General Supervision System:
The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

Overview

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) has the responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to have a comprehensive system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the IDEA, State laws, and applicable federal and State regulations. The mission of the DSE/EIS is to provide leadership, support, and accountability for results to Local School Systems (LSSs), Local Infants and Toddlers Programs (LITPs), Public Agencies (PAs), and stakeholders through the provision of a seamless, comprehensive system of coordinated services to infants, toddlers, young children, and youth with disabilities, birth through age 21, and their families.

The DSE/EIS organizational structure is based upon principles of collaboration and shared responsibility. The Division is organized by five branches: Policy and Accountability; Programmatic Support and Technical Assistance; Family Support and Dispute Resolution; Interagency Collaboration; and Resource Management. Birth through five staff are integrated within each branch. The Division matrix organizational design integrates knowledge and skills for improvement of compliance and results, and ensures consistent communication within the DSE/EIS, throughout the Department, and with external stakeholders and partners. The core functions of the DSE/EIS are leadership, accountability for results, technical assistance and program support, and fiscal and resource management. Please see Attachment A, which provides a graphic description of the Division’s cross matrix leadership.

Through the implementation of cross matrix leadership, the Division is committed to the following essential principles in order to improve results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with developmental delays and disabilities and their families:

- **Transparency:** Maintaining an open door to stakeholders and regularly keeping our stakeholders informed through formal and informal feedback loops, including quarterly birth through twenty-one special education and early intervention leadership meetings, the Annual Leadership Conference/Professional Learning Institute, meetings of the Assistant State Superintendent’s Advisory Council, and regularly scheduled convening of advisory groups, including the State Interagency Coordinating Council, Special Education State Advisory Committee, and the Early Childhood Advocacy Coalition.

- **Collaboration:** Continually engaging stakeholders through participatory processes that promote innovation, the sharing of best practices, and dissemination of research and evidence-based models. We are also committed to strengthening partnerships and planning with other MSDE Divisions and external stakeholder groups.

- **Equity, Excellence, Efficiency:** Serving stakeholders in a timely and effective manner, ensuring the availability of ‘real-time’ data for effective decision-making, and accelerating dissemination of models of best practices quickly and effectively throughout the State.
Accountability: Improving results for all infants, toddlers and preschool age children with developmental delays and disabilities served in LITPS. The DSE/EIS has developed a tiered system of analysis, monitoring, and support to identify LITPs in need of differentiated support and technical assistance. An LITP is assigned to a tier based upon performance on SPP/APR compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and findings identified through monitoring. This information is used to provide differentiated technical assistance that focuses on building capacity to improve results and directs State resources to those LITPs that are the lowest performing. At the same time, LITPs that are achieving success are recognized and provided with the support needed to publish and disseminate successful best practices.

Differentiated Framework

With the emphasis on results driven accountability, the DSE/EIS has increased its focus on the requirements related to results indicators. Each LITP is unique, and their needs for general supervision and engagement from the DSE/EIS vary greatly depending upon numerous factors. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) allows the DSE/EIS staff to monitor and provide technical assistance and support to programs in a more effective, efficient, and systematic manner.

The MSDE, DSE/EIS comprehensive system of general supervision is the Differentiated Framework. The Differentiated Framework includes tiers of general supervision and engagement to improve birth – 21 special education/early intervention results. The processes embedded in the Differentiated Framework include: Data collection; Data verification; Identification of LITP performance status; LITP improvement; Reporting; and Enforcements. Within these processes are the essential components of Maryland’s comprehensive system of general supervision:

Effective policies and procedures;

State Performance Plan (SPP) goals and targets;

Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR);

Fiscal management;

Dispute resolution; and

Targeted technical assistance and support.

The DSE/EIS has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for program support and technical assistance to provide a tiered system of monitoring and supports to address the needs of each LITP. The Differentiated Framework illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. The Division is committed to maintaining compliance and providing supports to improve the quality of special education services. An LITP is assigned to a tier based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The corresponding support an LITP can expect to receive is differentiated and based on that agency’s assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of the public agency’s needs. Please see Attachment B for a graphic representation of the Differentiated Framework.
The Differentiated Framework involves directing the Division’s attention to LITPs in need of more comprehensive engagement, technical assistance, and support in order to enable those programs to meet indicator targets, improve results, narrow the achievement gap, correct identified noncompliance, and maintain compliance. This represents the foundation of a comprehensive Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) to integrate a continuum of resources, strategies, structures and practices.

A majority of the LITPs are currently in the Universal Tier of General Supervision. This represents LITPs that have met identified performance and compliance criteria, resulting in a determination status of “Meets Requirements” or is in the first year of “Needs Assistance.” The LITPs assigned to the Universal Tier of General Supervision have no findings of noncompliance or have corrected all findings of noncompliance within one year and have maintained compliance.

Each LITP is monitored annually through a desk audit and cross-divisional data analysis of SPP Indicators, local priorities, and fiscal data. Additionally, a cyclical general supervision monitoring of select LITP includes, at a minimum, child record reviews for IDEA requirements, a review of policy, procedures, and practices, and sub-recipient fiscal monitoring. Each LITP develops and self-monitors an internal work plan including Local Priority Flexibility to address locally identified needs.

In the Universal Tier of Engagement, the focus is on professional development/learning and support to address statewide needs based on overall State trend data, (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide technical assistance include State and regional professional development, online tools, resources through the Maryland Learning Links website, Q&A Documents, and Technical Assistance Bulletins.

An LITP receiving a determination status of “Needs Assistance” for two or more consecutive years or “Needs Intervention” is assigned to the Targeted Tier of General Supervision. An LITP in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for identified noncompliance, and/or, although noncompliance may be corrected within one year, if compliance is not sustained.

Targeted monitoring occurs semi-annually and includes customized data analysis with real-time local and State data. Activities may include, but are not limited to: early intervention record reviews using selected sections of the DSE/EIS record review document, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LITP's system of general supervision, interview questions, and/or case studies. State and local joint cross-departmental and cross-divisional teams are formed to address identified needs. The LITP develops a local Improvement Plan, which is submitted to and approved by the DSE/EIS.

The corresponding Targeted Tier of Engagement focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, and technical assistance) to address the needs of the LITP on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LITP from needing substantial support. The LITP leadership is required to engage with the Division to review State and local data and information in order to implement an Improvement Plan that is approved by the DSE/EIS to build capacity to effectively address the identified needs. Evaluation and periodic feedback are critical elements of Targeted Engagement. A Targeted Assistance and Support Committee (TASC) team consisting of jointly identified local and state cross-Divisional members provides performance-based and responsive support.

Continuing up the Differentiated Framework tiers, an LITP with a determination status of “Needs Substantial Intervention” is assigned to the Focused Tier of General Supervision. These LITPs continue to have findings of noncompliance, have active CAPs for two or more years, and demonstrate little progress despite general and targeted technical assistance.
Focused monitoring is comprised of enhanced and differentiated monitoring and in-depth data analysis, and requires the participation of the State and local superintendent as well as identified stakeholders. Focused monitoring occurs quarterly and may include, but is not limited to: early intervention record reviews using selected sections of the DSE/EIS record review document, a review of the LITP’s real time data, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LITP’s system of general supervision, interview questions, provider observations, and case studies. A Focused and Comprehensive Action Plan is jointly developed by the LITP and DSE/EIS.

