	170	61
Howard	97	55	66	274	277	277	61	104	63
Kent	11	*	12	9	0	0	*	*	*
Montgomery	111	267	105	597	598	654	5	29	15
Prince George's	41	13	65	199	566	750	648	370	289
Queen Anne's	48	40	39	31	17	23	*	43	13
Saint Mary's	108	90	76	29	31	47	31	56	53
Somerset	19	17	9	7	*	5	0	0	7
Talbot	43	38	55	0	0	0	*	*	0
Washington	165	156	212	5	6	23	52	27	5
Wicomico	27	19	13	44	47	48	*	5	11
Worcester	*	23	0	15	12	13	24	27	29
STATE TOTAL	2,958	3,257	3,229	2,323	3,135	3,142	1,860	1,114	1,360

* Fewer than 5 students

Early Childhood - includes preschooler who receives all special education and related services in educational programs designed primarily for children without disabilities.

Early Childhood Special Ed. - includes preschooler who receives all of their special education and related services in educational programs designed primarily for children with disabilities housed in regular school buildings or other community-based settings.

Combined (part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education setting) - includes preschooler who receives services in multiple settings.

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AGES 3 THROUGH 5
IN PRESCHOOL LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENTS SY 2001-2002
COMPARISON TO STATE STANDARDS FOR LRE

Local School System	Early Childhood (LRE M)	State Goal: LRE M >= 60% * Gap *	Part-Time Early Childhood Part-Time Early Childhood Special Ed (LRE O)	State Goal: LRE M + O >= 80% * Gap *	Early Childhood Special Ed (LRE N)	State Goal: LRE N <= 15% * Gap *
Allegany	68.65%	8.65%	2.70%	-8.65%	12.43%	2.57%
Anne Arundel	17.40%	-42.60%	6.72%	-55.87%	39.04%	-24.04%
Baltimore City	35.02%	-24.98%	2.38%	-42.61%	23.83%	-8.83%
Edison Schools	100.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	15.00%
Baltimore County	50.59%	-9.41%	34.99%	5.58%	1.74%	13.26%
Calvert	3.72%	-56.28%	31.16%	-45.12%	29.77%	-14.77%
Caroline	43.90%	-16.10%	4.88%	-31.22%	25.61%	-10.61%
Carroll	32.20%	-27.80%	4.97%	-42.83%	26.70%	-11.70%
Cecil	53.43%	-6.57%	5.05%	-21.52%	28.16%	-13.16%
Charles	36.39%	-23.61%	0.32%	-43.29%	1.27%	13.73%
Dorchester	37.50%	-22.50%	31.25%	-11.25%	28.13%	-13.13%
Frederick	33.66%	-26.34%	3.44%	-42.90%	15.72%	-0.72%
Garrett	96.67%	36.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	15.00%
Harford	48.49%	-11.51%	9.21%	-22.30%	24.92%	-9.92%
Howard	8.75%	-51.25%	8.36%	-62.89%	36.74%	-21.74%
Kent	60.00%	0.00%	15.00%	-5.00%	0.00%	15.00%
Montgomery	6.24%	-53.76%	0.89%	-72.87%	38.84%	-23.84%
Prince George's	4.55%	-55.45%	20.21%	-55.24%	52.45%	-37.45%
Queen Anne's	38.24%	-21.76%	12.75%	-29.02%	22.55%	-7.55%
Saint Mary's	32.48%	-27.52%	22.65%	-24.87%	20.09%	-5.09%
Somerset	36.00%	-24.00%	28.00%	-16.00%	20.00%	-5.00%
Talbot	100.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	15.00%
Washington	88.33%	28.33%	2.08%	10.42%	9.58%	5.42%
Wicomico	8.72%	-51.28%	7.38%	-63.89%	32.21%	-17.21%
Worcester	0.00%	-60.00%	32.95%	-47.05%	14.77%	0.23%
STATE	**28.20%**	**-31.80%**	**11.88%**	**-39.92%**	**27.44%**	**-12.44%**

Met State goal.

Trend Results for Goal Indicator 1.1.7

1.1.7 The percentage of students with disabilities who receive high school diplomas will increase by 2%.

STATEWIDE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES (1.1.7)

	Diplomas* 1999-2000	Certificates** 1999-2000	Diplomas* 2000-2001	Certificates** 2000-2001	Diplomas* 2001-2002	Certificates** 2001-2002
STATE AVERAGE	99.0	1.0	99.3	0.7	99.0	1.0
LSS						
Allegany	97.8	2.2	99.3	0.7	99.0	1.3
Anne Arundel	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Baltimore City	97.6	2.4	99.5	0.5	99.9	0.1
Baltimore County	99.2	0.8	99.4	0.6	99.2	0.8
Calvert	99.6	0.4	99.9	0.1	96.2	3.8
Caroline	99.1	0.9	98.1	1.9	99.1	0.9
Carroll	98.8	1.2	99.4	0.6	98.5	1.5
Cecil	98.8	1.2	98.3	1.7	97.8	2.2
Charles	99.0	1.0	98.9	1.1	98.3	1.7
Dorchester	97.4	2.6	97.6	2.4	97.6	2.4
Frederick	100.0	0.0	99.7	0.3	99.4	0.6
Garrett	99.0	1.0	99.0	1.0	100.0	0.0
Harford	99.9	0.1	99.8	0.2	99.6	0.4
Howard	99.2	0.8	99.2	0.8	99.2	0.8
Kent	99.4	0.6	100.0	0.0	99.5	0.5
Montgomery	98.7	1.3	98.9	1.1	98.9	1.1
Prince George's	99.0	1.0	99.2	0.8	98.6	1.4
Queen Anne's	99.5	0.5	99.3	0.7	99.2	0.8
Saint Mary's	98.9	1.1	99.3	0.7	99.3	0.7
Somerset	100.0	0.0	98.9	1.2	97.6	2.4
Talbot	98.1	1.9	95.0	5.0	96.8	3.2
Washington	98.3	1.7	98.9	1.1	98.0	2.0
Wicomico	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	98.5	1.5
Worcester	98.8	1.2	99.6	0.4	99.6	0.4

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 0.2% gain (Diplomas), 0.2% reduction (Certificates) over previous year.

* Includes both general and special education students receiving a diploma as reported in the Maryland School Performance Report

**Includes special education students only

SELECTED EXIT DATA FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES*
JUNE 2001 - JULY 2002

	Total SWD Exiting HS		Percent Graduating with a Diploma		Percent Receiving a Certificate		Percent Dropping Out	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
STATE AVERAGE	**8,916**	**9,374**	**37.2**	**39.9**	**3.9**	**4.5**	**15.9**	**14.5**
Local School System								
Allegany	165	173	41.2	47.4	7.9	1.7	16.4	15.6
Anne Arundel	1,038	1,093	36.0	40.3	2.6	4.0	23.2	19.8
Baltimore City	1,564	1,782	19.2	19.1	3.2	4.2	26.5	27.4
Baltimore County	1,044	1,226	47.9	48.4	1.8	2.6	9.5	8.9
Calvert	204	190	25.0	31.1	1.0	0.5	20.6	20.5
Caroline	72	72	40.3	37.5	4.2	1.4	18.1	12.5
Carroll	295	258	45.1	69.0	4.1	5.8	15.6	5.8
Cecil	212	220	31.6	25.0	6.1	8.2	25.9	20.0
Charles	362	316	29.3	28.2	3.9	6.0	15.5	14.9
Dorchester	51	56	25.5	21.4	15.7	12.5	17.6	32.1
Frederick	386	336	49.5	57.4	3.1	4.5	1.8	4.2
Garrett	72	75	26.4	34.7	4.2	4.0	30.6	16.0
Harford	247	349	51.4	53.6	4.0	4.6	13.8	12.3
Howard	429	455	48.0	48.1	2.8	3.5	7.5	8.6
Kent	34	36	44.1	41.7	2.9	2.8	26.5	13.9
Montgomery	1,273	1,340	49.2	51.3	5.0	6.0	3.1	2.2
Prince George's	595	597	30.1	36.0	5.0	4.9	15.6	14.9
Queen Anne's	80	87	18.8	39.1	2.5	3.4	22.5	12.6
Saint Mary's	167	202	39.5	46.5	3.6	3.5	16.8	15.3
Somerset	49	20	26.5	20.0	6.1	0.0	18.4	15.0
Talbot	56	63	17.9	19.0	23.2	12.7	25.0	19.0
Washington	268	210	45.5	56.2	6.7	11.4	20.1	3.8
Wicomico	181	118	26.5	15.3	6.1	2.5	26.0	27.1
Worcester	72	100	50.0	40.0	5.6	2.0	8.3	14.0

* As reported in Table 19, Students with Disabilities by Exit Reason and LEA, Age 14-21, July 2001-June 2002 (Source: Dec. 1 Child Count); percents are percents of special education students only

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-2

To organize, analyze, and report data on post-high school employment and participation in post-secondary education among students with disabilities.

Indicators 1-2

1.2.1   Post-high school employment of students with disabilities will increase by 2% annually.
1.2.2   Participation of students with disabilities in post-secondary education will increase annually.

NOTE: At this time, no data is available on participation of SWD in post-secondary education. The Maryland State Department of Education is currently developing a process for collecting and reporting this data.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

<u>Objective 1-3</u>

To organize, analyze, and report data on the performance of eligible students on alternative assessments.

<u>Indicators 1-3</u>

1.3.1 The percent satisfactory on IMAP will increase by 3% annually (For example, if 40% of students achieved satisfactory during the previous year, then 3% more would have to achieve satisfactory the next year, for a total of 43%, to meet the MSIG annual goal).

1.3.2 By 2001, no student in Maryland will be exempted or excluded from statewide performance assessments.

Computation Methodology

Identify the percent of students with disabilities at the satisfactory performance level on the Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP) at each grade level, 3rd, 5th, 8th and 11th. Compare current results with the previous year and determine if there was a 3-percentage point gain. Satisfactory percentages are:

IMAP Grades 3, 5, 8 and 11	
Satisfactory	Due to the current restructuring of IMAP, standards have not yet been established. Results cannot be compared to previous years.

INDEPENDENCE MASTERY ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
2002 RESULTS BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM (1.3.1)

	Composite Score	Standard Deviation	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	No. of Students
STATE AVERAGE*	57.14	25.96	0.00	83.00	2385
Local School System					
Allegany	68.19	19.74	0.00	83.00	65
Anne Arundel	55.60	29.00	0.00	83.00	193
Baltimore City	51.83	29.71	0.00	83.00	551
Baltimore County	56.74	28.22	0.00	83.00	344
Calvert	63.88	18.27	15.00	83.00	34
Caroline	64.62	17.25	0.00	78.00	20
Carroll	44.29	20.46	0.00	74.67	44
Cecil	62.59	22.14	0.00	83.00	26
Charles	58.18	29.51	0.00	83.00	51
Dorchester	66.99	16.09	29.33	82.00	24
Frederick	61.13	22.79	0.00	83.00	63
Garrett	78.35	4.39	64.00	82.00	17
Harford	63.46	20.67	0.00	83.00	51
Howard	60.43	21.46	0.00	83.00	116
Kent	63.97	14.75	46.67	80.67	10
Montgomery	58.40	24.45	0.00	83.00	253
Prince George's	57.73	21.53	0.00	83.00	301
Queen Anne's	27.31	27.59	0.00	79.00	14
Saint Mary's	73.11	10.28	36.00	83.00	30
Somerset	60.63	15.12	29.00	79.00	9
Talbot	64.67	19.73	0.00	81.00	14
Washington	60.02	18.97	0.00	83.00	78
Wicomico	53.26	26.13	0.00	81.67	60
Worcester	76.47	4.10	67.33	83.00	17
School for Blind*	61.81	17.59	0.00	81.00	31

* School for the Blind is not included in State averages

   Note: due to scoring revisions, no comparison with previous years' data can be made

MARYLAND STATE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES EXEMPTED FROM MSPAP* (1.3.2)

Local School System	Grade 3			Grade 5			Grade 8		
	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002
Allegany	4.57	4.04	5.37	4.30	4.13	5.94	1.18	1.34	3.50
Anne Arundel	3.50	2.77	2.64	3.49	3.15	3.24	2.09	2.31	N/A
Baltimore City	2.81	2.38	1.60	2.82	2.77	2.29	1.57	1.98	1.98
Baltimore Co.	1.66	2.29	2.49	1.93	2.76	2.98	1.81	1.36	2.33
Calvert	1.56	1.31	1.18	1.54	1.36	1.90	0.67	0.92	N/A
Caroline	4.00	3.48	4.69	3.76	2.72	3.57	0.38	2.40	N/A
Carroll	2.72	2.59	2.21	2.56	2.89	2.47	1.49	0.97	N/A
Cecil	4.55	3.31	3.91	4.89	4.85	4.05	1.84	1.79	N/A
Charles	2.02	2.42	1.51	2.22	3.00	1.84	2.63	2.78	2.30
Dorchester	4.28	4.26	4.83	4.52	4.20	4.31	3.57	2.74	3.21
Frederick	1.97	1.97	1.83	1.85	2.04	2.21	0.86	1.18	N/A
Garrett	3.28	3.02	2.21	3.96	3.36	2.39	2.14	2.27	1.58
Harford	2.84	2.49	2.20	2.51	2.90	2.41	1.06	1.24	N/A
Howard	1.78	1.54	1.57	1.92	1.74	2.05	1.25	1.42	1.13
Kent	4.17	3.62	4.77	2.32	2.23	2.74	1.29	1.42	1.52
Montgomery	3.60	2.50	2.46	3.58	2.99	3.02	2.40	2.25	N/A
Prince George's	2.65	2.05	2.27	2.66	2.49	2.48	1.21	1.28	1.50
Queen Anne's	3.82	4.22	3.04	3.05	3.94	3.09	3.23	2.14	1.86
Saint Mary's	3.09	1.36	2.39	3.09	1.51	2.99	3.61	1.11	1.65
Somerset	3.12	1.68	2.26	0.93	2.78	3.69	1.63	1.42	N/A
Talbot	3.14	3.66	3.00	4.82	2.63	2.40	3.03	4.08	N/A
Washington	2.78	2.56	2.79	2.91	3.04	2.88	1.87	3.07	N/A
Wicomico	3.82	2.48	2.95	4.03	3.35	3.98	1.81	1.05	N/A
Worcester	0.10	0.17	0.64	0.18	0.73	0.59	0.62	1.25	0.90
STATE AVERAGE	2.77	2.35	2.29	2.88	2.75	2.72	1.73	1.73	1.87

* **See Appendix A for LSS Detail** (includes students whose accommodations invalidated their scores for one or more content areas and those whose IEPs exempted them from MSPAP)

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

<u>Objective 1-4</u>

Within local school systems, the significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions for students with disabilities as compared to the general student population will decrease.

<u>Indicators 1-4</u>

1.4.1   Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving long-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.

1.4.2   Within local school systems, the percentage of students with disabilities receiving short-term suspensions will decrease annually to reduce the significant discrepancy.

