

**MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services**  
**INTERIM PROGRESS/CUMULATIVE VARIANCE REPORT**  
**IDEA Part B 611, 619, and Part D Grant Lines**

Complete this reporting form for each grant line/initiative on the Notice of Grant Award (NGA).

Recipient Agency Name: Sample County Public Schools  
 State Fiscal Year: 2015  
 Grant#/Line# (Ex. 123456/02): 15XXXX/06  
 Grant Line Initiative Name: Local Priority Flexibility  
 Reporting Period: 7/1/2014 through 12/31/2015

Agency Finance Officer: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone #: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Agency Program Director: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone #: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

For each grant line/initiative on the NGA, complete the applicable sections as indicated below:

Section I: All grantees, including Non-LSSs and IHEs, must complete Section 1 for every grant line/initiative

Section II: Passthrough Grant Lines (611 and 619)\*

Section III: Part B Passthrough (611) and Preschool Passthrough (619) Parentally Placed Private School Students (PPPSS)

Section IV: Special Education Citizens Advisory Committee

Section V: All Non-LSS and IHE Initiatives, Local Priority Flexibility, Consortia, Part D, and other Discretionary Initiatives

\*For CEIS grant lines, complete only Section I of this report. Programmatic reporting must be completed on the CEIS interim progress report.

(If a response requires additional space, increase the row height.)

**SECTION I - Cumulative Variance** (Complete this section for each grant line.)

Expense Object	Approved Budget	Expenses to Date	Variance	% of Budget Expended
Salaries & Wages			\$0	#DIV/0!
Contracted Services			\$0	#DIV/0!
Supplies & Materials			\$0	#DIV/0!
Equipment			\$0	#DIV/0!
Fixed Charges			\$0	#DIV/0!
Other: postage, travel, etc.			\$0	#DIV/0!
Indirect Cost			\$0	#DIV/0!
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>#DIV/0!</b>

1. Is spending consistent with budget projections? If not, why?

2. Will 100% of the funds be expended by the end of the grant period? If not, what is the expected balance?

3. Will a request to amend the approved budget be submitted at least 45 days prior to the grant end date?

**SECTION II - Passthrough Grant Lines (611 and 619)** (Summarize progress to date and successful outcomes.)

**SECTION III - Part B 611 and 619 Parentally Placed Private School Students (PPPSS)** (Summarize progress to date.)

Did the LSS follow the plan presented in the LAFF to ensure timely and meaningful consultation with private school and parent representatives of PPPSS with disabilities? If not, please explain.

Provide data to substantiate the number of students:

- Evaluated
- Determined to be children with disabilities, and
- Served ages 3-5 and 6-21

Provide a list of parental complaints filed since the beginning of the grant period and the status/resolution.

Provide a breakdown of the location of services, including transportation, provided.

**SECTION IV - Special Education Citizens Advisory Committee** (Summarize progress to date.)

Provide a list of SECAC activities that have taken place since the beginning of the grant period.	
Is the current membership the same as presented in the LAFF? If no, provide a list of current membership by category.	
Provide a summary of the main concerns/recommendations presented to the LSS through the SECAC and the outcomes since the beginning of the grant.	

**Section V: Non-LSS, IHE, Local Priority Flexibility, Consortia, Part D, and other Discretionary Initiatives** (Summarize progress to date.)

List each strategy to achieve outcome.	For each strategy provide data and information to demonstrate progress and successful outcomes.	Is the strategy progressing according to the timeline? If not, why?
Present a two day institute for district-level administrators and supervisors (representing Curriculum and Instruction, ESOL, Talent Development, and Special Education) to ensure that they are knowledgeable about how to incorporate UDL into materials selection, curriculum documents and lesson plans and what observers should expect to see when UDL is implemented into daily classroom instruction.	Institute held on October 16th and 17th. Two follow up surveys have been administered to participants: one at the end of training and the other in December to ask how the training as impacted their practice. After training Survey Results are in Attachment A. Based on this feedback further training was provided in November and December. Survey results for that training are presented in Attachment B. Look for lessons are using the student work protocol on the Maryland State website and information on evaluation of student work for lesson plans can be found in Attachment C. Additionally, a selection of lesson plans for schools under supervision by those involved will be drawn at random to ascertain if UDL activities have reached into classroom planning.	Training was completed on given timeline.
The LSS Educator Access Website will be updated to incorporate current information linking UDL to College and Career-Ready Standards, assessment and newly-developed technologies.	Website is under development and a contract was worked out with a developer. A multidisciplinary group composed of a variety of stakeholders was formed in October to review current UDL information on the website and prepare further directions for the developer on what materials must be included such as current information linking UDL to Common Core Standards, Framework for Teaching and newly-developed technologies. The workgroup developed a set of core ideas centered around philosophy and content to guide the updates. It was also decided a UDL Resource Library would be added to list resources available to teachers and parents to further enhance UDL. The developer has been directed to build into the website a mechanism for tracking usage and a feedback system for users to make suggestions for improvement to the website. The developer for the website located look fors and training materials developed outside of the system. Examination of training materials available on various websites related to UDL indicated that adaption of these materials would work well for this system. As such, the LSS and its developer are negotiating on the use of the materials.	Strategy is progressing according to timeline. No impediments to a successful outcome to this project are anticipated. Website redesign will be undertaken in the second semester of school year. Negotiations for use of UDL Look fors have resulted in use of the website for training until a final agreement has been reached. Exhibits of enhancements will be submitted in final progress report.