At this level, the goal of the Focused Tier of Engagement is to direct substantial support to address the continuous lack of improvement of the LITP through significant systems change. A multi-faceted State and local leadership team meets regularly to develop and implement an action plan designed to affect systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. Principles of effective systems change, implementation, evaluation, and sustainability are foundational elements of the technical assistance. Frequent feedback and general supervision is maintained throughout the extent of the technical assistance.

The State Superintendent and the DSE/EIS Assistant State Superintendent work closely with the local School Superintendent or local Lead Agency Head to develop a cross-departmental, cross-divisional State and local implementation team. The MSDE provides increased oversight activities to assess progress and may direct federal funds, impose special conditions, and/or require a regular submission of data. The LITP leadership is required to participate in a quarterly joint State and local Focused Intervention and Accountability Team (FIAT) to review progress.

At the highest tier, the Intensive Tier of General Supervision, an LITP fails to progress and correct previously identified noncompliance despite receiving technical assistance and support. The failure to comply has affected the core requirements, such as the delivery of services to infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with developmental delays and disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight. The LITP enters into a formal agreement with the MSDE to guide improvement and may have additional sanctions. The LITP informs the MSDE of its unwillingness to comply with core requirements.

The Intensive Tier of Engagement focuses on providing support based on a Formal Agreement that is developed to guide improvement and correction with onsite supervision. The MSDE may direct, recover or withhold State or federal funds.

Data Collection
As part of the State’s general supervision system, data are collected from several sources. In Maryland, all data related to SPP/APR reporting are available in the State’s Online IFSP Database, with the exception of complaint data and family outcomes data. The former are collected from the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) Complaint Database, while the latter are collected through a State-funded vendor.

The Online IFSP Database is a secure web-based application that serves as the primary case management tool for service coordinators and service providers working with children in the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP). The main user function is the development and monitoring of Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs). Because IFSPs are entered into the Online IFSP Database through local users, the State has access to the IFSPs of all children receiving services through the MITP. In addition, local and state leaders can utilize the data analysis functions of the Online IFSP to generate both predefined and dynamic reports to assist with programmatic data-informed decision-making.

Data collected at referral and from IFSPs for every eligible child and family are entered into the database by local staff. MSDE and the LITPs generate reports on a regular basis to monitor statewide and local compliance/results and audit for data validity and reliability.

Evidence that the data on the processes and results component are part of a State’s or an LITP’s system of general supervision includes the following:

- Data are collected as required under the IDEA and by the U.S. Secretary of Education.
Data are routinely collected throughout the year. The LITPs submit data in a timely and accurate manner. Data are available from multiple sources and used to examine performance of the LITPs.

**IDEA Requirements**

The DSE/EIS conducts a comprehensive early intervention record review to ensure LITPs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and COMAR. The LITPs are selected for review on a cyclical basis using a representative sample based on child count that includes large, medium and small programs. Every LITP is reviewed at least once during the six year cycle.

**Effective Policies, Procedures, and Practices**

Maryland has policies and procedures aligned with the IDEA, 34 CFR §303. Maryland State law and Maryland’s Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) supports State implementation of the IDEA. Each LITP is responsible for developing policies, procedures and practices for effective implementation in accordance with federal and State requirements to ensure the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Natural Environment (NE). The DSE/EIS has embedded the review of LITP policies, procedures, and practices within existing components of general supervision.

**State Performance Plan**

The State Performance Plan (SPP) is the State’s plan to improve the 11 results and compliance indicators established by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). This plan contains a description of the State’s efforts to implement the requirements of Part C of the IDEA, including how it will improve performance on indicators. As part of the SPP, each indicator has a target set by the OSEP or the State. All targets set by the State are approved by the Special Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The State Performance Plan is located on the MSDE website: [http://www.mdideareport.org](http://www.mdideareport.org).

**Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR)**

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has revised its monitoring priorities to ensure a balance between compliance and results by placing a greater emphasis on accountability and technical assistance (TA) activities that focus on improving the MSDE's capacity to develop, strengthen, and support improvement at local levels. In response to OSEP’s shift in monitoring priorities, the MSDE, DSE/EIS has revised its monitoring procedures and now places greater emphasis on requirements related to improving educational results for children and youth with disabilities. In addition, the MSDE, DSE/EIS uses the *Differentiated Framework*, thus enabling the MSDE, DSE/EIS to work collaboratively with LITPs to focus on areas in need of improvement.

This is accomplished through the Maryland’s Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) process. General supervision is accountable for enforcing the requirements and for ensuring continuous improvement. The primary focus of the MCIR process is to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities and their families and ensuring that the MSDE meets the program requirements within IDEA.

The MCIR process verifies data, documents compliance with both IDEA and COMAR regulatory requirements, and provides technical assistance for the timely correction of identified findings of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance concerning the records of individual children with disabilities always result in verification of correction using a two prong process. First (Prong 1), the records in which the noncompliance was first identified are reviewed to determine if correction has occurred, or, the requirement was completed (for timeline violations), unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or the parent has withdrawn consent. Then (Prong 2), a subsequent review of a sample of records is conducted by the DSE/EIS to determine the level of compliance. If both reviews result in 100% compliance, then correction has been achieved and the corrective action is closed.

Comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every 6 years in each LITP. The purpose of comprehensive monitoring is to ensure the LITPs:

- Are compliant with State and federal regulations;
- Have a system of general supervision in place to monitor child progress and make data informed decisions; and
Are focused on improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with developmental delays and disabilities, and their families.

While some monitoring activities are universal for all, other monitoring activities are customized to examine areas of need. These areas are identified through a variety of sources such as but not limited to:

- Indicator data verification;
- Other data reviews;
- Grant reviews;
- Fiscal data;
- Medicaid monitoring;
- Family support data;
- State complaints; and
- Advocacy organization concerns.

While compliance continues to be important, the OSEP has shifted to an RDA focus with respect to results monitoring for children and youth with disabilities. In response, the DSE/EIS has developed monitoring activities geared towards these efforts to ensure improved results. Monitoring may be conducted either off-site as a desk audit or on-site depending on the nature of the monitoring activities. The method selected is dependent upon the activity and the information that is or is not accessible online and the practicality involved in acquiring the necessary documents needed for the review.

**Desk Audit**

A desk audit refers to a review of data, Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs), or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by DSE/EIS staff at the MSDE. It may be the single method used to complete a review or may be used in combination with an on-site visit. After the completion of the desk audit, the DSE/EIS staff may request further documentation or data to clarify potential findings of noncompliance or verify correction of noncompliance.

**On-Site Monitoring**

On-site monitoring refers to a review of data, IFSPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by DSE/EIS staff within the LITPs. On-site monitoring is specifically used to carry out those activities that are not practical to complete through a desk audit by the DSE/EIS staff. Examples of on-site monitoring may include but are not limited to a review of early intervention records for Medicaid monitoring, provision of related services, data-entry verification, etc.