1.4.3   Functional behavioral assessments (as defined) will decrease by 10% annually.

1.4.4   Placements of students in non-general education classrooms will decrease by 10% annually.

LONG-TERM SUSPENSIONS (GREATER THAN 10 DAYS)
OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM, 2001-2002 (1.4.1)

	All Students			Students with Disabilities			Students Without Disabilities		
	Total Enrollment 9/30/01	Number	Percent	SSIS Count 12/1/01	Number	Percent	Total Enrollment 9/30/01	Number	Percent
STATE	**860,640**	**3,200**	**0.37**	**111,551**	**584**	**0.52**	**749,089**	**2,620**	**0.35**
Allegany	10,180	6	0.06	1,892	0	0.00	8,288	6	0.07
Anne Arundel	75,081	205	0.27	10,448	51	0.49	64,633	154	0.24
Baltimore City	95,475	36	0.04	16,157	11	0.07	79,318	25	0.03
Edison Schools	2,342	*	0.04	226	*	0.44	2,116	0	0.00
Baltimore Co.	107,212	1,059	0.99	13,313	136	1.02	93,899	923	0.98
Calvert	16,651	5	0.03	2,183	0	0.00	14,468	5	0.03
Caroline	5,609	0	0.00	714	0	0.00	4,895	0	0.00
Carroll	28,127	*	0.00	3,732	0	0.00	24,395	*	0.00
Cecil	16,095	57	0.35	2,606	0	0.00	13,489	57	0.42
Charles	24,001	39	0.16	2,577	9	0.35	21,424	30	0.14
Dorchester	4,884	16	0.33	642	*	0.47	4,242	13	0.31
Frederick	38,022	41	0.11	4,537	15	0.33	33,485	26	0.08
Garrett	4,869	*	0.04	743	*	0.13	4,126	*	0.02
Harford	39,966	359	0.90	5,803	104	1.79	34,163	259	0.76
Howard	46,257	117	0.25	4,830	23	0.48	41,427	94	0.23
Kent	2,684	0	0.00	336	0	0.00	2,348	0	0.00
Montgomery	136,895	230	0.17	16,471	37	0.22	120,424	193	0.16
Prince George's	135,039	927	0.69	14,853	169	1.14	120,186	758	0.63
Queen Anne's	7,232	8	0.11	1,026	0	0.00	6,206	8	0.13
Saint Mary's	15,482	*	0.01	2,121	*	0.05	13,361	*	0.01
Somerset	3,060	*	0.03	375	0	0.00	2,685	*	0.04
Talbot	4,516	11	0.24	474	7	1.48	4,042	*	0.10
Washington	19,961	77	0.39	2,925	16	0.55	17,036	61	0.36
Wicomico	14,116	0	0.00	1,679	0	0.00	12,437	0	0.00
Worcester	6,884	0	0.00	888	0	0.00	5,996	0	0.00

* Fewer than 5 students

MULTIPLE SUSPENSIONS SUMMING TO GREATER THAN 10 DAYS
OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM, 2001-2002

	All Students			Students with Disabilities			Students Without Disabilities		
	Total Enrollment 9/30/01	Number	Percent	SSIS Count 12/1/01	Number	Percent	Total Enrollment 9/30/01	Number	Percent
STATE	**860,640**	**6,483**	0.75	**111,551**	**1,538**	1.38	**749,089**	**4,901**	0.65
Allegany	10,180	59	0.58	1,892	11	0.58	8,288	48	0.58
Anne Arundel	75,081	454	0.60	10,448	95	0.91	64,633	359	0.56
Baltimore City	95,475	1,282	1.34	16,157	403	2.49	79,318	857	1.08
Edison Schools	2,342	*	0.04	226	0	0.00	2,116	*	0.05
Baltimore Co.	107,212	531	0.50	13,313	86	0.65	93,899	445	0.47
Calvert	16,651	124	0.74	2,183	23	1.05	14,468	101	0.70
Caroline	5,609	154	2.75	714	60	8.40	4,895	94	1.92
Carroll	28,127	104	0.37	3,732	28	0.75	24,395	75	0.31
Cecil	16,095	230	1.43	2,606	*	0.04	13,489	226	1.68
Charles	24,001	181	0.75	2,577	43	1.67	21,424	138	0.64
Dorchester	4,884	130	2.66	642	33	5.14	4,242	97	2.29
Frederick	38,022	292	0.77	4,537	76	1.68	33,485	216	0.65
Garrett	4,869	8	0.16	743	*	0.27	4,126	6	0.15
Harford	39,966	556	1.39	5,803	183	3.15	34,163	365	1.07
Howard	46,257	97	0.21	4,830	12	0.25	41,427	84	0.20
Kent	2,684	30	1.12	336	*	1.19	2,348	26	1.11
Montgomery	136,895	354	0.26	16,471	108	0.66	120,424	238	0.20
Prince George's	135,039	1,151	0.85	14,853	248	1.67	120,186	903	0.75
Queen Anne's	7,232	28	0.39	1,026	7	0.68	6,206	21	0.34
Saint Mary's	15,482	177	1.14	2,121	29	1.37	13,361	148	1.11
Somerset	3,060	110	3.59	375	11	2.93	2,685	98	3.65
Talbot	4,516	29	0.64	474	7	1.48	4,042	22	0.54
Washington	19,961	27	0.14	2,925	*	0.07	17,036	25	0.15
Wicomico	14,116	326	2.31	1,679	53	3.16	12,437	273	2.20
Worcester	6,884	48	0.70	888	13	0.58	5,996	35	0.58

* Fewer than 5 students

SHORT-TERM SUSPENSIONS (BETWEEN 1 AND 10 DAYS)
OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
BY LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM, 2001-2002 (1.4.2)

	All Students			Students with Disabilities			Students Without Disabilities		
	Total Enrollment 9/30/01	Number	Percent	SSIS Count 12/1/01	Number	Percent	Total Enrollment 9/30/01	Number	Percent
STATE	**860,640**	**69,100**	8.03	**111,551**	**15,668**	14.05	**749,089**	**53,609**	7.16
Allegany	10180	591	5.81	1892	197	10.41	8,288	399	4.81
Anne Arundel	75081	7,241	9.64	10448	2,033	19.46	64,633	5,208	8.06
Baltimore City	95475	10,663	11.17	16157	2,951	18.26	79,318	7,777	9.80
Edison Schools	2342	299	12.77	226	39	17.26	2,116	260	12.29
Baltimore Co.	107212	11,386	10.62	13313	2,044	15.35	93,899	9,342	9.95
Calvert	16651	1,175	7.06	2183	265	12.14	14,468	910	6.29
Caroline	5609	811	14.46	714	228	31.93	4,895	592	12.09
Carroll	28127	1,324	4.71	3732	380	10.18	24,395	946	3.88
Cecil	16095	1,917	11.91	2606	13	0.50	13,489	1,907	14.14
Charles	24001	2,945	12.27	2577	693	26.89	21,424	2,255	10.53
Dorchester	4884	729	14.93	642	154	23.99	4,242	575	13.55
Frederick	38022	2,506	6.59	4537	676	14.90	33,485	1,831	5.47
Garrett	4869	202	4.15	743	76	10.23	4,126	132	3.20
Harford	39966	2,996	7.50	5803	801	13.80	34,163	2,230	6.53
Howard	46257	1,857	4.01	4830	461	9.54	41,427	1,396	3.37
Kent	2684	286	10.66	336	67	19.94	2,348	225	9.58
Montgomery	136895	5,448	3.98	16471	1,396	8.48	120,424	4,084	3.39
Prince George's	135039	10,786	7.99	14853	1,960	13.20	120,186	8,826	7.34
Queen Anne's	7232	450	6.22	1026	138	13.45	6,206	319	5.14
Saint Mary's	15482	1,184	7.65	2121	240	11.32	13,361	944	7.07
Somerset	3060	534	17.45	375	77	20.53	2,685	459	17.09
Talbot	4516	327	7.24	474	83	17.51	4,042	244	6.04
Washington	19961	1,054	5.28	2925	263	8.99	17,036	791	4.64
Wicomico	14116	1,875	13.28	1679	308	18.34	12,437	1,567	12.60
Worcester	6884	514	7.47	888	125	14.08	5,996	390	6.50

FUNCTIONAL BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENTS AND INTERVENTION PLANS (1.4.3)

	ASSESSMENTS			FUNCTIONAL PLANS		
	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002
STATE Totals	3,625	4,775	5,807	3,457	4,576	5,479
Local School Systems						
Allegany	91	125	141	91	125	141
Anne Arundel	77	61	*	73	58	*
Baltimore City	650	1316	1597	650	1316	1597
Baltimore County	0	46	48	0	29	28
Calvert	26	41	127	21	34	105
Caroline	28	34	30	28	32	30
Carroll	244	251	266	222	240	248
Cecil	231	265	293	226	264	284
Charles	257	286	271	247	275	258
Dorchester	24	27	27	23	25	26
Frederick	216	0	296	205	0	282
Garrett	31	26	28	31	26	27
Harford	53	96	97	19	52	62
Howard	142	208	244	134	198	237
Kent	*	6	18	*	6	18
Montgomery	761	844	1033	713	782	870
Prince George's	539	761	878	539	761	878
Queen Anne's	29	22	16	27	21	15
Saint Mary's	34	66	80	32	59	72
Somerset	15	20	18	12	17	17
Talbot	*	45	44	*	43	43
Washington	19	38	46	19	37	44
Wicomico	39	76	78	38	70	73
Worcester	57	55	51	57	55	51
MD Sch. Blind	18	24	30	17	23	28

* Fewer than 5 students

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
IN NON-GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS (1.4.4)

Local School System	Dec. 1, 1998	Dec. 1, 1999	Dec. 1, 2000	Dec. 1, 2001	Dec. 1, 2002
Allegany	.91	3.31	3.87	4.39	1.91
Anne Arundel	9.24	9.06	9.30	9.35	5.33
Baltimore City	11.27	10.61	10.90	11.44	10.60
Edison Schools	N/A	N/A	0.00	0.00	0.00
Baltimore County	7.15	7.78	7.53	7.02	7.95
Calvert	6.88	6.06	5.84	6.32	5.66
Caroline	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.84	0.97
Carroll	2.92	3.21	3.99	4.66	5.53
Cecil	1.27	1.42	1.80	2.03	2.20
Charles	2.75	3.96	4.30	3.10	2.64
Dorchester	0.15	0.31	0.64	0.31	0.51
Frederick	4.02	4.66	4.90	4.23	4.91
Garrett	0.13	0.53	0.89	0.27	0.55
Harford	4.16	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.82
Howard	4.57	4.64	5.20	5.24	4.48
Kent	0.57	0.59	0.86	1.19	2.02
Montgomery	6.06	6.08	7.62	7.65	7.38
Prince George's	14.06	11.92	9.79	10.11	10.60
Queen Anne's	2.08	1.32	1.88	1.85	2.11
Saint Mary's	0.98	0.97	1.16	1.08	1.68
Somerset	0.73	0.50	2.27	2.93	1.94
Talbot	0.18	0.00	1.59	2.11	0.21
Washington	5.97	6.31	6.26	6.91	6.54
Wicomico	0.25	0.48	0.82	0.95	0.66
Worcester	0.45	0.22	0.11	0.23	0.58
STATE AVERAGE	7.74	7.63	7.67	7.71	7.30

Source 12/1 Child Count. Includes: Home/Hospital/Public Day & Residential/Private Day & Residential
Met MSIG Targeted Goal of 10% decrease over previous year.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

Objective 1-5

To organize, analyze, and report data on attendance and dropout rates of students with disabilities.

Trend Results for Goal Indicators 1.5.1 and 1.5.2

    1.5.1   Average attendance rates of students with disabilities will improve by .2% annually.

    1.5.2   Dropout rates of students with disabilities will decrease by 0.5% annually.

ATTENDANCE RATES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (1.5.1)

	Grades 1-5			Grades 6-8			Grades 9-12		
	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002
STATE AVERAGE	94.4	94.1	94.1	91.6	91.6	91.7	88.8	88.5	89.1
Local School System									
Allegany	•95.3	•95.1	•95.4	93.1	92.2	92.1	91.2	89.3	88.9
Anne Arundel	•94.7	•94.4	•94.4	92.4	92.3	92.0	90.4	90.6	91.1
Baltimore City	93.0	92.6	92.7	85.0	84.6	84.2	74.8	73.7	71.2
Baltimore County	•94.7	•94.5	•94.6	93.1	92.8	92.4	92.8	92.5	92.7
Calvert	•95.0	•94.9	•94.9	93.9	93.9	•94.2	92.9	92.6	93.0
Caroline	•94.5	•94.0	93.9	92.1	91.4	91.4	92.0	91.5	89.7
Carroll	•95.2	•95.0	•94.8	•94.1	•94.4	93.9	92.4	92.7	92.6
Cecil	•94.4	93.4	93.8	91.8	91.4	91.3	90.1	88.9	89.5
Charles	•94.8	•97.9	•94.0	92.1	•96.7	90.9	89.2	•95.8	89.5
Dorchester	•94.8	93.8	•94.2	91.5	92.1	90.3	86.5	83.4	88.5
Frederick	•94.3	•94.1	•94.7	92.0	91.5	92.3	89.3	89.1	89.7
Garrett	•96.6	•95.4	•94.9	•95.7	•95.2	•94.3	•94.4	•94.6	93.9
Harford	•95.0	•94.4	•94.5	92.8	92.5	92.0	89.4	89.6	89.7
Howard	•95.5	•95.2	•95.2	93.9	93.3	93.3	93.1	92.9	92.6
Kent	•95.1	93.9	•94.3	92.4	92.0	91.8	86.6	89.9	88.5
Montgomery	•95.1	•94.4	•94.5	93.7	92.9	92.7	92.6	89.2	90.3
Prince George's	93.2	93.0	93.1	93.1	93.8	•97.3	89.1	91.2	•98.2
Queen Anne's	•94.4	•94.3	•94.3	93.1	92.7	92.4	88.8	88.4	89.6
Saint Mary's	•94.9	•94.1	•94.1	91.0	90.8	90.6	88.2	87.7	87.8
Somerset	•94.4	93.3	•94.0	91.8	92.9	93.6	88.8	92.8	92.8
Talbot	•95.3	•95.4	•94.7	93.8	93.7	93.2	93.3	92.9	92.7
Washington	•95.4	•95.2	•95.4	•94.2	93.9	•94.5	93.3	93.5	93.3
Wicomico	93.6	•94.1	•94.4	88.4	89.4	89.1	87.9	88.9	90.2
Worcester	•94.6	•94.4	93.9	93.8	93.4	93.2	92.0	91.7	91.3

Met MSIG Targeted Goal of a .2 percentage point increase over previous year.   • Met State satisfactory standard of 94%.

HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT RATES FOR
REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (1.5.2)

| | Dropouts, Grades 9-12 (as a percent of ALL students) | | | | | |
| | Regular Education | | | Special Education | | |
	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002
STATE AVERAGE	3.95	3.86	3.67	3.45	4.38	3.82
Allegany	2.89	3.30	3.40	5.93	5.93	8.95
Anne Arundel	4.02	3.98	4.70	7.14	6.68	·0.81
Baltimore City	11.67	11.53	10.05	·1.54	10.12	11.82
Baltimore County	3.61	2.82	3.04	·0.50	·0.25	·0.17
Calvert	3.70	3.92	3.27	·0.24	·0.87	·2.33
Caroline	6.31	5.01	5.95	·2.00	·0.00	·0.00
Carroll	2.43	2.07	1.79	3.85	·2.79	3.42
Cecil	5.50	4.18	3.30	·0.00	·0.96	·0.88
Charles	4.39	3.65	3.47	·0.00	·0.00	·0.00
Dorchester	6.32	3.42	4.61	9.58	6.51	11.66
Frederick	2.27	2.27	1.62	4.84	7.00	·2.85
Garrett	3.74	3.36	4.27	4.04	11.76	6.36
Harford	3.54	3.29	2.94	6.27	4.84	4.99
Howard	1.84	2.03	1.84	·0.29	·0.45	·2.07
Kent	3.22	3.89	5.45	7.59	·1.35	7.37
Montgomery	1.59	1.58	1.71	·2.85	·2.38	·2.24
Prince George's	2.38	3.08	3.03	·1.43	·1.78	·0.25
Queen Anne's	3.18	2.96	2.75	6.23	5.92	5.21
Saint Mary's	2.73	2.86	2.49	4.75	3.69	6.07
Somerset	5.01	6.86	5.46	4.20	11.29	·2.33
Talbot	2.42	2.17	2.64	·1.56	6.45	4.73
Washington	5.41	3.26	2.59	6.41	6.69	5.50
Wicomico	5.18	5.49	6.33	4.97	·0.00	·1.33
Worcester	3.98	1.84	3.02	4.78	·2.05	3.09

Met SIG Improvement Rate of 0.5% Annually, or maintained at 0.0%.

· Met State satisfactory standard of 3.0% dropout rate or less.

MSIG Goal 1: Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation, and technical assistance for education reform and system improvement.

<u>Objective 1-6</u>

Within local school systems, the percentage of African American students with disabilities and African American students in the total student population will be proportionate.

<u>Indicators 1-6</u>

    1.6.1   Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as students with a disability will decrease annually.

    1.6.2   Within local school systems, the disproportionate identification of African American students as mentally retarded (MR), emotionally disturbed (ED), learning disabled (LD), and "other disabilities" (as an aggregated category) will decrease.

PERCENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY RACE, DEC. 1, 2001 (1.6.1)

Local School System	American Indian /Alaskan Native		Asian / Pacific Islander		African American		White		Hispanic	
	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed
Allegany	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.7	4.3	3.4	94.8	95.4	0.2	0.3
Anne Arundel	0.2	0.2	1.2	2.9	23.4	20.1	73.1	74.3	2.0	2.5
Baltimore City	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.6	85.1	87.7	13.9	10.4	0.5	0.9
Edison Schools	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	99.6	99.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2
Baltimore Co.	0.7	0.5	1.4	4.0	33.6	33.7	62.7	59.7	1.7	2.0
Calvert	0.3	0.1	0.8	0.9	23.7	15.7	74.4	82.2	0.7	1.0
Caroline	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.9	26.6	19.1	72.4	77.5	1.0	2.5
Carroll	0.3	0.2	0.9	1.1	3.7	2.4	94.1	95.4	1.0	0.9
Cecil	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.7	6.9	6.3	91.5	91.0	1.3	1.7
Charles	1.3	1.0	1.2	2.4	43.0	37.5	53.1	57.1	1.4	2.1
Dorchester	0.5	0.2	0.9	1.0	51.2	42.3	46.3	55.3	1.1	1.3
Frederick	0.1	0.2	1.1	2.4	12.5	9.1	83.9	85.5	2.3	2.9
Garrett	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.3	98.8	99.5	0.0	0.1
Harford	0.1	0.5	1.2	2.2	15.9	14.8	81.2	80.2	1.6	2.4
Howard	0.2	0.2	4.0	10.4	23.1	17.8	69.9	68.7	2.7	2.9
Kent	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.4	34.8	26.2	63.7	70.5	1.2	2.7
Montgomery	0.3	0.3	5.9	13.9	26.5	21.1	49.7	47.4	17.6	17.2
Prince George's	0.5	0.5	1.6	3.2	78.3	77.4	13.3	10.3	6.4	8.6
Queen Anne's	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.8	14.9	10.2	84.2	88.1	0.2	0.7
Saint Mary's	0.9	0.5	0.9	2.2	24.3	18.8	72.8	76.7	1.1	1.8
Somerset	0.5	0.1	0.8	0.9	42.7	45.9	54.9	51.3	1.1	1.6
Talbot	0.4	0.2	0.6	1.3	34.6	23.9	62.2	72.2	2.1	2.5
Washington	0.3	0.2	0.3	1.2	8.1	8.5	89.9	88.5	1.3	1.6
Wicomico	0.2	0.1	1.0	2.3	40.7	35.7	56.5	59.5	1.7	2.4
Worcester	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.7	36.8	25.8	61.7	71.6	1.2	1.7
STATE AVERAGE	**0.4**	**0.4**	**1.8**	**4.6**	**39.8**	**37.2**	**53.6**	**52.4**	**4.4**	**5.4**

Source: Maryland Special Education Census Data, Dec. 1 Child Count
*General Education numbers include Students with Disabilities

PERCENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY RACE, DEC. 1, 2002 (1.6.1)

Local School System	American Indian /Alaskan Native		Asian / Pacific Islander		African American		White		Hispanic	
	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed
Allegany	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.6	4.8	4.0	94.4	94.9	0.2	0.2
Anne Arundel	0.3	0.2	1.1	3.0	23.5	20.3	72.8	73.5	2.3	2.9
Baltimore City	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6	85.5	88.0	13.2	9.8	0.6	1.2
Edison Schools	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	99.6	99.5	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4
Baltimore Co.	0.7	0.5	1.5	4.2	34.9	35.3	61.3	57.8	1.6	2.2
Calvert	0.3	0.2	0.6	1.1	23.7	15.6	74.6	82.0	0.9	1.1
Caroline	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.8	24.8	19.2	73.7	76.9	1.4	2.9
Carroll	0.3	0.2	0.9	1.1	3.7	2.6	94.1	95.1	1.0	1.0
Cecil	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.7	6.9	6.8	91.1	90.2	1.7	2.0
Charles	1.2	0.9	1.5	2.6	43.3	39.2	52.4	55.0	1.6	2.3
Dorchester	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.1	51.3	42.1	46.5	55.0	1.5	1.6
Frederick	0.2	0.2	1.4	2.6	12.2	9.5	83.2	84.2	3.0	3.4
Garrett	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.2	99.2	99.5	0.0	0.1
Harford	0.1	0.5	1.1	2.2	16.8	15.5	80.4	79.2	1.7	2.5
Howard	0.2	0.2	4.4	11.0	23.7	17.9	68.7	67.6	3.1	3.2
Kent	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.5	34.4	25.8	63.0	70.6	2.3	2.9
Montgomery	0.4	0.3	6.2	14.2	26.8	21.4	48.1	46.1	18.5	17.9
Prince George's	0.5	0.6	1.7	3.1	78.2	77.7	12.4	9.1	7.2	9.5
Queen Anne's	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.8	14.7	9.7	84.1	88.3	0.4	0.9
Saint Mary's	0.9	0.6	1.1	2.2	23.4	18.9	73.1	76.4	1.4	2.0
Somerset	0.3	0.0	0.8	1.0	40.2	45.6	56.8	51.5	1.9	1.8
Talbot	0.2	0.3	1.1	1.8	33.8	22.8	61.5	72.3	3.4	2.8
Washington	0.4	0.2	0.4	1.2	9.0	8.9	89.0	88.0	1.3	1.7
Wicomico	0.2	0.2	1.3	2.6	41.6	36.2	55.4	58.5	1.6	2.6
Worcester	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.7	35.7	25.5	62.8	71.6	1.4	2.1
STATE AVERAGE	**0.4**	**0.4**	**2.0**	**4.8**	**39.6**	**37.8**	**53.1**	**51.9**	**4.9**	**5.9**

Source: Maryland Special Education Census Data, Dec. 1 Child Count
*General Education numbers include Students with Disabilities

MSIG Goal 2

MSIG Goal 2: Professional development will be designed and delivered on the basis of student performance data that demonstrate needs for building competencies and capacities to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 2-1

To integrate MSIG professional development with MSDE professional development guidelines and initiatives for standards-based reform.

Indicators 2-1

2.1.1   100% of Maryland's neonatal care staff, hospital obstetric services staff, pediatricians, and family practitioners will receive information on identification, referral, and early intervention services.

2.1.2   100% of personnel serving infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will participate in professional development activities related to supporting family priorities and providing early intervention services in natural environments.

2.1.3   100 % of special education teachers and related service personnel serving kindergarten-age students with disabilities will participate in professional development activities on the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment program.

2.1.4   100% of professional development delivered to meet MSIG goals will fulfill the requirements described in Strategic Directions for Professional Development in Maryland Public Schools.

Objective 2-2

To Initiate informed and cohesive statewide participation in the implementation of the IDEA 1997 regulations, the Maryland SIG and its professional development initiatives, within the context of the Maryland School.

Indicators 2-2

2.2.1   Initial information on IDEA 1997 regulations and implementation of the MSIG will reach 100% of the leadership of partners and other participants.

2.2.2   100% of local administrators will become involved in advancing the goals and work of the MSIG with relation to their own districts.

Objective 2-3

To organize collaborative adoption, design, and delivery of sustained professional development programs to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities within the context of standards-based reform.

Indicators 2-3

2.3.1   100% of Maryland's professional development delivery systems and resources will be informed of the MSIG's professional development goals and initiatives.

2.3.2   100% of Maryland's professional development delivery system will be represented in the Professional Development Steering Group to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities.

2.3.3   100 % of Maryland's public schools will receive professional development promising practices information.

2.3.4   100 % of LSS administrators/directors of special education will recommend and encourage participation in programs.

Objective 2-4

To respond in 1999 to immediate needs for professional development to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Indicators 2-4

2.4.1   20 school districts will receive MSIG professional development awards for fall 2000 with 200 participants.

2.4.2   Practitioners and parents will participate in the new MSDE regional professional development on behavior management, discipline, alternative settings and environment in 2000.

2.4.3   Practitioners and parents will participate in the new MSDE regional professional development on behavioral assessments in 2000.

2.4.4   Practitioners and parents will participate in the new MSDE professional development on transition strategies in 2000.

2.4.5   Practitioners, personnel from community agencies that provide post-school supports, and parent resource center leaders will participate in professional development in interagency planning of post-school supports for students with disabilities in 1999.

2.4.6   Cadres of district-based trainers on effective practices for inclusion of LD students will be prepared in 100% of Maryland's districts during 2001.

Objective 2-5

To establish parameters for involving the spectrum of school personnel, parents, and others in professional development to build competencies and capacities for improving education for students with disabilities, 2000-2003.

Indicators 2-5

2.5.1   The 24 district-based trainer cadres will, in turn, provide professional development to approximately 4,800 practitioners and parents per year between 2000 and 2003.

MSIG Goal 2: Professional development will be designed and delivered on the basis of student performance data that demonstrate needs for building competencies and capacities to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 2-1

To integrate MSIG professional development with MSDE professional development guidelines and initiatives for standards-based reform.

Indicators 2-1

    2.1.4   100% of professional development delivered to meet MSIG goals will fulfill the requirements described in Strategic Directions for Professional Development in Maryland Public Schools.

FY 2002 REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES* (2.1)

STATE NETWORK	DESCRIPTION***	PROJECTED NUMBER OF EDUCATORS**	FUNDING AMOUNT
Baltimore City	The network program consists of the Technology Leaders in the Classroom initiative, which utilizes a training of trainers model to certify school technology teams. Members of the teams develop lesson plans and classroom activities that are available to all Baltimore City Public School personnel via the web. Also team members train, coach, and mentor the staff in their home schools. As a result of teacher training and curricula infusion, coupled with project-based classrooms and distance learning, 75% of students in selected schools will be computer literate.	416	$102,000
Eastern Shore	The network program represents a collaborative staff development initiative with three main focus areas: Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), High School Assessments (HSA), and Aspiring Leaders. At the network level, school systems send prospective administrator candidates, the Aspiring Leaders, to a series of yearlong training sessions for the purpose of creating a pool of administrator candidates versed in effective school leadership. MSPAP and HSA are addressed at the local school system level with a variety of ongoing staff development events designed ultimately to improve student performance on MSPAP and to prepare high school students for the successful completion of the content assessments.	3,726	$221,000
North Central	The network supports efforts to improve the quality of instruction in local schools to increase achievement for all students. The network provides training and collaborative follow-up to a cadre of teachers who train fellow teachers to focus on improving achievement on all state assessments, including ensuring success for students on the Maryland High School Assessments.	4,362	$155,000
Prince George's	The network implements professional development to support the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) and the High School Improvement Program through teacher research models of action research and inquiry group methodology. Teacher research projects focus on reading instruction and improving achievement.	1,477	$135,000
Southern Maryland	The network focuses on improving student performance with the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) and the High School Improvement Program. It extends the system wide literacy program that supports continuous improvement of K-8 instruction for all students in the area of reading/language arts and as a result increases student achievement.	597	$100,000
West Central	The network supports the implementation of continuous standards-based staff development programs that result in the improvement of instruction and higher achievement for students. The main focus is the High School Improvement Program and Reading Strategies /Action Research, targeting reading and writing in the content areas. The audience is secondary teachers in content areas, which are part of the High School Assessments, school based administrators and central office personnel.	795	$150,000
Western Maryland	The network cooperatively implements professional development to support the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) and the High School Improvement Program by sharing common goals. The Network focuses on improving student performance on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) and the High School Assessments. Additionally, the network supports school and system improvement plans focused on improving teaching, learning, and school management including teacher leaders aspiring to administrative positions.	1719	$215,000
Western Shore	In response to the need for increasing the skills and abilities of administrators the network is creating a leadership academy for principals, aspiring principals, and teacher leaders. Academic focus is on intellectual development, school improvement, collaborative support, and continuous improvement. A partnership with Western Maryland College has been established to provide certification in administration. This program applies research strategies and best practices to the professional development of leadership based on the belief that the outcome will result in positive student achievement.	137	$139,000
TOTAL		**13,229**	**$1,217,000**

*   See Appendix C for CSPD activities and specifications by district.

** Includes teachers (regular and special education), administrators and other educators that support classroom instruction and student learning.

*** All programs provide intensive staff development with multiple learning opportunities and follow-up throughout the school year.

MSIG Goal 3

MSIG Goal 3: Pre-service programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 3-1

To integrate MSIG pre-service preparation alignment activities with MSDE initiatives for teacher education redesign.

Indicator 3-1

3.1.1 100% of faculty and leadership engaged in pre-service education of personnel who serve infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive principles and guidelines for family-centered, community-based early intervention service delivery.

3.1.2 100% of faculty engaged in pre-service education of early childhood special and general education personnel will receive training on the implementation of the work sampling system for the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment program.

3.1.3 100% of graduating Institution of Higher Education (IHE) students in early childhood special and general education programs will receive training on the implementation of the work sampling system for the MSDE Early Childhood Assessment program.

3.1.4 100% of faculty and leadership involved in pre-service education in general education, special education, and related services will receive the principles and guidelines on redesigning pre-service preparation.

Objective 3-2

To improve pre-service capacities for preparing personnel who are competent to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities, in alignment with standards-based reform and a professional development continuum.

Indicators 3-2

3.2.1 By November 2000, 100% of Maryland's current PDSs will have District-IHE Teams for planning pre-service alignment and articulation between two-year and four-year institutions.

