

**STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2021**

**Maryland**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2023**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

In grades 3, 4, and 5 mathematics proficiency of students with disabilities will increase and the performance gap will narrow.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Four Maryland counties (Cecil, Charles, Queen Anne's, and Worcester) participated in the SSIP during this reporting cycle. Students from grades 3 to 5 in these four counties are included in these analyses. All elementary schools in each district are used for data collection. Moving forward the State will add two local education agencies (Baltimore and Howard Counties) to the SSIP with a continued focus on grades 3 to 5 mathematics performance and gap reduction.

#### Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

#### Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The State's Theory of Action was refined to align and extend the Maryland ESSA State Plan with a focus on capacity need (evidence-based specially designed math instruction), an improvement model inclusive of professional learning and coaching within a data-informed continuous improvement cycle, and a school organizational structure aimed at effective ITSS structures with collaborative planning time. The SiMR does not change but the participant local educational agencies have changed. Updates to the Theory of Action include the following enhancements:

- Creation of an active University-State-Local Education Agency partnership committed to the collaborative design of EBP.
- Development of systems change processes focused on a proven framework directed at organizational structures, professional learning, and specially designed math instruction.

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/MDTheoryofActionFFY2021.pdf>

### Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	10.40%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	13.00%	14.00%	14.00%	15.00%	15.00%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Third- through fifth-grade public school students with IEPs in the four MD SSIP counties who meet or exceed mathematics grade-level expectations on the annual State	Third- through fifth-grade public school students with IEPs in the four MD SSIP counties who take the annual State	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage

<b>assessment (the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program [MCAP]).</b>	<b>assessment in mathematics.</b>					
7	101	2.71%	13.00%	6.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) serves as the data source.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

SiMR data come from grade-level results on the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program (MCAP) exam in mathematics. MCAP results are publicly available data. The data are aggregated by district and school and analyzed by district by grade and reviewed for school and grade level. The data are disaggregated for students who have an IEP compared to data for all students. The SSIP target is the percentage of students who are proficient (level 4 and 5) in meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations in mathematics. No data are available for FFY 20 (no assessment due to Covid) and for FFY 21 (due to a shortened assessment administered in fall 2021 instead of spring 2021). FFY 22 data is reported here for newly participating schools.

**MCAP Spring 2022 - Mathematics – Baseline**

- Baltimore County Public Schools: Grade Level: 3, 4, & 5. X of 44 students with disabilities tested scored proficient with a x% proficiency rate.
- Howard County Public Schools: Grade Level: 3, 4, & 5. 6 of 58 students with disabilities tested scored proficient with 10.3% proficiency rate.

Preliminary data suggests that the Mathematics Proficiency Rate for students with disabilities across the participating schools in both LEAs is highest in Grade 3 (17.1%) with a significant decline in Grades 4 (0%) and 5 (6.6%).

**Demographic Profile of Participating Schools**

**Baltimore County**

- MEES: Total student population 350 learners with 17% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 74% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 58% of the student population identify as African American, 15% identify as White, 17% identify as Hispanic, 8% Multi-racial and 3% identify as Asian.
- SBES: Total student population 520 learners with 10.9% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 71.5% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 88.9% of the student population identify as African American, 2.35% identify as White, and 7.9% identify as Hispanic.

**Howard County**

- HHES: Total student population 823 learners with 13.6% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 36.2% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 41% of the student population identify as African American, 11.42% identify as White, 15.6% identify as Hispanic, 6.4% Multi-racial and 24.6% identify as Asian.
- JHES: Total student population 410 learners with 10.2% identified as receiving Special Education Services and 32.7% participating in Free and Reduced Meals. 42.4% of the student population identify as African American, 18.8% identify as White, 23.2% identify as Hispanic, 5.8% Multi-racial and 22.4% identify as Asian.

The State will hire an external evaluator to gather, organize and analyze outcomes related to student performance and achievement as related to the implementation of EBPs with fidelity reflected in individual student data analysis as well as the aggregate school-wide data. Formative evaluation data will be used to drive improvement actions across implementation by providing real-time information necessary to adjust and fine-tune improvement actions. Summative evaluation data will provide evidence of the unique contribution of the plan implementation actions reflected in the existing evaluation activities.