Intensive training will be provided for selected middle-school and high school co-teaching teams and differentiated grouping teams by an independent partner. The purpose is to increase the usage of data and decrease the achievement gap between special education and non-disabled students. An independent educational partner will be hired to provide these services and they will continue through May 2014.	The independent partner was identified and hired. Based on performance gap data, nine schools were selected to receive professional development on best practices for collaboration, co-teaching, flexible grouping, differentiated instruction, and using data to inform instruction. Training methods included face to face workshops, online learning events, job-embedded coaching, and participation in an online professional learning community. Initial training occurred in September and October. After 2 two-day training sessions were held the independent partner did on-site fidelity checks with classroom visits in November and December. Approximately 40 co-teaching teams were visited with pre- and post-conferences. Data from the visits conducted, and one additional round of visits in February has not yet been compiled.	Strategy is progressing according to timeline, with the exception of two of the nine schools declining to participate in the independent partner training. This is the only impediment to date. We are working with school leadership to ensure the concerns are met and the training takes place as planned. MSA results will be analyzed as soon as available from the March 2014 administration. All training materials and analysis of results will be submitted with final progress report.
The SEFEL (Social and Emotional Foundations of Learning) initiative will be expanded to train a new cohort of 10 preschool teachers and to provide job-embedded coaching for the cohort of Kindergarten teachers trained to establish Kindergarten SEFEL classrooms in school year __.	Project was not initiated at the beginning of the current reporting period due to a delay in establishing contracts with certified SEFEL trainers. Two certified trainers have now been secured. The system is using the Train Coach Train (TCT) model for SEFEL. Training is underway as of the date of this report. The SEFEL leadership team has been expanded to include partner stakeholders. SEFEL coaching for kindergarten teachers did not take place during the current reporting period but will occur in the next month. System supervisors have started visits to classrooms to ascertain the degree of implementation of SEFEL. However the development of look fors has been delayed and work will continue with a partnership between the University Partner and MSDE as materials are developed. Attachment D.	Start of project delayed. The system is confident the training and coaching will result in fidelity of implementation of the SEFEL model in targeted preK and Kindergarten classrooms. No further impediments expected to a successful outcome of this project.

If you are requesting technical assistance from MSDE staff, please explain your request here:

#### Certification:

I certify that the information provided in this document is true and correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Agency Finance Officer (signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Local Director of Special Education/Agency Program Director (signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
MSDE, Grant Liaison

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
MSDE, Program Liaison

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
MSDE, Programmatic Support & Technical Assistance Branch Chief

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
MSDE, Resource Management & Monitoring Branch Chief

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Attachment A

### Survey Results After UDL Training

	Strongly Agree or Agree	Disagree to Strongly Disagree	Unsure at this point
I feel comfortable with the elements of UDL.	33%	47%	20%
I feel that the practice lessons with which we worked illustrated clearly principles of UDL that I could use in my current position as a supervisor or curriculum leader.	72%	16%	12%
I was able to construct UDL practice lessons that I felt would be useful if I were to use them with teachers.	53%	45%	2%
I am willing to try the UDL information when I return to my position.	86%	4%	10%
With on-line support via the proposed website and with the training materials with which I worked, I am comfortable with UDL.	22%	79%	1%

## Attachment B

### Survey Results After UDL Training November and December -- only the December is reported

	Strongly Agree or Agree	Disagree to Strongly Disagree	Unsure at this point
I feel comfortable with the elements of UDL.	78%	12%	10%
I feel that the practice lessons with which we worked illustrated clearly principles of UDL that I could use in my current position as a supervisor or curriculum leader.	92%	3%	5%
I was able to construct UDL practice lessons that I felt would be useful if I were to use them with teachers.	53%	45%	2%
I am willing to try the UDL information when I return to my position.	96%	4%	0%
With on-line support via the proposed website and with the training materials with which I worked, I am comfortable with UDL.	97%	0%	3%

## Attachment C: Student Work Protocol for Analysis of Lesson Plans by Teams of Teachers

*Currently the Sample LSS is Using the Student Work Protocols on the MSDE MDk12.org Website*

<http://mdk12.org/data/progress/index.html>

home : data : monitoring student progress

### School Improvement in MARYLAND

ASSESSMENTS DATA ANALYSIS INSTRUCTION SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT USER GUIDES

#### Monitoring Student Progress

**Monitoring Progress**

- DEVELOPING A MONITORING PLAN
- ASSESSING FOR LEARNING
- ANALYZING AND USING THE DATA
- LEADING THE PROCESS
- MONITORING TEMPLATES

**Try asking school staff where each of their students is on the reading comprehension objective "drawing inferences." Which students are proficient? What evidence do they have that those students are proficient? What evidence do they have to identify what students who are not proficient still need to learn?**

Both research and common sense support the notion that we need to monitor student performance on an ongoing basis. If we are ever to know how we are doing, we will need to know where our students are. But that has been a challenge in schools. Try asking school staff where each of their students is on the reading comprehension objective "drawing inferences." Which students are proficient? What evidence do they have that those students are proficient? What evidence do they have to identify what students who are not proficient still need to learn? Educators who don't know where their students are do not have enough information to know how best to use their instructional time or which students need specific instructional interventions.

Annual data from the state assessments only gives schools a snapshot of where students are at a single point in time. Daily instruction continues between when the tests are given and when the results are returned to schools. Teachers must know on a day to day basis where their students are in relation to the content standards to have the necessary information to inform instruction.

This on-going monitoring is also the way teachers determine whether their instructional strategies are working for all students and which students need instructional interventions. Regular examinations of student performance on assignments and assessments enable teachers to make informed instructional decisions regarding teaching and re-teaching specific indicators/objectives. It is probably obvious, though not always practiced, that



**Attachment D: Outcomes and Resources Developed by the University of Maryland and MSDE  
Relative to SEFEL**

**<http://theinstitute.umaryland.edu/sefel/#>**

