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# Local Implementation for Results (LIR) Plan

## strategic imperative: secondary transition

Building a Comprehensive Secondary Transition System through:

Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of Effective IEP Secondary Transition Planning for students ages 14-21.

Secondary Transition Evidence-Based Practices (EBP)/Predictors with Fidelity (ages 14 through 21)

Stakeholder Linkages and Implementation

Job-embedded Inclusive Professional Learning and Coaching related to Career Technology Education (CTE), Work-based learning, and Higher Education Outcomes.

**Directions:** Engage in the TAP-IT data-informed decision-making process (an evidence-based data analysis and decision-making cycle).

*Build a* ***TEAM***

***ANALYZE*** *data to identify the potential root cause(s) and priority area(s);*

*Develop a* ***PLAN*** *with data-informed goal(s) based on identified priority area(s);*

***IMPLEMENT*** *strategies/evidence-based practices with fidelity in the priority area; and*

***TRACK*** *implementation progress and outcomes.*

Partner with your MSDE DEI/SES liaison to develop your SFY 2025 Access, Equity, and Progress LIR plan.

### TEAM: Local Implementation Team Formation for Strategic Collaboration

Identify the local implementation team including names, titles, e-mail, and phone contact information. Include General Education partners/internal and external stakeholders in the team.

| **Name and Title** | **Phone Number** | **Email Address** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Additional participants to invite:

How often does the ST Local Implementation Team Meet?

*Note: Highly Performing Teams meet at least quarterly to review data and modify the plan as appropriate to ensure effective progress monitoring.*

### Analyze: Review Trend Data, Determine Root Causes, and Identify Priority Area(s)

Identify prior focus areas withing your System and describe the impact of this work, including changes in infrastructure, professional practice, and student outcomes.

Identify data points relevant to your system’s priority area(s). Possible data points:

* SPP/APR Part B Indicators (use current data as available)
* Graduation, Indicator 1
* Drop-Out, Indicator 2
* Secondary Transition, Indicator 13
* Post-School Outcomes, Indicator 14
* Outcomes from previous LIR goal results
* Student Services Data
* Behavior
* Attendance
* Maryland Indicators of Effective Transition Practices (ETP) Local Results
* Local Implementation of Evidence-based practices and predictors
* Stage of implementation (General and Special Education) of Integrated Tiered Systems of Supports
* Division of Rehabilitative Services (DORS) data
* Pre-employment transition services (pre-ETS) vs traditional DORS services
* Youth applications and enrollment
* Career and Technology Education data
* Department of Labor, License, and Regulation (DLLR) data
* Enrollment in America’s Job Centers (AJCs)
* Youth enrollment
* Employer satisfaction surveys
* Internal monitoring reviews (IEP/Transition plan, work-based learning, employment)
* Local policies and procedures, and practices data (i.e., referrals, IEP teaming, IEP development, implementation, and evaluation)
* Other (i.e., results from locally developed surveys, feedback from parents or community partners)

Consider how your current inclusive personnel development activities (hiring and retention of staff, professional learning across service providers/systems/schools, coaching, performance assessment/fidelity) and/or infrastructure (allocation of resources, staffing patterns, use of data, consistent messaging) either support or challenge narrowing the gap for students with disabilities in your system.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Utilize a data analysis strategy (e.g., 5 Whys, Fishbone) to determine and document possible root causes.

| Data Source and Trend | Root Cause Analysis | Impact on Narrowing the Gap  (Why is this important?) |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### PLAN: Identify Priority Goal and Strategy/Evidence-Based Practice(s) To Be Implemented

Identify one or more priority goals and the strategy or evidence-based practices to be implemented to narrow the gap. Goals and activities should serve as a catalyst for the development of a sustainable, integrated system. Goals may target selected schools, regions, programs, or groups of students.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GOAL 1** | | |
| **Priority Area(s) addressed in Goal 1:** Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of Effective IEPSecondary Transition Planning for students ages 14 -21 Secondary Transition Evidence-Based Practices (EBP)/Predictors with Fidelity (ages 14 -21) Stakeholder Linkages and Implementation Job-embedded Inclusive Professional Learning and Coaching related to Career Technology Education (CTE), Work-based Learning, and Higher Education Outcomes | **Federal Accountability Indicator(s) Impact**: | **Identify Root Cause(s) addressed by Goal Statement 1:** |
| **Goal Statement 1.** [ Goals must be stated in SMART format: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and with a Timeline for completion.] | | |
| **Strategy/Evidence-based Practice (to implement to make progress towards the goal).** [Strategies/EBPs should address what specifically will be implemented with fidelity to achieve goals.] | | |

### IMPLEMENT: Identify Personnel Development and/or Infrastructure Implementation Activities

| Activity | | Who is involved?  (selected school(s), programs, regions, and/or groups of children/students) | When will it happen?  (Month/Year) | What is the projected cost? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  |  |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  |  |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  |  |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  |  |

### TRACK: Identify Benchmarks to Measure Progress

| **How will it be known that progress is being made? (Benchmark/Outcome)** | **What data will be used to measure progress?** | **How often will benchmark data be collected?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GOAL 2** | | |
| **Priority Area(s) addressed in Goal 2:** Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of Effective IEPSecondary Transition Planning for students ages 14 -21 Secondary Transition Evidence-Based Practices (EBP)/Predictors with Fidelity (ages 14 -21) Stakeholder Linkages and Implementation Job-embedded Inclusive Professional Learning and Coaching related to Career Technology Education (CTE), Work-based Learning, and Higher Education Outcomes | **Federal Accountability Indicator(s) Impact**: | **Identify Root Cause(s) addressed by Goal Statement 2:** |
| **Goal Statement 2:** [ Goals must be stated in SMART format: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and with a Timeline for completion.] | | |
| **Strategy/Evidence-based Practice (to implement to make progress towards the goal).** [Strategies/EBPs should address what specifically will be implemented with fidelity to achieve goals.] | | |