- The primary measure is the MCAP with a need to supplement this measure with a valid and consistent assessment that can be used over time to inform instruction and evaluate impact.
- The implementation of consistent local measures of student performance to inform specially designed math instruction aligned with State standard and can be used across LEAs for the analysis of student growth over time.
- A replicable, well-defined approach for the selection and/or design of math intervention tailored to the unique needs of learners with disabilities.
- Establish protocols and practices for the evaluation of professional learning with coaching to demonstrate how changes in adult behavior/professional practice impacts student outcomes.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

The State identified two data quality issues specific to the SiMR data for the final evaluation of SSIP implementation across the 4 LEAs (Charles, Cecil, Queen Anne's, and Worcester).

- **Comparability of local assessments.** MSDE collects low-stakes assessment data from the LEAs, and the LEAs participating in the SSIP each use different low-stakes assessments to measure mathematics performance throughout the school year. Each of these assessments have its own cut score for meeting grade-level standards and the threshold may not be comparable. While this may inform instruction within the schools or districts, it is less useful for evaluation purposes across districts. More valid conclusions can be reached when individual student data is collected and when MCAP test scores are available, since these allow for direct comparisons across the State.

- **Reporting on professional development/professional learning.** The LEAs began to take ownership and provide most of the professional learning in mathematics instruction and adaptations. LEAs received discretionary grant funding to supplement the provision of coaching to educators in their schools, beginning with a few target schools and expanding across their districts. There was considerable variability in the extent to which the LEAs utilized the survey tool to provide evaluation data. As a result, data about PL participation and feedback may not be representative of all PL participants, depending on the response rate of each LEA.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

Data for FFY 20 was not collected because the assessment was not administered. An abbreviated assessment in fall of 2021 is not being publicly reported due to the nature of the assessment, altered in quality and timeline.

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

<http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/EvaluationPlanDraftFFY23.pdf>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

Changes to the evaluation are defined in the updates to the evaluation plan with an emphasis on greater specificity related to : A formative evaluation will use data gathered during project implementation to help improve progress toward achieving SSIP goals. These will include qualitative input from implementers (University faculty, MSDE staff, school administrators, and implementing teachers), as well as ratings of products designed to guide the work of the SPDG/SSIP (e.g., EBP definitions, fidelity tools, products produced) related to quality, usefulness, and relevance, as well as alignment with research evidence, by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of product

A summative evaluation will focus on assessment of outcomes: the extent to which the SPDG/SSIP achieved its goals and objectives; the extent to which change in University coursework, State technical assistance, and Local professional learning activities has occurred; the extent to which participants implement EBPs with fidelity; as well as the extent to which there is an impact on student performance. Measures will include surveys (for Stakeholders, independent review panel, targeted participants), ratings based on criteria for content of products delivered (by Stakeholders and Independent review panel), fidelity of implementation, percent of completed components of local products delivered, percent of knowledge acquired through professional learning, and differential data of student achievement on State and local assessments.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

With the focus of the SSIP shifted to newly identified LEAs committed to the use of strengthened strategies in support of the implementation of refined evidence-based practices (EBP), the evaluation plan also shifted to measure both implementation and results. This shift occurred with funding from OSEP for a State Personnel Development Plan (SPDG) that maintained the SiMR but improved the methods for implementation. An additional focus on social-emotional learning as an EBP to support mathematics learning was added.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

- **Governance:** The State re-established LEA leadership teams which met a minimum of twice a year (virtually) to expand understanding of math instructional best/evidence-based practices, increase support across the State and develop coherent messaging from MSDE. Documentation of challenges, successes, barriers, and solutions.
- **Professional Learning/Technical Assistance:** The State continued to address capacity building across the SSIP districts and within the State implementation team. The original participant LEAs utilized State discretionary grant funding to support locally driven professional learning, instructional coaching, and continuous improvement.
- **Data:** The State continued to support continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics across the SSIP districts using EBP aligned to implementation fidelity specific to instructional coaching practices.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Governance:

- Peer systems coaching by DEI/SES staff members with LEA partners (engagement in monthly local implementation team meetings, initially onsite and then remotely) - technical assistance
- Increase the knowledge of stakeholders and acquire stakeholder input into SSIP strategies through regular participation in the SESAC quarterly meetings – accountability
- Increased quality and consistency in coaching through coaching conversations across SSIP districts to support fidelity (16% of teachers responding to survey indicate that the frequency of teacher-coach interactions occurred at least daily with an additional 16% of teachers indicating weekly contact.)