3.2.2 By 2003, District-IHE Teams for planning pre-service alignment and articulation will exist in at least 50 PDSs that involve all school districts and all pre-service programs in special education, general education, related services, and school administration.

3.2.3 Measurable improvements related to standards-based education of children with disabilities will occur in all of Maryland's pre-service preparation programs each year from 2000 to 2003.

Objective 3-3

To assist pre-service programs in general and special education in meeting new requirements in reading theory and methodology for initial certification or re-certification (and in other program changes that evolve through alignment with standards-based reform).

Objective 3-4

To reduce the number of personnel who are providing instruction to students with disabilities without full qualifications to do so.

Indicator 3-4

3.4.1 Between 1999 and 2003, approximately 150 practitioners will receive full certification as a result of training for delivery of instruction to students with autism.

3.4.2 Between 1999 and 2002, approximately 80 practitioners will receive full certification as a result of training for delivery of instruction to students with visual disabilities.

3.4.3 Stipend/scholarship support for practitioners in training for full certification in critical areas will be available to all 24 LEAs.

3.4.4 Additional practitioners, as identified, will receive full certification as a result of LSS-IHE training partnerships between 2000 and 2003, through projects generated by MSIG-supported RFPs.

Objective 3-5

To increase the supply of new personnel who are qualified to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 3-5

3.5.1 The numbers of special education trainees who are new personnel in the teacher education pipeline will increase by 20% between 2000 and 2003.

MSIG Goal 3: Pre-service programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 3-2

To improve pre-service capacities for preparing personnel who are competent to improve education and outcomes for students with disabilities, in alignment with standards-based reform and a professional development continuum.

Indicators 3-2

3.2.1 By November 2000, 100% of Maryland's current PDSs will have District-IHE Teams for planning pre-service alignment and articulation between two-year and four-year institutions.

3.2.2 By 2003, District-IHE Teams for planning pre-service alignment and articulation will exist in at least 50 PDSs that involve all school districts and all pre-service programs in special education, general education, related services, and school administration.

3.2.3 Measurable improvements related to standards-based education of children with disabilities will occur in all of Maryland's pre-service preparation programs each year from 2000 to 2003.

MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (IHE) PARTNERSHIPS (3.2)

IHE	AGREEMENT	LSSs	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
Bowie State University	Yes	Prince George's	• Mentoring • Accommodation Training	50,000 25,000
College of Notre Dame of Maryland	Yes	Harford	• Reading Courses • Mentoring	25,000
Coppin State University	Yes	Baltimore City	• Assessment Training • Mentoring	50,000 25,000
Frostburg State College	Yes	Allegany Garrett	• Mentoring • Learning strategy training • Developing a dual SE/Secondary Program	50,000 25,000 15,000
Goucher College	Yes	Anne Arundel	• Mentoring • Assessment training • Coaching of provisional teachers	50,000 35,000 25,000
Hood College	Yes	Washington Garrett	• Mentoring • Learning strategy training	50,000 25,000
Johns Hopkins Univ.	Yes	Howard	• Mentoring ECI/SE teachers	50,000 25,000
Loyola College	Yes	Baltimore Howard	• Stipends for ECI/SE program • Mentoring Teachers • PDS development	50,000 25,000
Mount St. Mary's College	Yes	Frederick	• Mentoring • Developing dual SE/Elem. Program	50,000 25,000
Towson University	Yes	Howard Baltimore County	• Mentoring • PDS development	50,000 25,000
University of Maryland - College Park	Yes	Prince George's	• Mentoring • PDS development • Inclusion training	50,000 35,000 25,000
University of Maryland – Eastern Shore	Yes	Kent Dorchester Caroline	Being processed	

LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM GRANTS

Local School System	Grants Received and Approved	Grant Topic Area(s)
Allegany	5/15/02	Handwriting Strategies: OT in-service
Anne Arundel	9/01/02	MSA Strategies
Baltimore City	6/30/02	Collaboration and Inclusion
Baltimore County	5/15/02	Training for General and Special Educators on writing IEP Goals
Calvert	9/23/02	Training on IEP development and access to general education
Caroline	5/15/02	IMAP strategies; independent living
Carroll	5/15/02	Reading Assessment and Instruction
Cecil	5/15/02	FBA and BIP
Charles	5/15/02	IMAP and Autism Training
Dorchester	5/15/02	Accommodations in General Education and Special Education; Instructional Strategies
Frederick	5/15/02	WJ-III training
Garrett	5/15/02	Inclusion of SED students
Harford	5/15/02	Reading and Writing Strategy Instruction
Howard	5/15/02	New teacher mentoring
Kent		
Montgomery	5/15/02	Inclusion
Prince George's	5/15/02	Accommodations for Middle School Students
Queen Anne's	5/15/02	Academy of Reading Autoskill Program
St. Mary's	5/15/02	Paraeducator training
Somerset		
Talbot	5/15/02	Inclusion
Washington	5/15/02	SIMS Training
Wicomico		
Worcester	9/23/02	Inclusionary Practices
Maryland School for the Deaf	5/15/02	Curriculum training and development; Reading Strategies with Hood College

LSS Grants Pending as of February 11, 2003: Somerset, Kent, and Wicomico Counties

MSIG Goal 3: Pre-service programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 3-5

To increase the supply of new personnel who are qualified to improve education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 3-5

3.5.1   The numbers of special education trainees who are new personnel in the teacher education pipeline will increase by 20% between 2000 and 2003.

Computation Methodology

Identify Maryland teachers and therapists that have and do not have certifications.

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND THERAPISTS
WITH AND WITHOUT CERTIFICATES (3.5.1)

Local School System	Students with Disabilities (Dec. 1, 2002)	Special Education Teachers*		Therapists*	
		Certified	Non-Certified	Certified	Non-Certified
		2002	2002	2002	2002
Allegany County	1,781	85	5	22	3
Anne Arundel County	10,695	653	21	107	15
Baltimore City	15,178	1,187	184	127	46
Edison Schools	231	1	0	1	1
Baltimore County	13,559	891	73	179	90
Calvert County	2,315	153	2	19	14
Caroline County	722	46	0	5	0
Carroll County	3,725	178	3	55	21
Cecil County	2,593	167	0	18	0
Charles County	2,504	168	26	25	6
Dorchester County	591	40	2	3	0
Frederick County	4,728	231	0	50	5
Garrett County	721	35	0	6	0
Harford County	6,079	286	19	29	9
Howard County	5,005	462	24	85	50
Kent County	346	18	0	4	0
Montgomery County	17,013	1,180	89	218	137
Prince George's County	15,076	1,032	131	149	52
Queen Anne's County	995	54	1	6	2
Saint Mary's County	2,144	151	1	19	7
Somerset County	361	26	0	1	4
Talbot County	467	29	0	4	2
Washington County	2,829	139	5	16	3
Wicomico County	1,663	119	9	8	4
Worcester County	860	62	0	5	3

Source: MSDE, Division of Planning, Results, and Information Management

* Certification as of April 4, 2003

MSIG Goal 4

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

<u>Objective 4-1</u>

To organize a permanent Steering Group to guide activities and inform all stakeholders on plans for statewide outreach and evaluation activities to improve early intervention capacities.

<u>Indicators 4-1</u>

4.1.1 100% of partners and stakeholders in Maryland's early intervention system will receive information on plans for the comprehensive evaluation and their participatory involvement by April 99.

<u>Objective 4-2</u>

To improve current efforts to identify all Maryland infants and toddlers who are potentially eligible to receive early intervention services under Part C of IDEA and inform families about available services.

<u>Indicators 4-2</u>

4.2.1 Report % of total State population of children birth to three years referred annually.

4.2.2 Report % of total State population of children birth to three years served annually.

4.2.3 % of children from birth to two years of age referred or recommended by physicians and hospitals will increase annually.

4.2.4 % of children birth to three years of age referred from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.

4.2.5 % of children and families from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.

Objective 4-3

To provide families of eligible infants and toddlers with service delivery options that address the identified needs of their children and support family priorities.

Indicators 4-3

4.3.1 % of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services in childcare environments, including Judy Centers, will increase annually.

4.3.2 % of children who are withdrawn from the early intervention system by parents prior to attaining desired outcomes will decrease annually.

Objective 4-4

To improve transition of children and families from early intervention to preschool and other community-based services.

Indicators 4-4

4.4.1 The number of toddlers exiting early intervention services at age three who transition to community-based services will increase, whether or not they are eligible for preschool special education.

4.4.2 % of families indicating satisfaction with their child's transition from the early intervention system at age three will increase.

4.4.3 10% of toddlers exiting the early intervention system at age three will participate in a pilot phase of MSDE's Early Childhood Assessment Program that provides a work sampling system for preschool services.

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

<u>Objective 4-2</u>

To improve current efforts to identify all Maryland infants and toddlers who are potentially eligible to receive early intervention services under Part C of IDEA and inform families about available services.

<u>Indicators 4-2</u>

4.2.1 Report % of total State population of children birth to three years referred annually.

4.2.2 Report % of total State population of children birth to three years served annually.

4.2.3 % of children from birth to two years of age referred or recommended by physicians and hospitals will increase annually.

4.2.4 % of children birth to three years of age referred from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.

4.2.5 % of children and families from Asian and Hispanic populations will increase to be proportionately representative of the statewide Asian and Hispanic populations of infants and toddlers.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Percentage of Age 0-3 Population Referred (4.2.1)

LITP	1999-2001 Total Births	12/1/2002 Referrals	Percentage Referred
Allegany	2,230	147	6.59%
Anne Arundel	20,344	809	3.98%
Baltimore City	28,476	1,170	4.11%
Baltimore County	27,455	1,606	5.85%
Calvert	2,935	87	2.96%
Caroline	1,159	20	1.73%
Carroll	5,609	298	5.31%
Cecil	3,484	115	3.30%
Charles	5,168	153	2.96%
Dorchester	978	53	5.42%
Frederick	8,398	320	3.81%
Garrett	1,016	13	1.28%
Harford	8,774	479	5.46%
Howard	10,537	593	5.63%
Kent	569	17	2.99%
Montgomery	38,573	1,494	3.87%
Prince George's	36,593	986	2.69%
Queen Anne's	1,447	97	6.70%
St. Mary's	3,784	140	3.70%
Somerset	770	28	3.64%
Talbot	1,056	78	7.39%
Washington	4,869	199	4.09%
Wicomico	3,436	108	3.14%
Worcester	1,546	65	4.20%
State Totals*	**219,206**	**9,075**	**4.14%**

* Based on the annual count of children served in a 12 month period

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Percentage of Age 0-3 Population Served (4.2.2)

LITP	1999-2001 Total Births	12/1/02 Snapshot	Percent Served	12/1/2002 Annual Count	Percent Served
Allegany	2,230	87	3.90%	135	6.05%
Anne Arundel	20,344	472	2.32%	864	4.25%
Baltimore City	28,476	866	3.04%	1,314	4.61%
Baltimore County	27,455	825	3.00%	1,346	4.90%
Calvert	2,935	66	2.25%	103	3.51%
Caroline	1,159	18	1.55%	46	3.97%
Carroll	5,609	140	2.50%	228	4.06%
Cecil	3,484	51	1.46%	98	2.81%
Charles	5,168	83	1.61%	152	2.94%
Dorchester	978	41	4.19%	67	6.85%
Frederick	8,398	196	2.33%	340	4.05%
Garrett	1,016	23	2.26%	23	2.26%
Harford	8,774	275	3.13%	511	5.82%
Howard	10,537	269	2.55%	499	4.74%
Kent	569	4	0.70%	10	1.76%
Montgomery	38,573	1,030	2.67%	1,677	4.35%
Prince George's	36,593	645	1.76%	1,104	3.02%
Queen Anne's	1,447	46	3.18%	61	4.22%
St. Mary's	3,784	114	3.01%	160	4.23%
Somerset	770	9	1.17%	9	1.17%
Talbot	1,056	36	3.41%	50	4.73%
Washington	4,869	125	2.57%	202	4.15%
Wicomico	3,436	81	2.36%	147	4.28%
Worcester	1,546	16	1.03%	36	2.33%
State Totals*	**219,206**	**5,518**	**2.52%**	**9,182**	**4.19%**

* Based on the annual count of children served in a 12 month period

Children from Birth to Age Two by Referral Source (4.2.3)

Referral Source	12/1/2000		12/1/2001		12/1/2002	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Hospital	27.0%	1,120	26.3%	1,093	24.8%	1,051
Physician	6.5%	272	7.1%	294	7.4%	312
Total	**33.5%**	**1,392**	**33.4%**	**1,387**	**32.2%**	**1,363**

Total Referrals 12/99-12/00		Total Referrals 12/00-12/01		Total Referrals 12/01-12/02	
Birth to Age Two	4,153	Birth to Age Two	4,152	Birth to Age Two	4,232

Children from Birth to Age Two by Referral Recommendation (4.2.3)

Referral Recommendation	12/1/2000		12/1/2001		12/1/2002	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Hospital	17.3%	720	17.1%	710	18.7%	791
Physician	22.9%	949	26.6%	1,103	32.5%	1,376
Total	**40.2%**	**1,669**	**43.7%**	**1,813**	**51.2%**	**2,167**

Total Referrals 12/99-12/00		Total Referrals 12/00-12/01		Total Referrals 12/01-12/02	
Birth to Age Two	4,153	Birth to Age Two	4,152	Birth to Age Two	4,232

Percentage of Children Referred from Asian and Hispanic Populations (4.2.4)

Population	Percentage of 2000-2001 Births	Percentage Referred 2000	Percentage Referred 2001	Percentage Referred 2002
Asian	5.0%	1.7%	2.3%	2.6%
Hispanic	7.0%	3.2%	4.3%	5.0%

Percentage of Children Served from Asian and Hispanic Populations (4.2.5)

Population	Percentage of 2000-2001 Births	Percentage Served 2000	Percentage Served 2001	Percentage Served 2002
Asian	5.0%	2.1%	2.2%	2.6%
Hispanic	7.0%	3.7%	4.0%	5.2%

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

<u>Objective 4-3</u>

To provide families of eligible infants and toddlers with service delivery options that address the identified needs of their children and support family priorities.

<u>Indicators 4-3</u>

4.3.1 % of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services in childcare environments, including Judy Centers, will increase annually.

4.3.2 % of children who are withdrawn from the early intervention system by parents prior to attaining desired outcomes will decrease annually.

Percentage of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Child Care Environments (4.3.1)

Population	12/1/2000		12/1/2001		12/1/2002	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Family Day Care	2.6%	207	2.2%	183	3.0%	271
Child Care Center	2.6%	209	3.3%	278	4.5%	409
Family/Center	0.3%	23	0.3%	26	0.3%	24
Judy Center		*	0.0%	*	0.2%	20
Total	**5.6%**	**439**	**5.8%**	**491**	**8.0%**	**724**

Total Served 12/99-12/00	7,894	Total Served 12/00-12/01	8,444	Total Served 12/01-12/02	9,075

* Fewer than 5 children

Percentage of Children Withdrawn from the Early Intervention System by Parents Prior to Attaining the Desired Outcomes (4.3.2)

	12/1/2000	12/1/2001	12/1/2002
Total Exiting	3,623	4,070	4,815
Number of Parent Withdrawals	508	557	572
Percentage of Parent Withdrawals	**14%**	**14%**	**12%**

MSIG Goal 4: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

Objective 4-4

To improve transition of children and families from early intervention to preschool and other community-based services.