### IMPLEMENT: Identify Personnel Development and/or Infrastructure Implementation/Activities.

| Activity | | Who is involved?  (Selected school(s), programs, regions, and/or groups of children/students) | When will it happen?  Month/Year | What is the projected cost? | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  | |  |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  | |  |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  | |  |
|  | Choose a factor. |  |  | |  |

### TRACK: Identify Benchmarks to Measure Progress

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| How will it be known that progress is being made? (Benchmark/Outcome) | What data will be used to measure progress? | How often will benchmark data be collected? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Reporting Requirements

**Interim and Final Progress Reports** must contain a detailed status of implementation, expenditures, and related benchmark data aligned to **each goal**. Please include information that highlights the **reinforcement and sustainability** of your AEP system.

| **Date** | **How** | **Who** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| January 31, 2025 |  |  |
| January 31, 2026 |  |  |
| November 30, 2026 |  |  |

# LEA Signatures Required for Submission

Local Director of Special Education Signature Date

Secondary Transition Coordinator Signature Date

## MSDE, DEI/SES Approvals

MSDE, DEI/SES, Secondary Transition Liaison Signature Date

MSDE, DEI/SES, Fiscal Grants Liaison Signature Date

# Rubric

A Review Committee composed of programmatic and fiscal representatives from the MSDE, DEI/SES will assign numerical scores to each plan proposal based on the criteria on the scoring rubric. Plan Proposals must receive a cut score of 35 to be considered for funding.

## Implementation Team (10 total points)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary  9-10 points** | **Meets Standard  7-8 points** | **Does Not Meet Standard  0-6 points** |
| There is a clear and robust management plan to ensure successful completion of the project. Highly qualified key personnel have been identified and have experience in conducting the activities and achieving the proposed outcomes. The roles and responsibilities of all key personnel are directly aligned to the proposed activities. Evaluation of the project activities and goals is an important part of the management plan presented. | There is a management plan to ensure execution and completion of the project. Qualified key personnel have been identified to provide oversight. Roles and responsibilities of key personnel are directly aligned to the activities and strategy. Program evaluation is an integral part of the management plan. | There is a limited management plan. Key personnel have been identified to provide oversight. Roles and responsibilities of key personnel are not aligned to the activities and/or strategy. Program evaluation is only loosely addressed in the management plan. |

## Review Trend Data, Determine Root Causes, and Identify Priority Area(s) (10 total points)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary  9-10 points** | **Meets Standard  7-8 points** | **Does Not Meet Standard  0-6 points** |
| The plan demonstrates a compelling and urgent need supported by evidence from the field and data within Maryland. Historically underserved groups are included in the needs assessment. The applicant has a demonstrated a history of experience and sustained positive outcomes. | The plan demonstrates a need for the proposed activities and provides some data but may not be directly related to the need. Either research or local data may be provided but may not address historically underserved groups. The applicant has experience and reports positive outcomes. | The stated need is not clearly defined, and data is not clearly related to the need. The plan has not committed to including historically underserved groups. The evidence of impact is weak. |

## Priority Goal(s) and Strategies/Evidence-Based Practice(s) (20 points)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary  13-20 points** | **Meets Standard  7-12 points** | **Does Not Meet Standard  0-6 points** |
| Plan goals are clearly stated, ambitious and attainable. There is a direct and robust alignment to the purpose and intent of the strategy. Clear milestones are provided that measure progress towards meeting the goal(s). All goals and objectives are measurable, having a clear alignment with the root cause factor(s) or need identified. | Plan goals are clear and measurable. Program goals align with the purpose and intent of the strategy. Milestones are provided that measure progress towards meeting the goal(s). | Plan goals are stated, but they are not measurable. There is a not a clear alignment to the strategy selected. Milestones do not measure progress towards the goal(s). |

## Benchmarks to Measure Progress (10 points)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary 9-10 points** | **Meets Standard  7-8 points** | **Does Not Meet Standard  0-6 points** |
| There is a clear plan for how the applicant will measure the success of the program. There are clear benchmark measures that align to the program requirements and goals. | There is a plan for how the applicant will measure the success of the program. There are benchmark measures that loosely align to the program requirements and goals. | There is not a clear plan for how the applicant will measure the success of the program. Limited benchmark measures that do not align with program requirements and goals. |

## Budget (10 points)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary 9-10 points** | **Meets Standard 7-8 points** | **Does Not Meet Standard 0-6 points** |
| The budget directly reflects plan activities and includes sufficient resources for successful execution within the proposed timeline. Justification has been provided for all expenses. There is a clear explanation of costs and demonstrates cost-effectiveness. All line items contain the calculations. | The budget reflects most planned activities. Justification has been provided for most expenses. There is a clear explanation of costs and demonstrates cost-effectiveness. Most line items contain the calculations used to derive the expected cost. There may be a few mathematical errors. | The budget reflects some plan activities and/or includes erroneous costs. Some line items are missing the calculations used to derive the expected cost. Some line items may not be justified for implementation of the proposal. |