**Case Study Reviews**

The MSDE, DSE/EIS staff conducts case study reviews of an individual child’s early intervention record. This allows the reviewer to gauge/conclude whether the child is being provided with appropriate services, which is evidenced by continued growth and progress towards child and family outcomes.

**Interviews**

Interviews are conducted with service providers and parents. This measures consistency and understanding of practices across the local program. Additionally, the MSDE, DSE/EIS staff are able to ascertain the knowledge of local program staff pertaining to the implementation of child’s IFSP and the responsibilities of staff.

**Directed Onsite Visits**

The MSDE, DSE/EIS reserves the right to conduct a directed onsite visit at any time based on multiple sources of data indicating potential concerns, evidence of repeated concerns, or a pattern of concerns over time. These concerns may come from examining data reported to the MSDE as part of the accountability system and other sources of information, such as interactions and conversations with parents, advocates, and/or district personnel. The purpose of the directed onsite visit is to monitor compliance and identify areas of need. The scope of each directed onsite visit is based on presenting concerns.
including relevant regulatory requirements. This is determined on a case-by-case basis and may include a targeted review of any of the following: SPP/APR Indicators; SSIS 618 data; fiscal management; IDEA requirements; or implementation of any other State and federal regulatory requirements. Based on identified needs, ongoing technical assistance is provided to support improvement efforts.

**Fiscal Management**

It is the primary responsibility of the Resource Management and Monitoring Branch to ensure effective procurement, use, and oversight of Division resources. This branch also provides for the effective, fiscal subrecipient monitoring of all recipients of the IDEA grant funds throughout Maryland, including the LITPs, local School Systems (LSSs), public agencies (PAs), and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE). Through grants management staff, the Branch also ensures fiscal accountability in accordance with federal and State regulations for federal and State funds administered by the Maryland State Department of Education for the benefit of children with disabilities, ages birth through 21. The Branch assists LITPs, and other subrecipients through the application, reporting, and fiscal management of those funds. Technical assistance relative to fiscal matters is also provided to all LITPs and grant subrecipient agencies, as well as the monitoring of subrecipient compliance with State and federal grant regulations, including the Code of Federal Regulations, IDEA, Education Department General Administrative Regulations, General Education Provisions Act, Office of Management and Budget Circulars and COMAR. The Branch additionally provides data and information to the Division leadership in support of programmatic interventions and to facilitate funding determinations and resource allocations. The Branch is additionally responsible for managing major Special Education State Aid grants and acting as the Fiscal Agent for the Children’s Cabinet Interagency Fund.

**Dispute Resolution**

The IDEA provides parents certain rights and procedural safeguards. These safeguards include formal dispute resolution requirements, such as mediation, formal complaints, resolution sessions, and due process hearings. The Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch collects and analyzes data on an ongoing basis using the parent contact and dispute resolution database to ensure effective implementation of the dispute resolution system.

**Program Improvement and Correction**

Through the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) in the SPP and data from the examination of the LITP performance, ongoing state activities are used for program improvement and progress measurement. The DSE/EIS also aligns improvement activities with existing Department initiatives, such as the Department’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver, Maryland’s Race to the Top grant, and Maryland’s Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant. Technical assistance activities, designed to address the needs of each individual LITP, are based on data that are collected.

**Technical Assistance System:**
The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

**Technical Assistance and Support**

Through the Division’s strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, the DSE/EIS focuses on building the capacity of local Infants and Toddlers Programs, local school systems, public agencies, and institutions of higher education, to narrow the performance gap and enable all children to be kindergarten ready. The Division works collaboratively with other Divisions within the MSDE to improve performance on statewide accountability measures and achievement of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards. Please refer to Attachment B, *Differentiated Framework, Tiers of Engagement*. 

*Team, Analyze, Plan, Implement, Track (TAP-IT)*
The TAP-IT process is the universal delivery system for improved results through the DSE/EIS *Differentiated Framework*:  
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Tiers of Engagement. TAP-IT ensures purposeful resource allocation and collaborative effort in support of research-based actions that narrow the achievement gap for children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. Through TAP-IT the DSE/EIS partners with LITPs around five levers for change based on State Education Agency (SEA) Levers for Change in Local Education Agencies and Schools, Redding, 2013:

- **Opportunity** by braiding of resources to support innovative practices;
- **Incentives** through Statewide recognition of child progress and gap reduction;
- **Systemic Capacity** by providing Statewide data systems that include the Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS), Maryland Online IFSP, and the Maryland Online IEP (MOEIP);
- **Local Capacity** building through expert consultation, establishment of Communities of Practice (CoP), training, coaching and opportunities for diagnostic site reviews;
- **Intervention** through the DSE/EIS Differentiated Framework - Tiers of Engagement that include universal support for internal decision-making processes based on implementation science, and dissemination of proven practices with demonstrated results.

The TAP-IT process begins with the formation of an implementation team comprised of LITP and DSE/EIS representatives who operate in a clearly defined partnership. The team collects all current, relevant data sources [for example: State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Review (SPP/APR), Maryland Report Card, Ready at Five - School Readiness Data, Maryland Online IFSP Database, and Family Survey Data]. Please refer to Attachment C for a graphic representation of TAP-IT.

**Team:** The LITP leadership selects team members who are decision makers [programmatic, fiscal, organizational, human capital, and general educator(s) as appropriate] and will represent the LITP in partnership with the MSDE, DSE/EIS team (data, fiscal, and programmatic MSDE liaisons). Collaborative team sessions are scheduled face-to-face and/or through technology applications to establish team function, roles and operating norms. There is attention to building the capacity of the team using implementation science. A partnership is jointly formed by the LITP and DSE/EIS team to guide the work that includes outcomes, design, and assessment.

**Analyze:** The team studies the processes currently in place to analyze data at the state and LITP levels. The team reviews the available data that include formative, summative, longitudinal summary reports and early warning alert systems that may be in place. The purpose of each data source is reviewed, and the strength and limitations are identified. The team describes/defines the sources and processes to analyze data and identifies opportunities for programmatic support and/or technical assistance. The team analyzes the data using an agreed upon protocol (a suggestion for data informed discussions is posted on Maryland Learning Links: [http://marylandlearninglinks.org/data/ck/sites/121/files/REL_2013001.pdf](http://marylandlearninglinks.org/data/ck/sites/121/files/REL_2013001.pdf)) and reports their finding.

**Plan:** The team reviews the effectiveness of existing processes and interventions to narrow the gap between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The team shares current research and research-based practices for narrowing the achievement gap. Allocation of resources is reviewed to determine their effectiveness in narrowing the gap. The team uses evidence based questioning strategies such as Teams Intervening Early to Reach all Students (TIERS): Asking the Right Questions at [http://www.hdc.lsuhs.edu/tiers/modules/Module/TIERS%20Data%20Use%20Steps%201-8%20output/story.html](http://www.hdc.lsuhs.edu/tiers/modules/Module/TIERS%20Data%20Use%20Steps%201-8%20output/story.html), and implementation science tools that include the Hexagon Tool where information is gathered and organized. These provide the team with a complete picture of the targeted interventions and their use in the LITP (see: [http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/hexagon-tool-exploring-context](http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/hexagon-tool-exploring-context)). Plans are created and resources are aligned to narrow the achievement gap based on the data analysis. Plans use SMART
goals that are Strategic, Measurable, Attainable, Results-based and Time-bound - and include ideas for sharing success and replication (see: http://www.hr.virginia.edu/uploads/documents/media/Writing_SMART_Goals.pdf)

**Implement:** The plan is implemented with the supports and resources identified from the LITP, the DSE/EIS, and other external partners. Monitoring of progress, identification and removal of barriers to change, and diagnostic site reviews are conducted.