Indicators 4-4

4.4.1   The number of toddlers exiting early intervention services at age three who transition to community-based services will increase, whether or not they are eligible for preschool special education.

4.4.2   % of families indicating satisfaction with their child's transition from the early intervention system at age three will increase.

4.4.3   10% of toddlers exiting the early intervention system at age three will participate in a pilot phase of MSDE's Early Childhood Assessment Program that provides a work sampling system for preschool services.

Percentage of Toddlers Exiting Early Intervention Services at Age Three
Who Transition to Community-Based Services (4.4.1)

12/1/2000			
Eligibility	Total # Transitioning	Transition W/Referrals	Percentage
Eligible for Preschool Special Education	1,745	723	41.4%
Not Eligible for Preschool Special Education	560	141	25.2%
Total	2,305	864	37.5%

12/1/2001			
Eligibility	Total # Transitioning	Transition W/Referrals	Percentage
Eligible for Preschool Special Education	2,022	740	36.6%
Not Eligible for Preschool Special Education	576	126	21.9%
Total	2,598	866	33.3%

12/1/2002			
Eligibility	Total # Transitioning	Transition W/Referrals	Percentage
Eligible for Preschool Special Education	2,166	939	43.4%
Not Eligible for Preschool Special Education	261	133	51.0%
Total	2,427	1,072	44.2%

MSIG Goal 5

MSIG Goal: Capacities for improving instruction and outcomes for students with disabilities will be strengthened throughout Maryland's education community as a result of technical assistance for improvement of education and management of change.

Objective 5-1
To adopt and communicate a model for delivery of technical assistance.

Objective 5-2
To provide information and technical assistance to promote the adoption and implementation of research and effective practices for improving education and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Indicators 5-2

5.2.1   By 2003, 50% of school districts will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving education and outcomes for students with disabilities.

5.2.2   By 2003, 100% of professional development delivery systems and sources will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving professional development in education for students with disabilities.

5.2.3   By 2003, 50% of pre-service programs will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving personnel preparation in education for students with disabilities.

5.2.4   By 2003, 50% of the Partners for Success centers will adopt and implement new effective practices and research findings as a basis for improving parent-educator skills and knowledge.

Objective 5-3
To organize a broad-based Consumer Review Group for quality control and continuous feedback of information needs.

Objective 5-4
To convene annual conferences to advance stakeholder participation in using research and effective practice for improving education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Objective 5-5

To provide needs-based assistance to all Maryland school districts for improving education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 5-5

5.5.1 Across districts, the overall performance of students with disabilities on MSPAP measures will improve by 3% per year from the 1997-1998 baseline to 2002-2003.

5.5.2 Among Maryland's low-performing schools, the overall performance of students with disabilities will improve on all outcome measures will improve by 3% per year from the 1997-1998 baseline to 2002-2003.

5.5.3 At least 10 successful local practitioners will become part of school improvement cadres each year between 1999 and 2003, for a total of at least 50 practitioner-consultants by 2003.

Objective 5-6

To provide assistance with reviews of State and local policies that influence education and outcomes of students with disabilities.

Indicators 5-6

5.6.1 Review of all MSDE policies and procedures relating to education of students with disabilities, with modifications as appropriate.

Objective 5-7

To secure and leverage additional resources that will complement the work of the State Improvement Grant.

Indicators 5-7

5.7.1 At least 15 grant applications for projects that complement and extend MSIG activities will be submitted to public and private agencies between 1999 and 2003.

5.7.2 Grants to LSSs will leverage approximately $1.5 million per year in local discretionary projects designed to address standards-based reform of education and better results for students with disabilities.

5.7.3 MSIG activities in cooperation with parallel or complementary projects and programs of the MSDE will add a value of at least $50,000 per year to the MSIG resources from 1999 to 2003.

Appendix A

Elaboration of Local School System Exemptions from Maryland State Performance Assessment Program

Allegany County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	731	732	731	732	731	732	731	732	731	732	731	732		
Exempt	89	82	0	17	88	83	0	17	0	17	0	17		
% Exempt	12.2%	11.3%	0.0%	2.4%	12.0%	11.5%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%	4.04%	5.37%

Grade 5														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	782	744	782	744	782	744	782	744	782	744	782	744		
Exempt	105	114	*	13	85	99	*	13	*	13	*	13		
% Exempt	13.4%	15.3%	0.1%	1.7%	10.9%	13.3%	0.1%	1.7%	0.1%	1.7%	0.1%	1.7%	4.13%	5.94%

Grade 8														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	769	814	769	814	769	814	790	814	769	814	769	814		
Exempt	56	79	0	17	6	24	0	17	0	17	0	17		
% Exempt	7.3%	9.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.8%	2.9%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	2.1%	1.34%	3.50%

* Fewer than five students

Anne Arundel County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	5705	5585	5705	5585	5705	5585	5705	5585	5705	5585	5705	5585		
Exempt	393	393	36	29	410	374	36	29	36	29	36	29		
% Exempt	6.9%	7.0%	0.6%	0.5%	7.2%	6.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	2.77%	2.64%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	6254	5948	6254	5948	6254	5948	6254	5948	6254	5948	6254	5948		
Exempt	586	542	21	35	512	475	21	35	21	35	21	35		
% Exempt	9.4%	9.1%	0.3%	0.6%	8.2%	8.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	3.15%	3.24%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	5858		5858		5858		5858		5858		5858			
Exempt	339	N/A	51	N/A	269	N/A	51	N/A	51	N/A	51	N/A		
% Exempt	5.8%		0.9%		4.6%		0.9%		0.9%		0.9%		2.31%	N/A

Baltimore City 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	7755	7821	7755	7821	7755	7821	7755	7821	7755	7821	7755	7821		
Exempt	500	357	87	55	261	175	87	55	87	55	87	55		
% Exempt	6.4%	4.6%	1.1%	0.7%	3.4%	2.2%	1.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	2.38%	1.60%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	6950	7952	6950	7952	6950	7952	6950	7952	6950	7952	6950	7952		
Exempt	566	531	88	80	238	241	88	80	88	80	88	80		
% Exempt	8.1%	6.7%	1.3%	1.0%	3.4%	3.0%	1.3%	1.0%	1.3%	1.0%	1.3%	1.0%	2.77%	2.29%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	6973	6816	6973	6816	6973	6816	6973	6816	6973	6816	6973	6816		
Exempt	269	253	87	84	211	222	87	84	87	84	87	84		
% Exempt	3.9%	3.7%	1.2%	1.2%	3.0%	3.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.98%	1.98%

Baltimore County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	8212	7903	8212	7903	8212	7903	8212	7903	8212	7903	8212	7903		
Exempt	471	491	46	57	475	463	46	57	46	57	46	57		
% Exempt	5.7%	6.2%	0.6%	0.7%	5.8%	5.9%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	2.29%	2.49%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	8548	8672	8548	8672	8548	8672	8548	8672	8548	8672	8548	8672		
Exempt	562	633	67	69	583	642	67	69	67	69	67	69		
% Exempt	6.6%	7.3%	0.8%	0.8%	6.8%	7.4%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	2.76%	2.98%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	8289	8580	8289	8580	8289	8580	8289	8580	8289	8580	8289	8580		
Exempt	235	470	43	59	269	494	43	59	43	59	43	59		
% Exempt	2.8%	5.8%	0.5%	0.7%	3.2%	5.8%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	1.36%	2.33%

Calvert County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1236	1231	1236	1231	1236	1231	1236	1231	1236	1231	1236	1231		
Exempt	53	52	*	*	28	19	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	4.3%	4.2%	0.3%	0.3%	2.3%	1.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	1.31%	1.18%

Grade 5														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1284	1350	1284	1350	1284	1350	1284	1350	1284	1350	1284	1350		
Exempt	62	81	5	9	23	37	5	9	5	9	5	9		
% Exempt	4.8%	6.0%	0.4%	0.7%	1.8%	2.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	1.36%	1.90%

Grade 8														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1318		1318		1318		1318		1318		1318			
Exempt	31	N/A	*	N/A	26	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A		
% Exempt	2.4%		0.3%		2.0%		0.3%		0.3%		0.3%		0.92%	N/A

* Fewer than five students

Caroline County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	421	377	421	377	421	377	421	377	421	377	421	377		
Exempt	38	37	*	6	34	45	*	6	*	6	*	6		
% Exempt	9.0%	9.8%	1.0%	1.6%	8.1%	11.9%	1.0%	1.6%	1.0%	1.6%	1.0%	1.6%	3.48%	4.69%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	454	453	454	453	454	453	454	453	454	453	454	453		
Exempt	34	42	*	*	32	39	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	7.5%	9.3%	0.4%	0.9%	7.0%	8.6%	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	2.72%	3.57%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	409		409		409		409		409		409			
Exempt	31	N/A	*	N/A	16	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A		
% Exempt	7.6%		0.7%		3.9%		0.7%		0.7%		0.7%		2.40%	N/A

* Fewer than five students

Carroll County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	2150	2166	2150	2166	2150	2166	2150	2166	2150	2166	2150	2166		
Exempt	139	124	12	7	147	135	12	7	12	7	12	7		
% Exempt	6.5%	5.7%	0.6%	0.3%	6.8%	6.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	2.59%	2.21%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	2233	2304	2233	2304	2233	2304	2233	2304	2233	2304	2233	2304		
Exempt	160	132	13	11	175	166	13	11	13	11	13	11		
% Exempt	7.2%	5.7%	0.6%	0.5%	7.8%	7.2%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	2.89%	2.47%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	2154		2154		2154		2154		2154		2154			
Exempt	36	N/A	11	N/A	45	N/A	11	N/	11	N/A	11	N/A		
% Exempt	1.7%		0.5%		2.1%		0.5%		0.5%		0.5%		0.97%	N/A

Cecil County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1240	1263	1240	1263	1240	1263	1240	1263	1240	1263	1240	1263		
Exempt	120	126	*	11	114	126	*	11	*	11	*	11		
% Exempt	9.7%	10.0%	0.2%	0.9%	9.2%	10.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.9%	3.31%	3.91%

Grade 5														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1323	1301	1323	1301	1323	1301	1323	1301	1323	1301	1323	1301		
Exempt	160	147	22	8	137	137	22	8	22	8	22	8		
% Exempt	12.1%	11.3%	1.7%	0.6%	10.4%	10.5%	1.7%	0.6%	1.7%	0.6%	1.7%	0.6%	4.85%	4.05%

Grade 8														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1275		1275		1275		1275		1275		1275			
Exempt	53	N/A	12	N/A	36	N/A	12	N/A	12	N/A	12	N/A		
% Exempt	4.2%		0.9%		2.8%		0.9%		0.9%		0.9%		1.79%	N/A

* Fewer than five students

Charles County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1682	1760	1682	1760	1682	1760	1682	1760	1682	1760	1682	1760		
Exempt	94	68	15	8	90	59	15	8	15	8	15	8		
% Exempt	5.6%	3.9%	0.9%	0.5%	5.4%	3.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	2.42%	1.51%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1824	1902	1824	1902	1824	1902	1824	1902	1824	1902	1824	1902		
Exempt	157	99	17	10	103	71	17	10	17	10	17	10		
% Exempt	8.6%	5.2%	0.9%	0.5%	5.6%	3.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	3.00%	1.84%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1778	1923	1778	1923	1778	1923	1778	1923	1778	1923	1778	1923		
Exempt	138	130	18	13	87	83	17	13	18	13	18	13		
% Exempt	7.8%	6.8%	1.0%	0.7%	4.9%	4.3%	1.0%	0.7%	1.0%	0.7%	1.0%	0.7%	2.78%	2.30%

Dorchester County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	348	328	348	328	348	328	348	328	348	328	348	328		
Exempt	29	29	8	9	28	30	8	9	8	9	8	9		
% Exempt	8.3%	8.8%	2.3%	2.7%	8.0%	9.1%	2.3%	2.7%	2.3%	2.7%	2.3%	2.7%	4.26%	4.83%

Grade 5														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	429	356	429	356	429	356	429	356	429	356	429	356		
Exempt	44	37	*	5	48	35	*	5	*	5	*	5		
% Exempt	10.3%	10.4%	0.9%	1.4%	11.2%	9.8%	0.9%	1.4%	0.9%	1.4%	0.9%	1.4%	4.20%	4.31%

Grade 8														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	359	410	359	410	359	410	359	410	359	410	359	410		
Exempt	28	34	*	*	15	33	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	7.8%	8.3%	1.1%	0.7%	4.2%	8.0%	1.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	2.74%	3.21%

* Fewer than five students

Frederick County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	2920	2890	2920	2890	2920	2890	2920	2890	2920	2890	2920	2890		
Exempt	139	137	19	18	131	108	19	18	19	18	19	18		
% Exempt	4.8%	4.7%	0.7%	0.6%	4.5%	3.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	1.97%	1.83%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	3087	2982	3087	2982	3087	2982	3087	2982	3087	2982	3087	2982		
Exempt	163	165	16	24	151	134	16	24	16	24	16	24		
% Exempt	5.3%	5.5%	0.5%	0.8%	4.9%	4.5%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	0.8%	2.04%	2.21%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	2877		2877		2877		2877		2877		2877			
Exempt	61	N/A	15	N/A	83	N/A	15	N/A	15	N/A	15	N/A		
% Exempt	2.1%		0.5%		2.9%		0.5%		0.5%		0.5%		1.18%	N/A

Garrett County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	370	422	370	422	370	422	370	422	370	422	370	422		
Exempt	35	26	*	*	16	18	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	9.5%	6.2%	1.1%	0.7%	4.3%	4.3%	1.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	3.02%	2.21%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	412	418	412	418	412	418	412	418	412	418	412	418		
Exempt	50	33	*	*	21	15	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	12.1%	7.9%	0.7%	0.7%	5.1%	3.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	3.36%	2.39%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	367	359	367	359	367	359	367	359	367	359	367	359		
Exempt	31	22	*	*	15	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	8.4%	6.1%	0.3%	0.6%	4.1%	1.1%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	2.27%	1.58%

* Fewer than five students

Harford County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	3102	2898	3102	2898	3102	2898	3102	2898	3102	2898	3102	2898		
Exempt	212	181	10	7	212	174	10	7	10	7	10	7		
% Exempt	6.8%	6.2%	0.3%	0.2%	6.8%	6.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	2.49%	2.20%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	3302	3126	3302	3126	3302	3126	3302	3126	3302	3126	3302	3126		
Exempt	244	211	10	*	291	225	10	*	10	*	10	*		
% Exempt	7.4%	6.7%	0.3%	0.1%	8.8%	7.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	2.90%	2.41%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	3018		3018		3018		3018		3018		3018			
Exempt	85	N/A	14	N/A	83	N/A	14	N/A	14	N/A	14	N/A		
% Exempt	2.8%		0.5%		2.8%		0.5%		0.5%		0.5%		1.24%	N/A