Support / challenge to system change:

- Specific coaching protocols are necessary to support implementation. Variable practices across the 4 districts lead to inconsistencies in the evaluation of effectiveness. This is especially evident in the self-reported use of an “Established Fidelity Tool” at 25%. It is critical that fidelity is clearly defined with observable criteria. Ongoing coaching through a protocol applied across schools and districts is a key component of the implementation plan moving forward. (The coaches’ assessment of their understanding of the EBP mathematics practices was indicative of a need for coaching aligned to EBP in mathematics. 20% of respondents indicated expertise in the math practice. 69% of respondents indicated a solid understanding of the math practice.) Implementation with fidelity impacts local district and State sustainability of the EBP necessary to achieve the SiMR.
- Regular participation in the SESAC quarterly meetings failed to impact system change across the 4 districts or the State. Collaboration with partners is key to maximizing effectiveness. Plan implementation has been refined to address this infrastructure improvement strategy (see next steps summary).

Professional Learning/Technical Assistance:

- State discretionary funding continued to support locally driven professional learning, instructional coaching, and continuous improvement.
- MSDE programmatic liaisons supported local actions with updates provided within the context of the “Conversations for Solutions” professional learning events.

Support / challenge to system change:

- After teachers, coaches, and administrators participated in a professional learning opportunity offered by the district or the State, they completed a survey in which they were asked about their level of knowledge before and after participating in the training event. Based on participant self-reporting, 76% of professional learning participants indicated that their knowledge increased “extensively”. Although participants reported increased knowledge and skills there was no mechanism to determine the impact of training on instructional practice, student outcomes, SiMR. Sustainability is achieved when the professional learning is implemented with fidelity overtime thus becoming a standard of practice. The professional learning and technical assistance implementation plan have been refined to address this infrastructure improvement strategy (see next steps summary).

Data:

Support / challenge to system change:

- Without a valid and usable data system, and without the talent and skill to use data reports for instructional decisions and to evaluate the impact of the EBP, local school systems will not be able to decide if they are being effective and will not be able to attribute any change in student performance to actual change in teacher instruction. Data use for decisions is critical to both achieving the SiMR and for sustaining use of EBPs over time.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Next steps include the following:

- Governance:
  - o The State has implemented a Stakeholder Advisory Group which meets quarterly to:
    - ? Develop a shared understanding of EBP
    - ? Advise the design of EBP
    - ? Advise on family and community engagement
    - ? Review data and plan of the Design Team
    - ? Contribute to the evaluation process
  - o The State recognizes that diversity of representation, knowledge and skills, and expertise are essential to systems change and shared ownership of improvement outcomes. This includes a Design Team and Focus Groups composed of:
    - ? University partners
    - ? National experts
    - ? State and Local leadership
    - ? Diverse school communities across LEAs
  - o The State has identified key personnel to contribute to the oversight, management, and day to day operations of the implementation plan as defined in the SPDG

Outcomes:

- o Conduct Stakeholders Advisory Group and establish Focus Groups
- o Establish practice profiles to operationalize Professional Learning, Math, SDI and SEL EBP
- o Implement Math SDI and SEL within an integrated, tiered system of supports
- o Embed EBP Math in SDI and SEL university level coursework
  - Professional Learning/Technical Assistance: The State has established a refined framework for professional learning and coaching using guidance from NIRN for operationalizing the essential functions of core professional learning and coaching activities
- o Application of framework across university, State, and local learning environments inclusive of
  - ? Content focus
  - ? Active learning
  - ? Sustained connections within a professional learning community
  - ? Collective participation
  - ? Coherence including the use of data analytics from real student data
  - o Emphasis on broad stakeholder ownership as the foundation for systemic change
  - o Professional learning integrated with school improvement
- Outcomes:
  - o Model and implement professional learning and coaching practices for State and local personnel implementing improvement planning
  - o Embed EBP in Math, SDI, and SEL practices in special education teacher preparation coursework
    - o Implement PL EBP with fidelity
  - o Embed EBP Math in SDI and SEL university level coursework
    - o Conduct a “retreat” with the Design Team, Implementation Team, and external evaluator to determine plan modifications
  - Data: The State will demonstrate continuous improvement of learner outcomes in mathematics across the SSIP districts as evidenced in the SiMR data.
    - o Increased achievement in mathematics for children with disabilities over 3 years (MCAP data)
    - o School-wide decrease in achievement gap in mathematics (Universal Screener)
    - o Increased social emotional competence (SEL assessment tool)
    - o Improved implementation of professional learning (QUR & E)
- Outcomes:
  - o Gather and report student baseline data in mathematics achievement and SEL- competence
  - o Create district and school profiles of instructional, curricular, intervention, and PL practices
  - o Create and implement EBP Math, SDI, and SEL fidelity measures
  - o Collect PL and coaching fidelity data in University courses
    - o Analyze and summarize student performance data by grade, school, and district to target improvement

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

The EBPs implemented by the 4 LEAs (Charles, Cecil, Queen Anne’s, and Worcester) critical to achieving the SiMR for this reporting period were identified by each LEA. Implementation continued to promote mathematics proficiency for students with disabilities in targeted elementary schools:

- Cecil County: “Targeted Mathematics Instruction” designed through a practice profile and fidelity tool.
- Charles County: Team Based Cycle of Instruction (TBCI) and Structured Cooperative Learning (SCL) with embedded culturally responsive practices within math instruction.
- Queen Anne’s County: “Do The Math” Intervention scaled up across all elementary schools (<https://www.hmhco.com/products/do-the-math/>)
- Worcester County: Main Lesson, Menu Lesson Instructional Framework based on John Tapper’s instructional strategies and Concrete, Representational, Abstract (CRA) assessments.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

**TARGETED MATH INSTRUCTION**

Core Components:

1. Formative Assessment
2. Math Content and Pedagogy
3. Intervention Design

Formative Assessment:

High Leverage Assessments: are a progress monitoring tool that assess student understanding related to High Leverage Concepts at each grade level.

- Administer 3 times per school year
- Analyze student responses using the OGAP Learning Progressions
- Identify students in need of targeted instruction

Formative Probes: are a formative assessment administered during instruction to assess progress toward the High Leverage Concepts

- Administer as part of the instructional process
- Analyze student responses using the OGAP Learning Progressions
- Analyze to determine the areas of need for targeted instruction

Analysis of Student Work: involves teachers and teacher teams analyzing student work and strategies used in alignment with the OGAP Learning Progressions to inform instruction

- Analyze and sort student work to determine the applied student strategies and possible misconceptions
- Determine the next step for targeted instruction using the OGAP Learning Progressions

Results of Formative Assessment Analysis: are used to inform targeted instruction to narrow the gap between where students are on the OGAP Learning Progression and the current learning goal.

- Identify current levels and student strengths based on formative assessment
- Utilize the results of the formative assessment and identify the student's placement on the OGAP Learning Progression.
- Identify the appropriate instructional pathway along the OGAP Learning Progression

Unique Student Needs: must be considered when planning targeted instruction. Universal Design for Learning, accommodations, modifications, and/or supplementary aids and services are critical instructional design considerations.

- Identify the learning characteristics and unique needs of students and utilize them in planning instruction
  - Adhere to accommodations, modifications, and/or supplementary aids and services that are identified within the IEP
- Standards-Based IEP Goals: in mathematics are identified and written based upon assessments that determine student understanding of high leverage concepts and readiness for major grade level content clusters.
- Identify instruction level mathematics goals addressing high level concepts in which students demonstrated difficulty
  - Identify grade level mathematics goals addressing major grade level content clusters when necessary

• Main Lesson-Menu Lesson Plan

#### DO THE MATH ADAPTATIONS

Materials and Time

- Teacher and student materials ready
- Teacher organized and familiar with lesson