**Track:** Team members meet quarterly face-to-face and/or through technology applications. They receive updates from those assigned to monitor each data set, financial reports are discussed and the team modifies the work as needed (e.g., based on fidelity of intervention implementation, child performance, etc.). An annual review and report of the work is completed by the team through the SMART Process. Success is shared, and the work is scaled up as appropriate.

**Professional Development System:**
The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

MSDE DSE/EIS has several key mechanisms in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services to improve results for infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities and their families. These include the annual submission of local Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plans, Suitable Qualifications – Maryland’s Personnel Standards for Early Intervention Service Providers, and ongoing professional learning activities and resources.

**Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plans**

Yearly, each Local Lead Agency (LLA)/Local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) is required to submit a Consolidated Local Improvement Grant (CLIG) designated as the single grant mechanism through which local jurisdictions receive federal and State funds to implement local early intervention programs in compliance with federal and State regulations, policies, and procedures to support positive results for infants, toddlers, and preschool children with disabilities and their families. A requirement of the annual CLIG submission is a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plan describing how the local early intervention system provides and coordinates training and technical assistance on an interdisciplinary basis, to the extent appropriate for public and private providers, primary referral sources, Family Support Network/Preschool Partners Coordinators, parents, paraprofessionals and service coordinators to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities, including children in the Extended IFSP Option, and their families.

The CSPD Plan developed by each local jurisdiction includes, as appropriate, training on the basic components of the early intervention system; the coordination of transition services from the Infants and Toddlers Program to Preschool Special Education services, or another appropriate early childhood program; the implementation of evidence-based practices through early intervention service options, strategies and instructional practices; and the development, implementation, and incorporation of educational outcomes in the IFSP that promote school readiness, including pre-literacy, language, and numeracy skills. Training activities typically include parents together with service providers and are intended to assist families with enhancing specific areas of a child’s development to support their participation as a full partner in the development and implementation of the IFSP.

Training needs are assessed in a variety of ways and may vary from individual to individual and year to year. A formal written survey of training needs is one mechanism for gathering information to support the focus of the CSPD Plan. Other sources of information that are considered when assessing local training needs include:

- Specific data-informed decision-making based on child outcomes, family outcomes, child find practices,
and/or natural environments practices;

· Evidence-based and recommended practices;

· Family and child issues currently challenging the program;

· Local, state, and national issues, trends, focuses; and/or

· Training evaluations.

The MSDE supports an evidence-based data-informed decision making process (Team-Analyze-Plan-Implement-Track, TAP-IT) to assist jurisdictions to align local CSPD Plans with conclusions drawn from the review and analysis of the local Suitable Qualifications status report (note: Suitable Qualifications are described below), self-monitoring, local data profiles, improvement plans, corrective action plans, complaints and investigations requiring corrective actions, and other data related to program improvement.

The method and results of the needs assessment are clearly summarized in the data summary section of the CSPD Plan with the list of anticipated in-service topics reflecting the results of the local needs assessment and based on the Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning. Specific documentation about the actual professional learning provided and the results of those professional learning experiences are included in the local Final Program Report.

Required local CSPD Plan components in FFY 2013:

a) A summary of the specific data on which the plan is based that supports the need for the proposed training activities. Data include the results of the local training needs assessment of public and private providers, primary referral sources, Family Support Network and Preschool Partners coordinators, parents, paraprofessionals, and service coordinators, in addition to other data analysis results;

b) The specific purpose for which the identified training is being sponsored (e.g., areas of non-compliance and performance, program improvement/results, required corrective actions, suitable qualifications, etc.);

c) A description of each training activity, including anticipated dates, training level, topic, presenters, audience, supportive resources, and planned follow-up to evaluate and support transfer of training to practice (e.g., coaching, communities of practice, etc.); and

d) Evaluation levels, instruments, methods or procedures, and the anticipated degree of training impact on the local early intervention system.

An additional requirement of each local CSPD Plan is the inclusion of local/regional training(s) and/or technical assistance on the utilization of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process for all new and experienced staff responsible for completion of the COS integrated into the IFSP process. Jurisdictions can access technical assistance from the Programmatic Support and Technical Assistance Branch in the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services to support local/regional planning and implementation efforts for customized COS professional development. Additionally, Maryland's online COS tutorial can be accessed through www.marylandlearninglinks.org to supplement face-to-face training.

After CLIG submissions are received by the DSE/EIS, each local CSPD Plan is reviewed by designated staff (i.e., programmatic, data and fiscal MSDE liaisons) through the utilization of a comprehensive template created to ensure all required plan components are adequately addressed. Approval of each local CSPD Plan is required to maintain robust professional learning for all early intervention providers, families and other early care and education professionals. When local CSPD plans are missing data or other required components, specific technical assistance is provided to support local plan approval. Designated MSDE, DSE/EIS staff also reviews Final Program Reports to ensure appropriate
Suitable Qualifications

The MSDE/MITP has established policies relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards pursuant to COMAR 13A.13.02.08(I) and 34 CFR §303.119. There are two components to Maryland’s Personnel Standards for Early Intervention Service Providers:

1. Personnel providing early intervention services to eligible children and their families shall meet highest requirements in the State that apply to the profession or discipline in which a person is providing early intervention services.

2. Personnel providing early intervention services under this part to eligible children and their families in excess of 15 percent of employment hours shall meet:

   a. Highest requirements in the State that apply to the profession or discipline in which a person is providing early intervention services; and

   b. Suitable qualifications.

Suitable qualifications (SQ) refers to requirements for personnel employed by State, local, and private agencies who provide early intervention services to eligible children and their families in excess of 15% of their employment hours. Requirements include a minimum of 120 contact hours of documented pre-service and/or in-service training, as well as on-site consultation in nine competency areas. Identified competency areas focus on cross-disciplinary topics that are considered essential to providing family-centered early intervention services and include: Infant and Toddler Development (Typical), Infant and Toddler Development (Atypical), Infant and Toddler Assessment (Instruments), Infant and Toddler Assessment (Procedures), Family Assessment, Family Partnerships, Early Intervention Service Options, Strategies, and Instructional Practices, Team Process, and Service Coordination.

The MSDE, MITP is responsible for the review of all SQ applications, storage and monitoring of SQ statuses and data, and the provision of personnel development activities/training to support providers in meeting competency areas.