* Fewer than five students

Howard County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	3618	3746	3618	3746	3618	3746	3618	3746	3618	3746	3618	3746		
Exempt	123	130	29	24	95	127	29	24	29	24	29	24		
% Exempt	3.4%	3.5%	0.8%	0.6%	2.6%	3.4%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	1.54%	1.57%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	3725	3807	3725	3807	3725	3807	3725	3807	3725	3807	3725	3807		
Exempt	152	186	25	28	138	171	25	28	25	28	25	28		
% Exempt	4.1%	4.9%	0.7%	0.7%	3.7%	4.5%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	1.74%	2.05%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	3498	3727	3498	3727	3498	3727	3498	3727	3498	3727	3498	3727		
Exempt	105	87	24	22	98	78	24	22	24	22	24	22		
% Exempt	3.0%	2.3%	0.7%	0.6%	2.8%	2.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	1.42%	1.13%

Kent County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	207	185	207	185	207	185	207	185	207	185	207	185		
Exempt	18	25	*	*	15	24	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	8.7%	13.5%	1.4%	0.5%	7.2%	13.0%	1.4%	0.5%	1.4%	0.5%	1.4%	0.5%	3.62%	4.77%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	224	207	224	207	224	207	224	207	224	207	224	207		
Exempt	21	14	*	*	5	8	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	9.4%	6.8%	0.4%	1.4%	2.2%	3.9%	0.4%	1.4%	0.4%	1.4%	0.4%	1.4%	2.23%	2.74%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	212	231	212	231	212	231	212	231	212	231	212	231		
Exempt	12	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	5.7%	4.8%	0.5%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	1.42%	1.52%

* Fewer than five students

Montgomery County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	10545	10362	10545	10362	10545	10362	10545	10362	10545	10362	10545	10362		
Exempt	671	628	54	60	692	661	54	60	54	60	54	60		
% Exempt	6.4%	6.1%	0.5%	0.6%	6.6%	6.4%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	2.50%	2.46%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	10892	10769	10892	10769	10892	10769	10892	10769	10892	10769	10892	10769		
Exempt	820	805	52	68	923	874	52	68	52	68	52	68		
% Exempt	7.5%	7.5%	0.5%	0.6%	8.5%	8.1%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	2.99%	3.02%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	10215		10215		10215		10215		10215		10215			
Exempt	431	N/A	66	N/A	687	N/A	66	N/A	66	N/A	66	N/A		
% Exempt	4.2%		0.6%		6.7%		0.6%		0.6%		0.6%		2.25%	N/A

Prince George's County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	10797	10623	10797	10623	10797	10623	10797	10623	10797	10623	10797	10623		
Exempt	688	682	14	51	587	563	14	51	14	51	14	51		
% Exempt	6.4%	6.4%	0.1%	0.5%	5.4%	5.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	2.05%	2.27%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	10921	11059	10921	11059	10921	11059	10921	11059	10921	11059	10921	11059		
Exempt	884	826	13	48	693	630	13	48	13	48	13	48		
% Exempt	8.1%	7.5%	0.1%	0.4%	6.3%	5.7%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	2.49%	2.48%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	9795	10184	9795	10184	9795	10184	9795	10184	9795	10184	9795	10184		
Exempt	503	573	13	48	199	151	13	48	13	48	13	48		
% Exempt	5.1%	5.6%	0.1%	0.5%	2.0%	1.5%	0.1%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	1.28%	1.50%

Queen Anne's County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	549	526	549	526	549	526	549	526	549	526	549	526		
Exempt	59	43	*	*	64	45	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	10.7%	8.2%	0.7%	0.4%	11.7%	8.6%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	4.22%	3.04%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	567	587	567	587	567	587	567	587	567	587	567	587		
Exempt	59	59	*	*	67	46	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	10.4%	10.1%	0.4%	0.2%	11.8%	7.8%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	3.94%	3.09%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	530	609	530	609	530	609	530	609	530	609	530	609		
Exempt	31	36	*	*	21	24	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	5.8%	5.9%	0.8%	0.3%	4.0%	3.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	2.14%	1.86%

* Fewer than five students

Saint Mary's County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1141	1131	1141	1131	1141	1131	1141	1131	1141	1131	1141	1131		
Exempt	35	54	5	7	38	80	5	7	5	7	5	7		
% Exempt	3.1%	4.8%	0.4%	0.6%	3.3%	7.1%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	4%	0.6%	1.36%	2.39%

Grade 5														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1195	1177	1195	1177	1195	1177	1195	1177	1195	1177	1195	1177		
Exempt	32	71	9	8	40	108	9	8	9	8	9	8		
% Exempt	2.7%	6.0%	0.8%	0.7%	3.3%	9.2%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	1.51%	2.99%

Grade 8														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1122	1189	1122	1189	1122	1189	1122	1189	1122	1189	1122	1189		
Exempt	16	44	10	*	19	58	10	*	10	*	10	*		
% Exempt	1.4%	3.7%	0.9%	0.3%	1.7%	4.9%	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	0.3%	1.11%	1.65%

* Fewer than five students

Somerset County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	258	229	258	229	258	229	258	229	258	229	258	229		
Exempt	9	12	*	*	9	7	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	3.5%	5.2%	0.8%	1.3%	3.5%	3.1%	0.8%	1.3%	0.8%	1.3%	0.8%	1.3%	1.68%	2.26%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	222	212	222	212	222	212	222	212	222	212	222	212		
Exempt	16	15	*	*	9	20	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	7.2%	7.1%	1.4%	1.4%	4.1%	9.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	2.78%	3.69%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	223		223		223		223		223		223			
Exempt	10	N/A	0	N/A	9	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A		
% Exempt	4.5%		0.0%		4.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		1.42%	N/A

* Fewer than five students

Talbot County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	328	345	328	345	328	345	328	345	328	345	328	345		
Exempt	26	19	6	6	22	19	6	6	6	6	6	6		
% Exempt	7.9%	5.5%	1.8%	1.7%	6.7%	5.5%	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%	1.7%	3.66%	3.00%

Grade 5														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	336	389	336	389	336	389	336	389	336	389	336	389		
Exempt	22	23	*	*	27	21	*	*	*	*	*	*		
% Exempt	6.5%	5.9%	0.3%	0.8%	8.0%	5.4%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.8%	2.63%	2.40%

Grade 8														
Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	343		343		343		343		343		343			
Exempt	26	N/A	6	N/A	34	N/A	6	N/A	6	N/A	6	N/A		
% Exempt	7.6%		1.7%		9.9%		1.7%		1.7%		1.7%		4.08%	N/A

* Fewer than five students

Washington County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1526	1462	1526	1462	1526	1462	1526	1462	1526	1462	1526	1462		
Exempt	97	101	10	11	97	100	10	11	10	11	10	11		
% Exempt	6.4%	6.9%	0.7%	0.8%	6.4%	6.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	2.56%	2.79%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1547	1610	1547	1610	1547	1610	1547	1610	1547	1610	1547	1610		
Exempt	124	131	13	10	106	107	13	10	13	10	13	10		
% Exempt	8.0%	8.1%	0.8%	0.6%	6.9%	6.6%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	3.04%	2.88%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1547		1547		1547		1547		1547		1547			
Exempt	99	N/A	33	N/A	54	N/A	33	N/A	33	N/A	33	N/A		
% Exempt	6.4%		2.1%		3.5%		2.1%		2.1%		2.1%		3.07%	N/A

Wicomico County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1151	1158	1151	1158	1151	1158	1151	1158	1151	1158	1151	1158		
Exempt	73	78	6	14	74	71	6	14	6	14	6	14		
% Exempt	6.3%	6.7%	0.5%	1.2%	6.4%	6.1%	0.5%	1.2%	0.5%	1.2%	0.5%	1.2%	2.48%	2.95%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	1125	1190	1125	1190	1125	1190	1125	1190	1125	1190	1125	1190		
Exempt	82	97	16	23	80	95	16	23	16	23	16	23		
% Exempt	7.3%	8.2%	1.4%	1.9%	7.1%	8.0%	1.4%	1.9%	1.4%	1.9%	1.4%	1.9%	3.35%	3.98%

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	996		996		996		996		996		996			
Exempt	18	N/A	9	N/A	9	N/A	9	N/A	9	N/A	9	N/A		
% Exempt	1.8%		0.9%		0.9%		0.9%		0.9%		0.9%		1.05%	N/A

Worcester County 2001 and 2002 MSPAP Exemptions: Grades 3, 5, and 8

Grade 3

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	498	470	498	470	498	470	498	470	498	470	498	470		
Exempt	*	9	0	0	*	9	0	0	0	0	0	0		
% Exempt	0.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.17%	0.64%

Grade 5

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	527	510	527	510	527	510	527	510	527	510	527	510		
Exempt	8	8	*	0	11	10	*	0	*	0	*	0		
% Exempt	1.5%	1.6%	0.2%	0.0%	2.1%	2.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.73%	0.59

Grade 8

Content	Reading		Writing		Language Usage		Mathematics		Science		Social Studies		Average %	
Year	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Total	545	521	545	521	545	521	545	521	545	521	545	521		
Exempt	26	14	0	*	15	10	0	*	0	*	0	*		
% Exempt	4.8%	2.7%	0.0%	0.2%	2.8%	1.9%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	1.25%	0.90%

* Fewer than five students

Appendix B

Local School System Profiles

Allegany County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematic s	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	34.7	38.4	35.7	46.9	42.4	48.7	16.8	45.6	47.7
Special Ed	31.1	41.5	33.3	25.8	32.3	28.1	3.1	7.1	7.9

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	100.0	97.0	96.3	100.0	99.0	98.8
Special Ed	94.4	65.4	79.4	97.6	91.6	97.6

Out < 21%   61.3
Out 21-60%   25.0   ⌐ 86.3
Out > 60%   11.7

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	96.0	94.8	94.1	3.40
Special Education	95.4	92.1	88.9	8.95

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,211
Professional Instructional Staff: $43,056

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 26 or 1.46 %

Anne Arundel County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	37.3	41.9	30.2	52.8	49.2	48.1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	23.9	22.1	15.4	27.6	22.2	18.9	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.5	93.6	92.0	99.9	98.8	98.5
Special Ed	90.0	66.7	84.4	95.7	93.2	96.3

Out < 21%   58.4
Out 21-60% 16.5   74.9
Out > 60%   19.2

	Attendance Rate			Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.6	94.4	93.6	4.70
Special Education	94.4	92.0	91.1	0.81

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,782
Professional Instructional Staff: $47,752

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 489 or 4.57%

Baltimore City
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	12.8	23.5	13.5	19.9	25.8	21.5	12.6	32.1	15.8
Special Ed	8.5	10.7	7.3	6.6	8.1	8.9	1.1	5.6	1.9

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	96.2	84.2	68.0	98.7	93.6	81.9
Special Ed	65.8	32.4	29.5	80.0	54.5	53.5

Out < 21%   35.3
Out 21-60%   24.3   } 59.6
Out > 60%   29.4

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	94.2	88.5	81.0	10.05
Special Education	92.7	84.2	71.2	11.82

Per Pupil Expenditures: $8,896
Professional Instructional Staff: $47,022

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 1,561 or 10.28%

Baltimore County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	39.0	44.3	35.1	51.1	48.2	47.4	33.2	55.9	50.0
Special Ed	32.2	39.5	30.2	36.8	34.7	30.1	7.8	18.8	11.5

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.4	95.8	86.5	99.9	99.5	97.0
Special Ed	92.2	75.4	75.7	97.9	94.3	95.6

Out < 21%   50.8
Out 21-60%   12.7   63.5
Out > 60%   28.0

	Attendance Rate			Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.8	94.7	93.9	3.04
Special Education	94.6	92.4	92.7	0.17

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,906
Professional Instructional Staff: $47,875

Public/private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 972 or 7.17%

Calvert County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	44.6	56.1	50.3	60.1	61.8	57.2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	24.6	24.7	17.3	31.8	31.4	23.9	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.9	99.1	97.1	99.9	99.8	99.9
Special Ed	97.5	90.8	91.4	100.0	99.2	100.0

Out < 21%   48.4
Out 21-60%   39.2   ⎯ 87.6
Out > 60%   7.0

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.7	95.4	94.3	3.27
Special Education	94.9	94.2	93.0	2.33

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,015
Professional Instructional Staff: $49,837

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 122 or 5.27%

Caroline County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	43.6	48.5	47.2	50.1	47.3	55.3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	27.6	48.3	35.0	35.5	40.6	43.5	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.7	94.6	91.0	99.7	99.1	97.2
Special Ed	94.9	78.9	82.1	92.0	88.0	92.6

Out < 21%   59.4
Out 21-60%   24.2   ⎤ 83.6
Out > 60%   15.5

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.1	93.5	92.0	5.95
Special Education	93.9	91.4	89.7	0.00

Per Pupil Expenditures: $6,675
Professional Instructional Staff: $42,836

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: * or 0.55%

 * Fewer than 5 students

Carroll County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	33.9	44.6	35.0	46.7	49.9	52.7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	17.3	32.1	23.4	29.8	33.5	26.3	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.9	98.9	95.8	100.0	99.9	99.9
Special Ed	91.2	82.5	74.5	96.1	95.6	96.0

Out < 21%   69.6
Out 21-60%   17.5   87.5
Out > 60%   7.0

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.7	95.5	94.8	1.79
Special Education	94.8	93.9	92.6	3.42

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,055
Professional Instructional Staff: $48,024

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 197 or 5.29%

Cecil County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	37.4	44.6	39.6	57.1	57.0	59.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	28.0	49.5	30.6	43.4	40.1	25.8	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	100.0	97.4	93.0	100.0	99.8	99.0
Special Ed	100.0	75.6	67.6	100.0	100.0	90.4

Out < 21%   59.5
Out 21-60%   23.3   82.8
Out > 60%   14.8

	Attendance Rate			Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.3	93.4	91.6	3.30
Special Education	93.8	91.3	89.5	0.88

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,167
Professional Instructional Staff: $44,805

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 45 or 1.74%

Charles County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	38.5	39.0	33.6	50.2	44.4	42.8	37.2	58.5	51.8
Special Ed	19.1	30.5	20.8	28.8	22.4	14.6	9.5	15.1	10.4

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.1	94.3	89.1	99.7	98.9	96.9
Special Ed	87.2	74.1	71.2	96.7	92.0	96.0

Out < 21%   62.0
Out 21-60%   17.5   ⌐ 79.5
Out > 60%   17.6

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.1	93.8	92.5	3.47
Special Education	94.0	90.9	89.5	0.00

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,026
Professional Instructional Staff: $45,481

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 45 or 1.80 %

Dorchester County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	23.4	28.6	20.4	42.9	42.9	41.8	18.2	31.5	23.6
Special Ed	25.9	36.2	14.9	20.0	25.0	21.2	11.1	12.2	8.2

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	98.9	90.1	79.7	99.7	97.9	91.0
Special Ed	75.0	36.4	42.9	100.0	100.0	85.0

Out < 21%	82.0	
Out 21-60%	4.4	86.4
Out > 60%	13.3	

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.1	92.4	92.2	4.61
Special Education	94.2	90.3	88.5	11.66

Per Pupil Expenditures: $8,063
Professional Instructional Staff: $45,302

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: * or 0.17 %

* Fewer than 5 students

Frederick County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	41.0	42.9	38.7	55.3	48.4	59.7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	14.4	19.7	14.4	21.8	17.0	22.5	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.5	94.9	92.5	99.9	98.8	97.3
Special Ed	92.8	75.9	79.1	97.1	92.9	93.4