Instructional Routines

- The gradual release model is used to teach explicitly
- Concrete manipulatives are used to demonstrate concepts
- Mathematical representations are modeled and recorded on the board
- Accurate math vocabulary is modeled and consistently used during instruction

Student Engagement

- Students are focused and participate throughout all steps of the gradual release model
- Students work cooperatively with partners as directed for assigned instruction, games, Think-Pair-Share, etc.
- Manipulatives are utilized appropriately during instruction and partner work

Ongoing Evaluation/Check for Understanding

- The math content is modeled, and students are asked clarifying questions to demonstrate understanding before being released to work in pairs
- Student responses are acknowledged with appropriate feedback provided during direct instruction
- Students are monitored for understanding during partner work to assess readiness for release to independent work
- Students demonstrate the ability to apply concepts taught from the first lesson to other lessons throughout the week.

General Observations of the Group

- Student success rate is high
- Transitions between activities are smooth
- Teacher uses evidence from student work as a means to evaluate student understanding
- Teaching goals adjusted for each child as needed

#### MAIN LESSON-MENU LESSON

Launch (5-10 minutes):

- Introduces main lesson, activates prior knowledge, and engages all learners (one step word problem or number talk)
- o Teacher activates prior knowledge by engaging students with prior skills or understanding
- o Teacher uses Launch to introduce Main Lesson (key concepts/strategies in Launch appear in Main Lesson)
- o Teacher uses Launch to engage all students

Main Lesson (20-30 minutes):

- Lessons and learning targets usually come from a school or district mathematics program. Main lessons include a problem or task focused on a key math concept, makes strong use of student discourse, and uses heterogeneous grouping for the purpose of inclusion.
- o Teacher provides problem solving experiences in heterogeneous groups
- o Teacher provides multiple opportunities for student-to-student discourse
- o Teacher communicates learning target(s) through verbal and visual strategies
- o Teacher checks for student understanding of learning target(s)
- o Teacher refers to learning target throughout lesson

Menu (30-35 minutes):

- This part of the lesson plan is dedicated to differentiating instruction to meet the specific individual learning needs of students in the class.
- o Teacher works with small groups or individual students while the rest of the class is engaged in a variety of learning activities.
- o Students self-select from a variety of activities from a "menu."
- Must Do's/Can Do's (Structural)
- o An observable system for assigning required and optional activities
- o Teacher provides choice of activities for students to take ownership of their learning
- Targeted Instruction (Content)
- o Teacher uses formative assessments to modify instruction
- Math Games (Content)
- o Teacher selects math games that serve an instructional purpose
- o Teacher/Paraprofessional uses games as review of mastered skills or an exploration of new learning
- Journal Prompt (Content)
- o Teacher provides a journal prompt that emphasizes student reflection on key math concepts

- o Teacher provides written feedback to students on a rotating basis
- o Teacher provides a journal for each student to write their reflections in

Closure (5-10 minutes):

- Questions or problems are posed that are related to the learning goal to focus attention and discussion on the work completed during main lesson and/or menu. These can sometimes take the form of exit slips or probes.
  - o Teacher poses question or problem to guide student to student discussion related to the learning goal
  - o Teacher asks students to reflect on the question or problem in small groups or partners
  - o Teacher asks groups or partners to share their thinking on question or problem
  - Instruction and Assessment Strategies in Math Menu (throughout the lesson)
  - o Teacher asks questions to probe and deepen student understanding or uncover misconceptions.
  - o Teacher assists students in clarifying and assessing their thinking with one another.
  - Student work is used to inform the planning of future menus
  - Activities are offered at different levels of complexity
- Formative assessment is used to identify and support struggling learners

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

The mathematics EBPs were designed by teams following intensive year-long training. Implementation science strategies (e.g., using a practice profile and fidelity check) were used to define the EBP and train implementers to initial fidelity. The theory of action was employed to identify if medium term objectives (teacher implementation) were achieved, as a path to achieving the long-term objective of the SiMR. Rates of fidelity were collected; initial ratings ranged from qualitative summaries to a checklist to a rubric; inconsistency in measures made it difficult to evaluate. This will change with the new SPDG work in which a State-level design team will create the definitions for the EBP and create the methods for measuring fidelity of implementation.