Ongoing Professional Learning Activities and Resources

In order to improve program quality and services to positively impact child and family outcome results, the MSDE Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, in collaboration with numerous partners, provides resources, training, consultation, and technical assistance to local LITP directors, service providers, community partners, stakeholders and parents in numerous formats and forums. Dissemination of these trainings, resources, media, and tools to strengthen child outcomes and the early intervention and education services provided to infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities, and their families, is supported through the DSE/EIS website www.marylandlearninglinks.org in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education (CTE).

Several online professional learning resources have been highly utilized for providing ongoing training and support to all early care and education professional as well as families.

- The Embedded Learning Opportunities (ELO) website assists IFSP teams with selecting learning experiences to integrate into families’ daily routines in an effort to enhance young children’s development of functional skills and behaviors across the three early childhood outcomes. The website is organized by three common daily routines in which parents/caregivers and children engage: mealtime, bath time, and bedtime. Within each routine area, various activities are presented by age group (birth through 5 years). Each activity enhances growth and development in relation to age-specific indicators from Maryland’s Healthy Beginnings Developmental Guidelines. Professionals can use the website with families to identify relevant activities to work toward the accomplishment of children’s IFSP
The Child Outcomes Summary (COS) tutorial assists early intervention professionals and families to understand and be successful with measuring early childhood outcome results utilizing the COS process integrated into Maryland’s online IFSP. The online tutorial supplements direct face-to-face training and provides an ongoing resource for implementing the COS process in early intervention and engaging families in the COS process in Maryland. [http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/128970](http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/128970)

The Birth-Five Evaluation and Assessment Module is an online professional learning resource designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of evaluation and assessment (birth–five), including definitions, purposes, legal requirements, recommended practices and family partnerships. Throughout the module, the learner is engaged in Checks for Understanding to assess knowledge of content. Reflection activities are utilized along with IFSP and IEP toolkits to assist the learner with effectively synthesizing assessment information. Learners are introduced to an evidence-based, data-informed decision making model to ensure purpose-driven evaluation and assessment. Differentiated learning is supported through resource links to regulations, videos, other modules and tutorials, checklists, practice briefs, and supplemental materials. [http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/142555](http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/142555)

Maryland Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning website is based on the research from the Center on the Social and Emotional Foundation for Early Learning (CSEFEL) which promotes a framework for teaching social and emotional skills to young children. The MSDE in collaboration with the University of Maryland School of Social Work/Institute for Innovation and Implementation developed evidence-based, user-friendly, online training modules to assist early childhood educators promote children’s social emotional development and address the challenging behavior and mental health needs of young children. The training is divided by age group for infant and toddler program staff and preschool program staff. The trainings are divided into 4 modules, each one containing a pre- and post-assessment and downloadable handouts. [https://theinstitute.umaryland.edu/sefel/about/index.cfm](https://theinstitute.umaryland.edu/sefel/about/index.cfm)

The Prematurity and Atypical Development Professional Learning Series is a website designed to equip early intervention professional learning facilitators with the information and materials needed to deliver a 5-module training series on prematurity and atypical development. The modules include: The ABCs and 123s of Prematurity, Diagnoses Associated with Prematurity and Developmental Implications, Understanding and Using Adjusted Age with Infants Born Prematurely, A Potpourri of Interventions for After the NICU, and Atypical Development-Increasing Awareness. Each module includes a Facilitator’s Guide, Learning Objectives, Video Presentation, and Participant Handouts along with a pre-post assessment. [http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/273786](http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/273786)

The MSDE targets specific universal professional learning activities to local early intervention leaders. These include the annual DSE/EIS Professional Learning Institute with an early childhood strand, quarterly face-to-face Birth through 21 Leadership professional learning, and monthly Birth through 21 Leadership teleconferences. For FFY 2014 and 2015 the focus of the professional learning activities for early intervention leaders will be high-quality, functional, routines-based IFSPs with the rollout of a reflection tool and training modules.

Additional universal professional learning activities are focused on Part C service coordinators with an annual/bi-annual technical assistance forum based on a needs assessment survey. Topics for the FFY 2013 forum included policy updates, collaborative teaming in the IFSP/Child Outcomes Summary Process, innovative online resources to support evidence-based practices, and family partnerships.
As described under Maryland's Technical Assistance System, the *Tiers of Engagement* provide differentiated program support and technical assistance based on State and local needs related to implementing a high quality, seamless, evidence-based early childhood intervention system of services. The Division facilitates data informed systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation of evidenced-based professional learning to enhance the quality of recommended early childhood practices including assessment, environment, family partnerships, instruction, intervention, teaming and collaboration, and transition. The differentiated engagement model focuses on building capacity to improve results and direct State resources to those LITPs that are the lowest performing, while recognizing and providing the support needed to publish and disseminate successful best practices to those LITPs which are achieving success.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Throughout FFY 2012, MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, local ITP directors, and local special education directors. Updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at all SICC meetings throughout the reporting period. A special presentation on the statewide data and the draft APR was made to the SICC on January 8, 2015.

In preparation for the new APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at a Professional Learning Institute (PLI) statewide meeting in January 2014. During the meeting, results trend data were shared, proposed target scenarios were provided, and stakeholders were given the opportunity to suggest specific targets for each results indicator. In addition, the MSDE created a SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Feedback from stakeholders was received through December 5, 2014. Results from this survey guided final target setting and were presented at the January 8, 2015 SICC meeting.

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

MSDE will make the APR and revised SPP available to the public via [http://www.mdideareport.org](http://www.mdideareport.org) shortly after submission to the Office of Special Education Programs by February 1, 2014. Copies of the APR and revised SPP will be provided to LITPs, the SICC, and other stakeholders simultaneously.

As required in the IDEA of 2004, MSDE will report to the public on the performance of LITPs on Part C Indicators # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 for FFY 2013 (July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014). Performance data in numbers and percentages will be reported for each LITP, along with the State target, State performance data, and a narrative description of the indicator. State performance data on Part C Indicators # 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 will also be reported to the public.

In partnership with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE), MSDE has developed an accessible, state-of-the art SPP/APR website for local and State performance data. The website currently includes APRs from FFY 2005 to FFY 2012 and can be accessed at [http://www.mdideareport.org](http://www.mdideareport.org). In addition to the complete SPP/APR, the website includes State and LITP results for all applicable indicators and tools for comparing local performance in relation to the State targets. The public may see progress and slippage through a combination of tables and graphs populated on the website. This site also includes OSEP’s annual State determination, and MSDE’s annual local Infants and Toddlers Program determinations. The FFY 2013 APR will be included on this website shortly after the State’s submission to OSEP.