Out < 21%   76.3
Out 21-60%   13.7   ⎤ 90.0
Out > 60%   4.8

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.8	94.7	92.9	1.62
Special Education	94.7	92.3	89.7	2.85

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,006
Professional Instructional Staff: $46,716

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 179 or 3.79%

Garrett County
2001–2002

	Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory								
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	24.6	31.0	22.7	38.8	40.4	42.2	33.6	58.3	61.7
Special Ed	5.0	22.2	17.5	21.8	16.5	20.0	2.4	9.8	29.5

	Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing					
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.7	96.3	93.9	100.0	98.9	98.5
Special Ed	94.6	87.5	76.8	96.0	92.0	84.0

Out < 21%	54.3	
Out 21-60%	28.1	82.4
Out > 60%	16.9	

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.8	95.5	95.1	4.27
Special Education	94.9	94.3	93.9	6.36

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,452
Professional Instructional Staff: $42,145

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: * or 0.42%

* Fewer than 5 students

Harford County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	40.2	51.9	43.2	54.2	54.1	56.8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	18.6	28.5	17.9	28.0	27.2	27.2	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	97.2	94.2	89.6	98.1	97.1	96.0
Special Ed	90.5	77.9	73.7	96.2	89.1	90.8

Out < 21%   55.8
Out 21-60%   36.3   ⌐ 92.1
Out > 60%   3.0

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.6	94.3	92.6	2.94
Special Education	94.5	92.0	89.7	4.99

Per Pupil Expenditures: $6,962
Professional Instructional Staff: $44,715

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 264 or 4.34%

Howard County
2002–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	53.9	57.8	46.7	62.7	57.4	63.8	42.6	59.9	68.1
Special Ed	36.3	30.0	34.5	37.4	26.7	24.9	12.3	22.5	21.3

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.6	97.4	96.2	100.0	99.5	98.8
Special Ed	99.4	88.5	91.6	97.8	91.2	94.3

Out < 21%	58.2
Out 21-60%	27.2
Out > 60%	10.0

85.4

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	96.3	95.6	95.2	1.84
Special Education	95.2	93.3	92.6	2.07

Per Pupil Expenditures: $8,432
Professional Instructional Staff: $49,048

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 216 or 4.32%

Kent County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	49.3	55.2	58.7	52.1	40.2	43.8	36.5	60.5	54.5
Special Ed	53.3	59.0	61.5	20.0	19.4	22.6	11.8	23.1	23.1

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.5	98.5	90.8	98.6	100.0	100.0
Special Ed	91.7	78.3	75.0	93.8	87.5	93.8

Out < 21%   67.8
Out 21-60%   13.5   81.3
Out > 60%   17.2

	Attendance Rate			Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.2	94.6	92.2	5.45
Special Education	94.3	91.8	88.5	7.37

Per Pupil Expenditures: $8,985
Professional Instructional Staff: $48,891

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: * or 0.58%

* Fewer than 5 students

Montgomery County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	31.9	43.9	33.6	46.8	49.2	53.5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	23.4	29.9	17.7	26.6	23.6	23.2	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.5	95.0	90.4	99.9	99.0	96.0
Special Ed	92.2	71.8	78.0	97.7	93.5	91.9

Out < 21%   43.8
Out 21-60%   18.6   ⎤ 62.4
Out > 60%   30.2

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.7	95.0	93.6	1.71
Special Education	94.5	92.7	90.3	2.24

Per Pupil Expenditures: $9,464
Professional Instructional Staff: $55,043

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 1,226 or 7.21%

Prince George's County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	16.0	29.2	14.7	26.6	34.2	19.5	17.7	38.9	26.5
Special Ed	9.9	19.9	11.4	13.7	16.7	10.3	3.0	9.2	4.8

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	98.2	87.0	68.7	99.6	97.5	88.7
Special Ed	85.3	56.3	43.5	95.0	83.2	81.3

Out < 21%   41.0
Out 21-60%   24.5 ⎤ 65.5
Out > 60%   23.1

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.2	98.0	98.9	3.03
Special Education	93.1	97.3	98.2	0.25

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,313
Professional Instructional Staff: $47,532

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 1,565 or 10.38%

Queen Anne's County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	43.4	48.2	36.4	59.9	53.2	53.2	31.6	52.2	59.1
Special Ed	17.1	16.0	9.3	35.5	10.1	18.0	16.7	18.0	17.0

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	100.0	94.0	95.7	100.0	98.2	98.2
Special Ed	95.6	70.0	85.6	100.0	95.2	97.6

Out < 21%   76.5
Out 21-60%   19.3   95.8
Out > 60%   2.4

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	94.9	94.5	91.8	2.75
Special Education	94.3	92.4	89.6	5.21

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,391
Professional Instructional Staff: $43,965

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 11 or 1.11%

Saint Mary's County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	35.4	43.9	37.1	46.7	50.0	46.9	26.1	50.0	49.4
Special Ed	29.5	36.7	21.4	41.2	35.6	24.5	4.5	10.7	12.0

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.5	91.0	80.5	99.9	99.0	95.0
Special Ed	94.0	66.0	62.9	97.8	88.0	91.3

Out < 21%	57.5	
Out 21-60%	28.6	86.1
Out > 60%	12.1	

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.1	93.1	90.5	2.49
Special Education	94.1	90.6	87.8	6.07

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,368
Professional Instructional Staff: $46,187

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 17 or 0.79%

Somerset County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	24.1	35.8	19.8	31.9	33.5	30.2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	15.8	21.4	7.1	12.5	21.4	10.7	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	96.7	84.9	84.7	100.0	98.6	95.9
Special Ed	62.5	62.5	68.8	90.0	95.0	75.0

Out < 21%   74.4
Out 21-60%   11.6   ⌐ 86.0
Out > 60%   11.9

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	94.6	93.5	94.2	5.46
Special Education	94.0	93.6	92.8	2.33

Per Pupil Expenditures: $8,458
Professional Instructional Staff: $42,040

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 6 or 1.66%

Talbot County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	27.6	33.2	28.7	38.8	37.9	36.4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	18.8	27.6	10.3	7.1	14.6	2.1	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.4	91.6	94.3	100.0	98.8	98.0
Special Ed	90.2	45.0	73.2	100.0	100.0	100.0

Out < 21%   65.8
Out 21-60%   26.2   — 92.0
Out > 60%   7.8

Attendance Rate				Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	96.2	94.4	95.0	2.64
Special Education	94.7	93.2	92.7	4.73

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,335
Professional Instructional Staff: $42,428

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: * or 0.21%

* Fewer than 5 students

Washington County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	44.6	45.5	41.3	54.9	48.3	51.5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	30.2	38.3	26.4	33.3	28.2	24.9	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.4	95.9	95.1	99.9	98.9	98.6
Special Ed	97.5	79.5	88.3	99.2	95.9	96.8

Out < 21%   72.5
Out 21-60%   13.7   — 86.2
Out > 60%   6.7

	Attendance Rate			Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	96.3	95.7	95.5	2.59
Special Education	95.4	94.5	93.3	5.50

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,224
Professional Instructional Staff: $44,826

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 183 or 6.47%

Wicomico County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	25.0	38.8	26.7	40.1	39.2	38.6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Ed	17.6	29.0	24.6	26.3	28.6	26.0	N/A	N/A	N/A

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.1	86.9	87.2	100.0	98.5	97.7
Special Ed	94.6	66.3	63.4	100.0	95.2	91.9

Out < 21%   70.4
Out 21-60%   12.1   ⌐ 82.5
Out > 60%   16.8

	Attendance Rate			Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.5	92.4	91.9	6.33
Special Education	94.4	89.1	90.2	1.33

Per Pupil Expenditures: $7,678
Professional Instructional Staff: $43,692

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 5 or 0.30%

Worcester County
2001–2002

Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) – Percent Satisfactory									
	Third Grade			Fifth Grade			Eighth Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	52.0	62.6	49.4	51.6	48.6	52.8	30.3	60.2	61.3
Special Ed	22.2	22.2	19.0	16.4	20.3	8.7	5.4	15.9	15.9

Maryland Functional Test (MFT) – Percent Passing						
	Ninth Grade			Eleventh Grade		
	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Regular Ed	99.2	90.5	91.2	99.8	98.5	97.9
Special Ed	88.9	75.0	80.6	94.7	94.7	98.2

```
Out < 21%      76.0
Out 21-60%     15.7  ┐─ 91.7
Out > 60%       7.6
```

	Attendance Rate			Drop Out Rate
	Elementary	Middle	High	
Regular Education	95.5	94.8	93.5	3.02
Special Education	93.9	93.2	91.3	3.09

Per Pupil Expenditures: $8,505
Professional Instructional Staff: $45,648

Public/Private Schools for 3-21 Year Olds: 0 or 0.00%

Appendix C

School System CSPD Submissions

Allegany County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Reading Strategies	T	40	30		15
Positive Behavior Supports	T	50	30	10	20
School-wide Discipline	T	50	50	5	30
Functional Behavior Assessment	S/T	20	50		10
Inclusion	S/T	100	25	25	25
Learning Strategies (SIMS)	S	50	30		10
ADHD	S	50	30		20
504	S	30	30		

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Crisis Intervention Training (CPI); Read and Succeed; Autism; Change Agent; Inclusion/High School Assessment; 504; FBA/BIP; Working with Paraprofessionals; Strategic Instruction Model.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Anne Arundel County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Autism	A/S/T	31	58	215	6
Behavior Support	A/S/T	75	93	170	42
Collaborative Teaching	S/T	186	114	1	9
Differentiated Instruction	S/T	65	94	20	49
General Educators Role	A	82	4	8	0
IEP Development	S/T	32	210	0	2
IEP Process	A	0	170	0	282
Reading Strategies	A/S	25	351	78	159
Paraeducators	A/S	0	1	145	1
Speech	S/T	13	1	30	149
New Teacher Certification	A	0	40	0	1
Crisis Intervention	S/T	13	88	69	17

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Paraeducator Training; Paraeducator Orientation; Phonographics; Inclusion Training; ECI Parent Training; ECI Teacher Competencies; ECI Transition; Leadership Development; General Ed Content Training; ED Teachers Staff Development.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Baltimore City Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Child Study Teams Training	S/T	300	200	450	
Policies and Procedures	A/S/T	150	500	150	
Placement in the Least Restrictive Environment	A/S/T	400	300	450	
IEP Implementation	A/S/T	500	1000	100	50
Inclusionary Practices	S/T	300	260	50	
Pre-Referral Interventions	S/T	100	150	150	
Behavior Management/Crisis Intervention	S/T	1500	300	50	
Instructional Practices for Low Incidence Groups	A/S/T	200	500	50	
Adaptations, modifications, and accommodations	A/S/T	200	500	50	

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

- Training for new IEP Instructional Associates
- Training for Child Study Team on standard operating procedures
- Training for vision and hearing teachers
- Training for preschool teachers
- Training for teachers and administrators of MOIL/SPH, ED, LD, and PAL students
- Training of school-based administrators and support team members on special education compliance
- Training in LRE, inclusion, and IEP implementation
- Training for new and probationary teachers
- Training in curriculum modifications, adaptations, and accommodations

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Baltimore County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Writing Ed Assessments	T		800		160
Writing IEP Goals	T		800		160
IEP Team Compliance	T				300
Assistive Technology	S	100	300	300	
Wilson Reading	S	100	300		
Functional Acad/IMAP	S		100	50	100
Behavior Inter. Strategies	S	100	200	50	
Writing Ed Assessments	T		800		160

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:
Database of training needs attached to submission too lengthy to be included.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Calvert County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: *No CSPD information provided with submission.*

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Caroline County Public Schools					
School Year 2002 – 2003 **Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)**					
Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Lindamood Bell	S	15	14	0	9
Reading Interventions	T	80	50		9
Co-Teaching	T	50	28	4	12
Transitioning	T	50	25	3	5
IMAP Prep	T	30	13	7	9
Math Interventions	A	50	35		9
COMAR Revisions	S	15	50	4	9

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Lindamood Bell training; Reading interventions training & implementation; IMAP preparation; FBA/BIP Inservice for teachers and administrators; IDEA regulations; Transitioning for MS & HS inservice; Co-teaching training using Caroline County Public Schools Manual.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Carroll County Public Schools					
School Year 2002 – 2003 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)					
Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: *No CSPD information provided with submission.*

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Cecil County Public Schools					
School Year 2002 – 2003 **Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)**					
Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Inclusion	A/S/T	20	20		
Procedural Safeguards	A/S/T	10	20	20	
IDEA Regulations	A/S/T	20	20		
Proactive Discipline	A/S/T	40	40	40	
PASS Training	A/S/T	30	30		
Program Development	A/S/T	30	30		

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Due process procedures training; IDEA regulation training; Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Training; PASS training for Building Coordinators and Building Administrators; Inclusion strategies for special educators and general educators through inservices/conferences; Program development through participation in state and regional conferences; Proactive Discipline for special and general educators.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Charles County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Autism	S/T	20	20	10	5

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Professional development through Johns Hopkins University; New teacher training on special education issues and instructional techniques to be conducted this summer.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Dorchester County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Co-teaching / Differentiating Instruction	S/T	16	22	9	4
Aligning curriculum instruction and IEPs	S/T	12	12	6	
Data collection, record keeping, and compliance	S/T	12	50	9	12

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

Inclusive Instruction / Collaborative Teaching – General education/special education teams continue to develop differentiated units and lessons for instruction. A consultant was provided to work with staff from high school content areas on addressing specific content and how to differentiate instruction to meet the required outcomes.

Compliance/Policy and Procedure – Staff inservice was provided prior to the opening of school to provide updates and to disseminate a resource document to guide staff through each type of IEP meeting. A revised IEP Chairperson Resource Manual was also developed and disseminated and inservice provided as needed. In addition, staff received inservice training in the area of extended school year service in follow-up to corrective actions taken.

IMAP Framework/Assessment – Staff involved in the administration process for IMAP received inservice by the LAC and IMAP Coordinator. The work on revising the IEP objective bank to correlate with the IMAP framework continues, including extended outcomes and indicators for reading, writing, and math.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Frederick County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Woodcock-Johnson III	A/S/T		250		
Managing Difficult Behaviors	A/S/T	0	60	0	
PDD/Autism	A/S/T	0	4	0	

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

Autism training for 3 days for all schools having students with autism enrolled in their population. This included administrators, 45 teachers (special education and general education), two speech/language pathologists, and 30 instructional assistants.