Through consistent descriptors of an EBP, it is expected that teacher instruction will be consistent and measurable, allowing the SSIP leaders to evaluate the impact of the EBP on student performance.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

The State's external evaluator created an online tool that all SSIP stakeholders used to input data. This tool was a branching survey, such that participants indicate their role and the activity on which they are reporting. The tool then opened to the questions specific to that activity and role. The external evaluator partnered with MSDE to ensure the LEAs were using the online tool throughout the school year to track implementation of SSIP activities. MSDE and the external evaluator tracked response rates by LEA and respondent role.

Coaches reported the percentage of their teachers who are implementing evidence-based practices (EBPs) and what percentage are implementing EBPs to fidelity. In addition to teachers' use of the EBPs, coaches report the extent to which they understand their district's mathematics EBP

Variable practices across the 4 districts led to inconsistencies in the evaluation of effectiveness. This was especially evident in the self-reported use of an "Established Fidelity Tool" at 25%. It is critical that fidelity is clearly defined with observable criteria. Ongoing coaching through a protocol applied across schools and districts is a key component of the implementation plan moving forward. (The coaches' assessment of their understanding of the EBP mathematics practices was indicative of a need for coaching aligned to EBP in mathematics. 20% of respondents indicated expertise in the math practice. 69% of respondents indicated a solid understanding of the math practice.) Implementation with fidelity impacts local district and State sustainability of the EBP necessary to achieve the SiMR. After teachers, coaches, and administrators participated in a professional learning opportunity offered by the district or the State, they completed a survey in which they were asked about their level of knowledge before and after participating in the training event. Based on participant self-reporting, 76% of professional learning participants indicated that their knowledge increased "extensively". Although participants reported increased knowledge and skills there was no mechanism to determine the impact of training on instructional practice, student outcomes, SiMR. Sustainability is achieved when the professional learning is implemented with fidelity overtime thus becoming a standard of practice.

Data for FFY 20 was not collected because the assessment was not administered. An abbreviated assessment in fall of 2021 is not being publicly reported due to the nature of the assessment, altered in quality and timeline. Without a valid and usable data system, and without the talent and skill to use data reports for instructional decisions and to evaluate the impact of the EBP, local school systems will not be able to decide if they are being effective and will not be able to attribute any change in student performance to actual change in teacher instruction. Data use for decisions is critical to both achieving the SiMR and for sustaining use of EBPs over time.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

N/A

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**



It is expected that the 4 SSIP LEAs (Charles, Cecil, Queen Anne's, and Worcester) will continue using their EBPs and ongoing coaching efforts as components of effective instructional practice and professional learning to continue to drive system change and improve student achievement. Strategies to achieve the SiMR are changing to meet the needs of learners with disabilities in mathematics for improvement plan implementation in the Revised SSIP LEAs (Baltimore and Howard). These strategies include:

- Evidence-based Professional Learning and Coaching: under the guidance of Dr. Thomas Guskey, and other experts in coaching and professional learning, as well as input from stakeholders, MSDE will design a professional learning system or standards that can be applied across university, State TA, and local levels to support the development of personnel capacity to implement and sustain implementation of math and social-emotional instructional practices. Standards based on research will be designed for initial and ongoing professional learning as well as job-embedded coaching.
- Evidence-based specially designed mathematics instruction: under the guidance of Dr. Jenny Root, Dr. Paul Riccomini, and another national expert in teaching mathematics to students with disabilities in general education settings, and with stakeholder input, MSDE will design a standard approach to adapting an evidence-based mathematics curriculum and daily lessons for learners with varying disabilities.
- Research-based, embedded social-emotional supports: under the guidance of Dr. Doug Fisher, and with input from our stakeholders, MSDE will design an approach for addressing the social-emotional needs of mathematics learners with disabilities during mathematics instruction and across the school day as appropriate.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.**