OSEP Response
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments
Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data
Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>95.80%</td>
<td>96.70%</td>
<td>97.30%</td>
<td>96.70%</td>
<td>97.70%</td>
<td>96.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response
The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services
FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>9/24/2014</td>
<td>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>10,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Alternate Data

To report the percentage of infants and toddlers (including 3 and 4 year olds in the Extended Option) with IFSPs who received early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner, the MSDE generated a report from the statewide Part C database comparing IFSP meeting date (date of parent consent) and the actual service initiation date for all services on initial IFSPs and any service added during the time period at subsequent IFSP meetings. These data represent an entire year's worth of children receiving new services, not just a snapshot count.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner</th>
<th>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>10,395</td>
<td>96.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status | Slippage
Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)

2,152

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data were collected from the full reporting period of July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

To report the percentage of infants and toddlers (including 3 and 4 year olds in the Extended Option) with IFSPs who received early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner between 7/1/2013 and 6/30/2014, the MSDE generated a report from the statewide Part C database comparing IFSP meeting date (date of parent consent) and the actual service initiation date for all services on initial IFSPs and any service added during the time period at subsequent IFSP
meetings. The State’s criterion for timely service delivery is the following: not later than 30 days from the date of the IFSP. The target data reported for this indicator includes data for all 24 LITPs in Maryland. The MSDE and the LITPs verified family-related reasons, IFSP team decision-making reasons, and weather-related agency closings for the legitimate initiation of services outside the 30-day timeline and the report was modified based on the results of state and local reviews and LITP data verification.

**Data Collection, Reporting, and Analysis**

The percentage of children having timely service initiation includes children who had actual initiation of a new service between 0 and 30 days after parental signature of the IFSP. There were an additional 2,152 children whose service initiation date exceeded 30 days from the parental signature on the IFSP because of family-related reasons, child unavailability (e.g., child illness or hospitalization), or IFSP team decision making (e.g., physical therapy service two times per year). If the reason for untimely initiation of a service was related to a system issue (e.g., scheduling problems or staff unavailability), the service was considered untimely and the child whose service was untimely was not included in the State’s percentage of children receiving timely services.

Before finalization of SPP/APR data, local programs were reminded of the requirement to ensure the submission of timely and accurate data. Because the MSDE expects all data to be entered in a timely and accurate manner, local programs are assigned an Improvement Plan (IP) when large amounts of data (generally greater that 20% at the time of profile development) are missing from the database. As part of their IP, local programs are required to develop and implement strategies to correct data entry issues.

On September 25, 2014, the MSDE re-ran the child-level and summary actual service initiation reports and validated data. These data are used for local determinations and are reported in the State’s Annual Performance Report. The data validation for this indicator included contacting jurisdictions about justifications for late services that were unclear. Also, the predefined report includes all services that are untimely, and the MSDE staff must distinguish between those services that are untimely due to family related reasons and those that are late due to system reasons. Untimely services are summed and are reported above. For FFY 2013, statewide and local data reports were distributed on 4/1/14 and 1/28/15.

To monitor timely service data, the MSDE uses multiple predefined reports that (1) summarize the percentage of timely services, and (2) list all of the children who have untimely services or missing actual service initiation dates. During the FFY 2008 reporting year, the MSDE made changes to the Part C database in order to capture the services that had not been initiated and would never be initiated due to family-related reasons. In particular, some services are added to the IFSP but never actually start, such as when parents change their mind about approving a specific service, when families move out of the local jurisdiction, or when providers are unable to make contact with families despite repeated efforts to do so. These circumstances are now documented in both the early intervention record and the Online IFSP through a “Reason No Actual Service Initiation Date Entered” data field. This data field also reduces the amount of data validation required by the MSDE since the MSDE no longer has to request information about why these service entry dates were not entered. The MSDE also created a report to capture those services that will never start due to family-related reasons (e.g., family changed mind after signing IFSP, family moved out of state, etc.). This report has decreased the validation work required by the MSDE.
| The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. |
| OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action. |
## Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

**Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012**

At the systemic level, eighteen instances of noncompliance, less than 100% compliance, were identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator and all were corrected within 12 months or less or prior to written notification. The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through a review of updated local data and the MSDE data analyses, subsequent to the closing of the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or Improvement Plan (IP) to verify 100% compliance. Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442) consistent with timely provision of services (Prong 2). The MSDE found that all systemic incidences of noncompliance were corrected with 100% compliance achieved. This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes included by local programs in IPs or CAPs.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

**Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012**

For FFY 2012, there were 325 individual level incidences of noncompliance. The State reviewed the records of all 325 children whose services were not initiated within Maryland's 30-day timeline in FFY 2012 and verified through the Online IFSP Database that all of the services were eventually provided, although late, as documented on the IFSP (Prong 1).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.50%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>91.50%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>89.70%</td>
<td>89.60%</td>
<td>91.20%</td>
<td>92.30%</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>96.30%</td>
<td>97.10%</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>92.50%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>93.50%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Throughout FFY 2012, MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, local ITP directors, and local special education directors. Updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at all SICC meetings throughout the reporting period. A special presentation on the statewide data and the draft APR was made to the SICC on January 8, 2015.

In preparation for the new APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at a Professional Learning Institute (PLI) statewide meeting in January, 2014. During the meeting, results trend data were shared, proposed target scenarios were provided, and stakeholders were given the opportunity to suggest specific targets for each results indicator. In addition, the MSDE created a SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Feedback from stakeholders was received through December 5, 2014. Results from this survey guided final target setting and were presented at the January 8, 2015 SICC meeting.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>9/24/2014</td>
<td>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>9/24/2014</td>
<td>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</th>
<th>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>97.81%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To report on the percentage of infants and toddlers (birth to age 3) who receive early intervention services primarily in natural environments, the MSDE generated a report from the statewide database, which calculated the frequency and intensity of services delivered in all settings for all eligible children with IFSPs on 10/25/13. Infants and toddlers were considered to receive service(s) primarily in the natural environment if more than half of their early intervention service hours were provided in a home or community-based setting.

Out of 7,773 active eligible children, 7,603 children received services primarily in the natural environment. There were 170 children who received the majority of their services in settings other than natural environments. In FFY 2013, the State met its target of 92.00% and improved from the previous year by 0.21%.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments
Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

| The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets |
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 2013</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.80%</td>
<td>80.60%</td>
<td>80.60%</td>
<td>68.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 2013</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.60%</td>
<td>73.80%</td>
<td>68.80%</td>
<td>65.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 2013</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.30%</td>
<td>85.80%</td>
<td>85.80%</td>
<td>73.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 2013</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.30%</td>
<td>69.90%</td>
<td>69.90%</td>
<td>70.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 2013</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.40%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>85.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 2013</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.40%</td>
<td>75.40%</td>
<td>70.90%</td>
<td>63.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

Added Targets for FFY 2012 as reported in the FFY 2012 Part C State Annual Performance Report.

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A1 ≥</td>
<td>66.04%</td>
<td>67.04%</td>
<td>68.04%</td>
<td>69.04%</td>
<td>70.04%</td>
<td>71.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A2 ≥</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
<td>65.40%</td>
<td>65.90%</td>
<td>66.40%</td>
<td>66.90%</td>
<td>67.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B1 ≥</td>
<td>71.17%</td>
<td>72.17%</td>
<td>73.17%</td>
<td>74.17%</td>
<td>75.17%</td>
<td>76.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B2 ≥</td>
<td>61.34%</td>
<td>61.84%</td>
<td>62.34%</td>
<td>62.84%</td>
<td>63.34%</td>
<td>63.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C1 ≥</td>
<td>75.03%</td>
<td>76.03%</td>
<td>77.03%</td>
<td>78.03%</td>
<td>79.03%</td>
<td>80.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C2 ≥</td>
<td>56.16%</td>
<td>56.66%</td>
<td>57.16%</td>
<td>57.66%</td>
<td>58.16%</td>
<td>58.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Throughout FFY 2012, MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, local ITP directors, and local special education directors. Updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at all SICC meetings throughout the reporting period. A special presentation on the
statewide data and the draft APR was made to the SICC on January 8, 2015.