Specific training was held for behavior management of included students with special needs.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Garrett County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
IEP Writing	S/T	0	38	6	
Content Mentoring	S/T	10	5		
Physical Restraint	S/T	8	4	8	
Differentiated Instruction	A/S	20	10		
Autism	S/T	0	8	6	

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: *Submission notes "Please see attached", but attachment not available with submission.*

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Harford County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Reading Methodology	A/S	10	50		
Content Enhancement	A/S	20	20		
Legal Issues	T		10		10
New Teacher Training	A/S		40	20	
IMAP	A/S		25		5
Training for IA's	A/S		300		
CPI Training	A/S/T	40	40	10	40

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:
- Training of all additional staff in reading methodology (Project Read – Levels I and II)
- Training of teaching teams (secondary level) in Content Enhancement
- Advanced training of administrative personnel on legal issues
- Facilitative IEP training for 50 staff members including building administrators and special education staff
- IMAP training for test administrators

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Howard County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Reading Instructional Strategies	A/S/T	10	170		
Effective IEP Teams	T	22	22	22	
Procedural Safeguards	A/S/T	40	35	30	
Leadership Training for Team / Instructional Leaders	T		135	10	
IMAP Training	A/S/T		35		
ESY Training	T		35	25	
IEP Training (New Teachers)	A		30	10	

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:
- Improving the IEP Team Meeting Process
- Procedural Safeguards for New Personnel
- Special Education Team/Instructional Leader Training
- Special Education New Teacher Training
- Reading Instructional Strategies

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Kent County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A/S/T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Multi-sensory Reading Strategies	S/T	35	10	4	7
Positive Behavioral Interventions	S/T	100	35	10	12
Co-teaching	A/S/T	60	35	10	12
Differentiated Instruction	S/T	150	35	10	8
Computerized IEP Process	S/T		26	10	8
Instructional Consultation/collaboration	A/S/T	150	26	10	12
Accommodations and Modifications	S/T	60	26	10	12

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:
- Workshops for general and special educators on co-teaching and differentiated teaching strategies
- Training for elementary teachers (special and general educators on multi-sensory reading)
- Consultant to work with schools on multi-sensory reading
- Consultant to work with schools on differentiated instruction
- Instructional assistants received up-dated training on crisis intervention
- Implementation of IC Model in four elementary schools
- Completed training of staff on Excent
- Training of 2 crisis teams in two elementary schools on CPI
- Additional trainings:
- Provided workshop for all staff on compliance issues
- Provided extensive training on ESY
- All Principals and IEP Chairpersons provided with copy of "Maryland Special Education Law and Policy Manual"
- All Principals and IEP Chairpersons provided with copy of MCIE's "IEP and Inclusion Guide"
- Principals and staff have also been provided with copies of various articles and handouts on the above topics
- All schools were provided with copies of the Explosive Child and Yardsticks in addition to books on the attached lists

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Montgomery County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Legal update/implementation Training	A/S/T	200	800	100	20
Assistive Technology	S/T	10	160	30	5
Reading Literacy	A/S/T	50	160	10	15
Intensive Needs Staff Training	A/S/T	15	144		
Inclusion Education	A/S/T	10	60	20	10
Content Module Training	A/S/T	25	400	50	

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

- Classroom Management and Behavior
- Assistive Technology
- Reading Literacy
- Learning for Independence Curriculum
- Inclusion Education

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Prince George's County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Assuring FAPE/Inclusive Environments	A/S/T	500	1600	250	50
Woodcock Johnson	A/S/T		1000	250	50
Development of IEP's	A/S/T		1000	250	50
Functional Behavioral Assessments/Plans	A/S/T	50	500	250	50
Alternative Interim Programs	A/S/T	200	1000	250	50
Autism Waiver	A/S/T	50	100	150	10
Assessing the General Curriculum	A/S/T	50	500	150	20
Transition Services	A/S/T	50	250	50	500
MSPAP/CRT/IMAP/H.S. Assessment	S/T	50	500	50	20
ESY	S/T	50	1000	200	50
Pre-referral Interventions	A/S/T	500	200	50	100
Discipline	A/S/T	500	500	100	100

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

1.1 Training and orientation of staff on changes in policies and procedures, updating staff

1.2 Use of Excent as part of the IEP decision making process

2.1 Training on FBAs/FBPs – emphasis on modifying and revising as student's needs change

3.1 Training on Second Steps, Cooperative Discipline, Nonviolent Crisis Prevention, School-wide supports

4.1 Training on development of alternative interim programs

5.1 Training on math, social studies, and reading curriculum

6.1 Career Expo, transition workshops for students and parents

6.2 Training on incorporation of transition goals on IEP, anticipated services

7.1 Training on best practices model; working with students with autism in inclusive environments

8.1 Training on behavioral support systems, integration into comprehensive school activities and classes

9.1 Training on inclusion of special education students on MSPAP and CTBS; appropriate accommodations

9.2 Up-dates on status of H.S. Assessments; inclusion of special educators in general education training sessions

10.1 Training on ESY criteria, eligibility and potential service models

11.1 Training on completing Medicaid reporting forms

12.1 Training on changes on SSIS

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Queen Anne's County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Sp. Ed. Procedures	S/T	5	50	10	10
IEP Development	S/T	5	60	10	10
EXCENT	S/T	0	60	15	0
Instructional Strategies	A/S/T	25	30	0	10
Assistive Technology	A/S/T	0	10	5	5

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

- Special Education Procedures (IEP Chairpersons's meetings)
- Use of EXCENT
- IEP development (team training)
- Behavior support techniques

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Saint Mary's County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Autism	S		20	5	
Reading	S		30		
IEP mtg facilitation	T	25	5		
IMAP	S		20		
Technology			50		
Behavior	T		20		
Inclusion	T	50	50		

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: Seminars were presented for new teachers in the areas of technology, classroom management, IEP development and assessment. Staff received training in the implementation of new software programs and the integration into the curriculum. Staff received training from Johns Hopkins University in working with children with autism. The Partner Center presented training for staff and parents in IEP process.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Somerset County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Restraint training	S		6	4	3
ICT training	S/T	15	5	4	4
Procedures training	A/S/T		25	7	10
Inclusion	S/T	25	7	4	3

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

- Conference attendance in the following areas: autism, pre-school services, infant-toddler services, inclusion, MD Coalition, Assistive technology, LRP conference, Intellitools, ED conference, Asberger's Syndrome, OT national conference, speech therapy meetings.
- Inservices attended: Emotional disturbance, A and S staff, LCC Team training, linkages with community agencies, home-hospital requirements, IMAP requirements.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Talbot County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Lindamood Bell	S/T	5	25	5	2
Inclusion	A/S/T	58	10	5	4
Mathematics – Everyday Math	S	38	10	0	5
Autism	S/T	5	5	2	0
Assessment	S/T	0	14	1	0
Policy and Procedure	S/T	12	35	15	0
Training for Instructional Assistants	A/S/T				20

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

- Autism – through national conference
- Lindamood Bell – both LIPs and Visualization/Verbalization
- Inclusion – Disability Awareness at both high schools and high school teams attend conference by MD Coalition for Inclusion
- Modifications/Accommodations to each school faculty
- USE course for teachers
- Paraeducator – on-line training
- Assistive Technology training to all special ed staff
- SpEd Policy/Procedure/IEP development
- Round Table/How to make a referral

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Washington County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Reading Strategies	A/S/T	500	50	10	
IEP Process Update	A/S/T	75	150	25	
Study Skills/SIMS	A/S/T	50	10	15	
Differentiated Instruction	A/S/T		50		
Pre-referrals/intervention	A/S/T	50	25		
Autism	A/S/T	200	50	20	50 I.A.'s
Behavioral Strategies	A/S/T	50	50	20	50 I.A.'s
Computerized IEP	A/S/T		50	25	
Transitioning	A/S/T	30	50	15	
Woodcock Johnson	A/S/T		50		
Positive Behavior Support	A/S/T	35	10	5	10 I.A.'s
Developing Birth – 5 Program	A/S/T	25	10	10	
School Based	A/S/T	30	15	12	10 I.A."s
Life Skills Programs	A/S/T	75	35	10	15 I.A.'s

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

- **Study Skills/SIMS**: General & Special Ed. Teachers – 30
- **Special Ed. Update**: Administrators, Spec. Ed. Teachers, Related Services – 200 Participants
- **Autism**: Special Ed. Teachers – 60: Instructional Assistants – 60
- **Self-Advocacy/Student Led IEP**: Special Ed. Teachers – 60; Instructional Assistants – 60
- **Managing Aggressive Behavior**: All Special Education Staff – 300
- **Crisis Prevention School-Based Planning**: Boonsboro Middle – 34 Teachers; Clear Spring High – 12 Teachers; E.R. Hicks Middle – 2 Teachers; Western Hgts. Middle – 5 Teachers; Sharpsburg Elem. – 3 Teachers; Maugansville Elem. – 6 Gen. Ed. Teachers, 2 Spec. Ed. Teachers; Eastern Elem. – 3 Spec. Ed. Teachers, 2 Instructional Assistants; Old Forge Elem. – 23 Teachers; Pleasnat Valley Elem. – Spec. Ed. I.A.
- **Human Sexuality**: Parents – 35, Service Providers – 8, Instructional Assistants – 2
- **Nurturing the Brain**: Parents – 12
- **Anger & Defiance**: Parents – 50
- **USE**: Parents – 8
- **Accommodations in General Education Environment**: Teachers – 2; Parents – 2
- **ADHD**: Parochial Teachers – 46
- **Student Mentors**: Students – 5, Teachers – 1

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Wicomico County Public Schools					
School Year 2002 – 2003 **Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)**					
Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending: *No CSPD information provided with submission.*					

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Worcester County Public Schools

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Autism	S/T	75	50	10	
LRE	S/T	100	60	10	
Program Results	A	40	60	5	

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:
- Ongoing T.E.A.C.H. training on autism has been provided for general and special education teachers, related services: administrators and paraprofessionals
- Two-credit course on meeting needs of diverse learners provided for general and special education teachers and related service providers.
- Summer workshops were offered for general and special education on assistive technology, school improvement, program results, and disproportionality.
- School-wide in-service on inclusion was provided for Stephen Decatur High School, Ocean City Elementary, Berlin Intermediate, and Snow Hill High School.

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Maryland School for the Deaf

School Year 2002 – 2003
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)

Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
More thorough needs analysis	A		12		
Inservice teachers in corrective instructional strategies for reading comprehension	A/S		12		
Inservice teachers in alternative strategies for teaching struggling students	A/S		12		
Inservice teachers in implementation of strategies	A/S/T		12		

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:
- Devise more thorough needs analysis
- Inservice teachers in corrective instructional strategies for reading comprehension
- Inservice teachers in alternative strategies for teaching struggling students
- Inservice teachers in the implementation of strategies

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Maryland School for the Blind					
School Year 2002 – 2003 **Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)**					
Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
No submission from The Maryland School for the Blind available					
Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:					

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Correctional Education					
School Year 2002 – 2003 Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD)					
Training Areas	Level* (A,S,T)	General Education Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Related Services Personnel	"Other" Personnel
Woodcock Johnson III	S/T		X		
CareerScope	S/T	X	X		
TeamTech	S/T		X		

Specific training needs (federally funded) completed during the year just ending:

- Woodcock Johnson III – Updated skills for administering the new Woodcock Johnson III
- TeamTech – Technical part of computer training for reading program
- CareerScope – Computer training for career assessments evaluations
- SSIS – Training for completing SSIS forms accurately

* A - Awareness Level; S - Skill Development Level; T - Transfer Level

Appendix D

School Improvement Grant Funding Sources by:
Goal
Institution of Higher Education

Local School System

FUNDING SOURCES BY GOAL, BY IHE, AND BY LSS

GOAL 1 **IMPROVED PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MEASURES OF ACCOUNTABILITY:** Objective data on academic performance and other outcomes of students with disabilities will be routinely collected, analyzed, disseminated, and used to drive professional development, personnel preparation and technical assistance for school reform and system improvement.

IHE/LSS Grants ($50,000-$75,000)	LSS Grants ($12,500)
Hood College – Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Frederick and Washington Counties; Support WJ-III training **Frostburg State University** – Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Garrett and Allegany Counties	**Anne Arundel** - MSPAP Instructional Strategies Frederick - WJ-III training Worcester - MSPAP Analysis

GOAL 2 **PREPARE SERVICE PROVIDERS TO WORK WITH INCREASED EFFECTIVENESS:** Professional development will be designed and delivered on the basis of student performance data that demonstrate needs for building competencies and capacities to improve educational outcomes of students with disabilities.

IHE/LSS Grants ($50,000-$75,000)	LSS Grants ($12,500)
Hood College – Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Frederick and Washington Counties; Support WJ-III training **Frostburg State University** – Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Garrett and Allegany Counties **College of Notre Dame** – Improve teacher training in reading (advanced coursework designed for students with disabilities) **University of MD – College Park** – Develop 5 new professional development schools with PG County Public Schools; increase PDS program to secondary schools	**Allegany** - Handwriting strategies; OT in-service Baltimore City - Inclusion **Calvert** - Reviewing IEPs for Access to General Education Curriculum **Caroline** - IMAP training **Carroll** - Reading Assessment and Instruction **Cecil** - FBA and BIP **Charles** - IMAP and Autism Training **Dorchester** - Accommodations in general education **Garrett** - Inclusion of SED Students **Harford** - Reading Interventions **Howard** - Mentoring new teachers **Kent** - Differentiated Instruction Strategies **Montgomery** - Inclusion **Prince George's** - Accommodations for Secondary Students **Queen Anne's** - Academy of Reading **St. Mary's** - Paraprofessional training **Wicomico** - Inclusion Model Training **Maryland School for the Blind** - Reading Comprehension Strategies

GOAL 3   PRESERVICE TRAINING WILL PREPARE PERSONNEL TO WORK WITH INCREASED EFFECTIVENESS: Pre-service programs will increase their productivity and capacities to align personnel preparation with standards-based reform and with professional development to improve education and the outcomes of students with disabilities.

IHE/LSS Grants ($50,000-$75,000)	LSS Grants ($12,500)
Goucher College – Pre-service training in the area of educational diagnostics in order to ensure implementation of IEP **Bowie State** – Mentoring Program in PG county **Coppin State** – Developing an assessment institute, mentoring in Baltimore City **Johns Hopkins University** - Mentoring preschool special education teachers and providing related coursework **Towson University** – Design a blended Elem/SE teacher education program and develop PDSs, Mentoring new teachers in Howard County **Frostburg State University** - Develop a dual SE/secondary program **Mount St. Mary's College** - Redesign SE teacher education program	**Howard** - new teacher mentoring

GOAL 4   EARLY INTERVENTION SYSTEMS WILL PREPARE CHILDREN WITH THE NECESSARY READINESS SKILLS FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS: The statewide early intervention system will improve its capacities to provide high-quality services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and to promote readiness to learn.

IHE/LSS Grants ($50,000-$75,000)	LSS Grants ($12,500)
Johns Hopkins University - Mentoring preschool special education teachers and providing related coursework **Loyola College** - Implement a new ECI/SE teacher education program	

GOAL 5   TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WILL ENSURE IMPROVED EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES: Capacities for improving instruction and outcomes of students with disabilities will be strengthened throughout Maryland's education community as a result of technical assistance for improvement of education and management of change.

IHE/LSS Grants ($50,000-$75,000)	LSS Grants ($12,500)
Hood College – Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Frederick and Washington Counties; Support WJ-III training **Frostburg State University** – Develop in-service training on the Learning Strategies Intervention Model in Garrett and Allegany Counties **University of MD – College Park** – Develop 5 new professional development schools with PG County Public Schools; expand PDSs to secondary schools	**Calvert** - Reviewing IEPs for Access to General Education Curriculum **Caroline** - IMAP strategies **Carroll** - Reading Assessments **Cecil** - FBA and BIP **Charles** - IMAP and Autism training **Dorchester** - Accommodations in general education **Garrett** - Inclusion of SED students **Harford** - Reading Interventions **Montgomery** - Inclusion **Prince George's** - Accommodations for Secondary Students **Queen Anne's** - Academy of Reading **St. Mary's** - Paraprofessional training **Washington** - SIMS training