In Phase 1 of the SSIP the MSDE gathered stakeholders to examine a variety of student data, state indicator data, and input from a mixture of focus groups (advocates, LSS representatives, technical assistance partners, family members), resulting in agreement that math achievement was a priority area to address, and should become the State's State-Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) with a focus on grades 3 through 5. The MSDE then provided professional development workshops and coaching from national math experts to build instructional capacity of state and local coaches and provided technical assistance to support LSSs to: a) design or select their elementary math intervention based on research, b) implement the practice, c) use a team-based continuous improvement cycle with a focus on fidelity data, and d) expand local training and coaching across elementary schools. Despite the relatively high levels of teacher implementation with fidelity, the following problems have been identified:

- The design or selection of the math evidence-based practice (EBP) and measures of fidelity were created locally and not through an agreed-upon criteria. With limited math materials for screening, progress monitoring, and intervention compared to reading, (Fuchs, undated) each district designed their own EBP and created a fidelity of implementation measure. Each district used a different math curriculum and designed a slightly different approach to intervention and specially designed instruction (SDI). There is a need for a replicable, well-defined approach to evidence-based core math instruction coupled with a replicable, well-defined approach for selecting or designing math interventions with specially designed instruction to respond to the unique needs of learners with disabilities.
- The professional development model initially provided to participating LSSs also offered a coaching component through follow up grants. Local instructional coaching, however, varied across districts without a clear link to evidence-based coaching practices. There is a need to establish protocol and practice that is based on research for effective professional learning and coaching to sustain implementation with fidelity and continuously improve implementation.
- The return of students to school post-covid restrictions resulted in a higher level of behavioral challenges from children who forgot how to "do school" or who were in K through 1st grade, transitioning to middle school, or transitioning to high school and had not had a solid structured educational experience that prepared them for a whole new way of teaching and learning methods. Social-emotional supports and affirming asset-based instruction has become recognized as critical to support children's participation in learning activities, especially for those with disabilities.

MSDE has successfully applied for, and received, a State Personnel Development Grant that is specifically designed to address the SiMR, but with more highly structured strategies, fidelity measures, and PL/Coaching model that can be consistently applied across 2 school districts to improve student learning and demonstrate connections between teaching with evidence-based practices (both specially designed mathematics instruction and social-emotional support strategies). Rather than having districts design their math interventions, the work of the SPDG is to use national experts and research, with input from stakeholders including LEAs, to design practices that would be implemented with fidelity. A coaching model is being designed for implementation in FFY 23 and 24 that will be piloted and refined for replication across the State. Organizational structures that need to accompany professional learning will be addressed, such as: systems for using student data to analyze intervention needs, design of an integrated system of math and SEL supports that include the necessary, ongoing collaborative planning using continuous improvement cycles, and school schedules that allow for collaborative planning time and direct instruction in the needed dose and intensity for learners with disabilities.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

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

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's SPP/APR and State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 25, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

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

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

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

In preparation for its FFY 2021 APR submission, the State provided numerous opportunities to obtain stakeholder input on its data analysis, evaluating progress on targets, and improvement strategies. For example the MSDE, DEI/SES engages local leaders in Conversations for Solutions meetings 3 to 4 times per year. Meetings were held in August 2021, August 2022, and December 2022. Similarly, the DEI/SES obtained stakeholder feedback during each SESAC and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC) Meeting, which both occur every other month.

Because the State is proposing a new baseline and targets for Indicator #2 in FFY 2021, consistent with the APR reporting requirements, the State obtained feedback on its proposal at a December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions Meeting (which included early intervention and special education leadership from across Maryland, as well as parents and other stakeholder representatives) and the January 25, 2022 SESAC Meeting. Targets were revised as appropriate based on Stakeholder feedback and the final proposed targets are included in the the FFY 2021 submission.

As required, the State revised Indicator 3A Assessment Participation targets to match the ESEA requirement of at least 95%. Stakeholders were informed of this revision during the opportunities for stakeholder feedback mentioned above and were supportive of this revision.