In preparation for the new APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at a Professional Learning Institute (PLI) statewide meeting in January, 2014. During the meeting, results trend data were shared, proposed target scenarios were provided, and stakeholders were given the opportunity to suggest specific targets for each result indicator. In addition, the MSDE created a SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Feedback from stakeholders was received through December 5, 2014. Results from this survey guided final target setting and were presented at the January 8, 2015 SICC meeting.

Stakeholders were in agreement with the State's proposal to reset the child outcomes baseline for FFY 2013 so that targets would be an accurate reflection of the State's change in data collection methodology.

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2008 data to the FFY 2013 data). Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2008 previously established baseline data to reflect the correct FFY 2013 data and indicate that this is the baseline data as reported in the State's FFY 2013 SPP.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes
FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed | 4,841

Does the State’s Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>68.80%</td>
<td>66.04%</td>
<td>66.04%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>4,838</td>
<td>65.60%</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).

A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2010, for the federal reporting of child outcome results, Maryland began using the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) at entry and exit to compare progress to typical peers. In FFY 2011, Maryland began initial implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process into the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) process and form, with full implementation during FFY 2012. With recent revisions to Maryland's child outcomes measurement process and the anticipation of setting revised targets, Maryland established a new baseline utilizing the FFY 2013 data with subsequent targets for FFY 2014 - FFY 2018. The actual FFY 2013 child outcomes data (birth to 3), across the six summary statements using the COS process to compare progress to typical peers, indicated no progress or slippage as it serves as Maryland's new baseline data as well as the FFY 2013 target.

In Maryland, the COS process is completed and documented on the Strengths and Needs Summary page of the IFSP which replaces the COSF as the mechanism for collecting, measuring, and reporting on the three early childhood outcomes. The
Strengths and Needs Summary captures multiple sources of information including: the child’s present levels of development (gained through the evaluation/assessment process including naturalistic observation, parent interview, and team involvement), the family’s concerns, priorities and resources, and the family’s daily routines in natural environments. This information is utilized to summarize the child’s strengths and needs in the three early childhood outcome areas.

For each skill/behavior identified as a strength or need, the following questions are considered to guide the conversation with the family and to identify the appropriate COS Rating Descriptor for each of the three early childhood outcome areas:

- Are the skills and behaviors, demonstrated for this area, what one would expect for a child this age? (i.e., age-expected skills)
- If not, are they like those of a younger child? Are they the skills and behaviors that come just before the age-expected skills and behaviors? (i.e., immediate foundational skills)
- If not, are the skills and behaviors like those of a MUCH younger child? Are they much earlier than age-expected skills and behaviors or atypical? (i.e., foundational skills)

The COS Rating Descriptors are based on the child’s functioning across settings and situations in the three functional areas compared with what is expected given the child’s age. The COS Rating Descriptors use family-friendly language to assist families to understand their child’s development in relation to same-age peers and are matched to the COSF 1 through 7 scale. Only the COS Rating Descriptors are written on the IFSP, not the 1 to 7 numbers. The 1 to 7 numbers are assigned in the database to calculate child progress data.

For each of the three early childhood outcome areas, the appropriate COS Rating Descriptor is documented on the Strengths and Needs Summary page under the question, “How Does My Child’s Development Relate to His/Her Same Age Peers?”

In addition to the COS Rating Descriptor the following question is also required: “Has my child shown any new skills or behaviors related to (outcome area) since the last Strengths and Needs Summary?” “Yes, No or Not Applicable?” This question is identical to the progress question on the COSF, “Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to each outcome since the last outcomes summary? (yes or no).” When developing an initial IFSP and completing the COS entry, the answer to the question is “not applicable” since the child has not yet received early intervention services. At exit (or any other time the COS process is completed, e.g., at annual IFSP reviews) this yes/no question must be answered.

Currently, the COS is only required at entry, exit at age 3, and exit after age 3 (when in the Extended IFSP Option for at least 3 months), but best practice guidance has been provided to local programs to complete the COS process at every annual IFSP review. The online IFSP document allows for multiple interim COS ratings.

Since integrating the COS process into the IFSP, missing data is becoming less of an issue as it is a required component of the initial and exit IFSP. The online IFSP database allows for documentation of "reasons for missing COS progress data." Reasons for missing data include: not in the program for at least 6 months, attempts to contact unsuccessful/parent withdrawal, moved out of state, and deceased. Further analysis of numbers and percentages of those children with actual missing or impossible COS progress data can be found in the attached Table 1: FFY 2013 Missing COS Progress Data (Birth to 3). Several children with missing COS data had a progress at exit report with an "impossible" progress score for an outcome area. The slight variation of "impossible" data across the three indicators is the reason for the slight difference in the denominator of each of the three outcome areas. The number of children with missing "impossible" COS progress data has decreased significantly from last year (which ranged from 19 to 27 children) to this year (which ranged from 1 to 3 children).

The MSDE continues to focus on data quality, through a variety of statewide and local improvement efforts, including professional learning and technical assistance activities.
OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2008 data to the FFY 2013 data). Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2008 previously established baseline data to reflect the correct FFY 2013 data and indicate that this is the baseline data as reported in the State's FFY 2013 SPP.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

| The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR. |

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2008 data to the FFY 2013 data). Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2008 previously established baseline data to reflect the correct FFY 2013 data and indicate that this is the baseline data as reported in the State’s FFY 2013 SPP.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

A. Know their rights;
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and
C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2006</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>79.50%</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 2006</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>94.90%</td>
<td>94.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2006</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>77.50%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 2006</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>94.70%</td>
<td>94.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2006</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 2006</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
<td>95.20%</td>
<td>95.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

Targets for FFY 2007 were not pre-entered into Grads360 website.

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target A ≥</th>
<th>Target B ≥</th>
<th>Target C ≥</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>81.20%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>83.40%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>85.60%</td>
<td>90.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>87.80%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>91.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Throughout FFY 2012, MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, local ITP directors, and local special education directors. Updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at all SICC meetings throughout the reporting period. A special presentation on the statewide data and the draft APR was made to the SICC on January 8, 2015.

In preparation for the new APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at a Professional Learning Institute (PLI) statewide meeting in January, 2014. During the meeting, results trend data were shared, proposed target scenarios were provided, and stakeholders were given the opportunity to suggest specific targets for each results indicator. In addition, the MSDE created a SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Feedback from stakeholders was received through December 5, 2014. Results from this survey guided final target setting and were presented at the January 8, 2015 SICC meeting.
OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 4: Family Involvement

FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

A. Know their rights;
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondent families participating in Part C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of C Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.
The State did not experience slippage. The chart above does not allow the State to indicate a different denominator for each question due to surveys with missing responses. The total number of surveys returned was 4,029, but many surveys were returned without all questions answered. As such, the denominator differs depending on the number of surveys returned with that particular item answered. The chart below shows the appropriate calculations for each subindicator. These calculations result in 94.7% for Indicator 4A, 94.7% for Indicator 4B, and 94.9% for Indicator 4C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondent families participating in Part C</th>
<th>4,029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights</td>
<td>3,734/3,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs</td>
<td>3,618/3,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn</td>
<td>3,548/3,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The family outcome indicators are calculated based on family responses to a series of questions administered via a paper/pencil survey. As with previous iterations of this survey, the questions on the survey are those recommended by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and are valid and reliable. The survey includes 22 core questions followed by two demographic questions, including the relationship of the survey respondent to the child and the child's age when first referred to early intervention. Two additional questions were asked of parents whose children turned three years old before July 1, 2014, and continued to receive services through an IFSP.