For FFY '21, stakeholder engagement occurred through the States Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC). The IDEA requires each State to establish and operate an advisory panel (SESAC) which, under federal law, students with disabilities

and families of students with disabilities must comprise at least 50 percent of the committee's membership. The purpose of the committee is to advise the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for students with disabilities. Members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of students, ages birth through 21, with disabilities. Maryland's SESAC is comprised of the following strong community stakeholders:

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

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SESAC during all five meetings during FFY 2020. SESAC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part B APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SESAC, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 28, 2022, the draft FFY 2020 APR and data were presented to the SESAC.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two initial SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the LITP Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD), SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Like previous years, parents responding to both surveys provided low responses to issues of training or support. In addition, parents of students in preschool responded less favorably to receiving information about community services and supports. Parents of school-age students responded less favorably to the school providing them information on agencies that can assist their child in transition from school, providing information about organizations that support parents of students with disabilities, and explaining what options parents have if they disagree with the decision made by a school.

In FFY '22, the MSDE created a Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) specifically aligned to the work of the SSIP through SPDG funding. This group, after a launch in November 2021, began interactive half-day quarterly meetings in which they learned, advised, and made specific recommendations on:

- Recruitment, readiness, and selection criteria for applicant LEAS who wanted to join the work to address the SiMR.
- Family partnership strategies focused specifically on engagement in their child's learning of mathematics concepts.
- Incorporating social-emotional learning strategies into instruction using the Frey, Fisher, and Smith book: *All learning is social and emotional* (2019).
- Designing and clarifying the framework and practices for evidence-based mathematics instruction that would serve as the basis for implementation in target schools.

Members of the SAG include approximately 25 regularly attending representatives from:

- MSDE Assistant State Superintendents and Division staff (special education, data/evaluation, teaching and learning)
- Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education
- Parents' Place of Maryland
- MD Developmental Disabilities Council
- Kennedy Krieger Institute
- National Experts in math, SEL, and professional learning
- Towson University
- LEAs: Baltimore County and Howard County

#### **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

In each of the SAG half-day meetings, approximately 1/3 of the time is spent on learning through presentation/discussion with the SPDG Co-Principal Investigator and/or national experts (e.g., Doug Fisher, Jenny Root, Tom Guskey and more). The content of learning is components of implementation science (e.g., understanding fidelity or practice profiles), mathematics or SEL evidence-based practices, etc. in order for members to make informed recommendations. Approximately 1/3 of the time is devoted to small group problem-solving, and 1/3 of the time devoted to recommendations and next steps. These discussions have been very helpful in the LEA recruitment/selection process, decisions about implementation and family engagement, and in assisting MSDE staff in prioritizing the work.

In addition, members of the SAG participate in one of the following Design/Focus groups that meet between SAG meetings to design the EBPs and content in fidelity of implementation measures:

- Mathematics/Specially Designed Instruction

- Social-Emotional Learning
- Professional Learning/Coaching

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

With a greater emphasis on the role of the university in teacher preparation, it is anticipated that Towson University can take a larger role in support of local school systems and can become a university model for integrating specially designed instruction with standards-based mathematics instruction with embedded social-emotional supports. This will be the work of the Stakeholder Advisory Group, Design Team and focus groups are ongoing.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

Timelines have been adjusted to reflect ongoing implementation actions.

By the end of the 2023, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will identify and design the EBPs associated with evidence-based specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by Stakeholders' ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (very low – very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.

By the end of the 2023, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will define and establish the fidelity of implementation of EBP measures associated with specially designed math instruction and social-emotional supports, as measured by ratings of identified EBPs as a 4 out of 5 on a scale (very low – very high) quality, usefulness, relevance, and evidence-based.

By the end of the 2023, the SPDG Design Team, with input from Stakeholders and focus group members, will revise the specially designed math and SEL EBP process based on implementation fidelity and coaching input, as measured by a 4 out of 5 QUR rating on a 1 – 5 scale) by teacher implementers.

By the end of the 2024, Towson University faculty will have embedded EBP in math SDI and SEL practices in special education teacher preparation coursework, as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, and 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.

By the end of Years 2022 - 2026, participants receiving PL services from PL implementers (University, State, and local) will demonstrate a 25% increase in knowledge as measured by pre-post course/PL activity assessments.

By the end of the 2026, all general and special education elementary teachers participating in professional learning and coaching activities will demonstrate improved implementation of math and SEL EBPs as measured by 60% fidelity in Year 2, 70% fidelity in Year 3 and 4, and 80% in Year 5.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

N/A

#### **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **17 - OSEP Response**

#### **17 - Required Actions**