The MSDE provided the external evaluation team with a data file of all active eligible children as of June 30, 2014 receiving early intervention services across 24 local Infants and Toddlers Programs (ITPs). Using these data, a unique confidential identification number was matched to each potential survey respondent and based on the primary home language data field, each family was assigned to receive the survey in either English or Spanish. In mid-September, survey envelopes were mailed in bulk to the 24 local ITPs. The sealed, pre-addressed envelopes, which included a cover letter, the survey questionnaire, and a business reply envelope, were then hand-delivered by the local ITPs to their respective families. When this was not possible the survey was mailed to the family by the local program. Service coordinators and service providers supported families by answering questions and facilitating translations as necessary. Completed surveys were returned via the business reply envelope to the offices of the external evaluation team, where they were opened and logged.

The values for the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Indicator #4 were calculated by dividing the number of responses that agreed, strongly agreed, and very strongly agreed, with specific survey questions (Q17 for 4a; Q15 for 4b; and Q19 for 4c) by the total number of responses. Variations in the denominator occurred due to variations in the number of questions a family answered on the survey.

Response Rates

The FFY 2013 Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program Early Intervention Services Family Survey was distributed to 9,330 families across 24 local Infants and Toddlers Programs. The overall survey response rate was 43.2% (n=4,029), with
the response rate by jurisdiction ranging from a high of 97.3% to a low of 0.0%. Just over one-third (n=9) of jurisdictions achieved a response rate greater than 50.0% and two jurisdictions had response rates greater than 90.0%. The overall response rate was down slightly (1.8 percentage points) from last year’s rate of 45.0%, with almost two-thirds (n=15) of jurisdictions having a lower response rate this year than they did in FFY 2012.

Survey Representativeness

Figure 1 (attachment) compares the demographic characteristics of all children who were active and eligible for Part C Early Intervention Services on June 30, 2014 to the demographic characteristics of children whose families responded to the FFY 2013 Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program Early Intervention Services Family Survey. Demographic data for all active and eligible children were provided to the external evaluation team by the MSDE prior to the survey mailing. These data were then matched to survey respondents using the unique confidential identification number printed on each distributed survey.

In general, the survey was fairly representative across all key respondent demographic variables (see Figure 1) with the largest discrepancies being an over-representation of families having children diagnosed with a physical or mental condition with a high probability of a developmental delay (4 percentage points), and families of children referred between ages birth to one year (4 percentage points); and a corresponding under-representation of families of children referred between ages two to three years (4 percentage points). The survey representativeness echoed last year’s findings, with all demographic variables within a few percentage points of last year’s representation.

Jurisdiction

Similarly, the FFY 2013 survey was also generally representative by jurisdiction, as is shown when comparing the percentage of active and eligible children in each local Infants and Toddlers Program (ITP) to the percentage of survey responses from each ITP (see Figure 2 - attachment). With the exception of Wicomico, which had a response rate approaching 100%, ITPs at the very top and bottom of the over-under distribution (see the last column of Table 2) are those with the highest proportion of active and eligible children. This includes Prince George's (over-represented by 4.9 percentage points) and Montgomery and Baltimore City (under-represented by 3.8 percentage points and 4.1 percentage points, respectively). The same pattern was evident in last year’s comparison, with the magnitude of the over- or under-representation of these large jurisdictions essentially determined by changes in response rates (i.e., a higher jurisdiction response rate results in an increased over-representation or decreased under-representation of the jurisdiction, and vice versa for a lower jurisdiction response rate).

Was sampling used? No
Was a collection tool used? No

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Required Actions from FFY 2012

监测优先级：早期介入服务在自然环境中

合规指标：接受早期干预服务的婴儿和幼儿在IFSP上按时接受服务的百分比。

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>Gray – Data Prior to Baseline</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Yellow – Baseline</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Throughout FFY 2012, MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, local ITP directors, and local special education directors. Updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at all SICC meetings throughout the reporting period. A special presentation on the statewide data and the draft APR was made to the SICC on January 8, 2015.

In preparation for the new APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at a Professional Learning Institute (PLI) statewide meeting in January, 2014. During the meeting, results trend data were shared, proposed target scenarios were provided, and stakeholders were given the opportunity to suggest specific targets for each results indicator. In addition, the MSDE created a SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Feedback from stakeholders was received through December 5, 2014. Results from this survey guided final target setting and were presented at the January 8, 2015 SICC meeting.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)
FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>9/24/2014</td>
<td>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013</td>
<td>12/16/2014</td>
<td>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</td>
<td>73,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</th>
<th>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>73,267</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Compared to the average national data percentage of children birth to 1 year of age receiving early intervention services (1.11%), Maryland served 1.68% of the resident population of children birth to 1 year of age. Maryland exceeds the national average by 0.57 percentage points and the percentage served ranked tied for 12th among the 50 states, DC and Puerto Rico.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline, Yellow – Baseline, Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Throughout FFY 2012, MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, local ITP directors, and local special education directors. Updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at all SICC meetings throughout the reporting period. A special presentation on the statewide data and the draft APR was made to the SICC on January 8, 2015.

In preparation for the new APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at a Professional Learning Institute (PLI) statewide meeting in January, 2014. During the meeting, results trend data were shared, proposed target scenarios were provided, and stakeholders were given the opportunity to suggest specific targets for each results indicator. In addition, the MSDE created a SPP/APR Stakeholder Survey to obtain stakehoholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Feedback from stakeholders was received through December 5, 2014. Results from this survey guided final target setting and were presented at the January 8, 2015 SICC meeting.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>9/24/2014</td>
<td>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013</td>
<td>12/16/2014</td>
<td>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</td>
<td>221,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</th>
<th>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>221,196</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Compared to the national data, Maryland served 0.69 percentage points more children birth to three years of age than the national baseline of 2.82% and ranked tied for 14th among the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>[Gray]</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>[Yellow]</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>94.80%</td>
<td>98.70%</td>
<td>99.10%</td>
<td>98.20%</td>
<td>98.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,948</td>
<td>9,763</td>
<td>98.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.74%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline)

1,790

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data for Indicator 7 include all eligible children that were referred between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

To report the target data for this indicator, the MSDE generated state and local reports throughout the reporting period from the statewide Part C database. The reports are based on the calculation of the number of days between the date of referral and the date of the initial IFSP meeting for each child referred in a selected period. The number/percent of meetings held within the timelines and the reasons why IFSPs were not held within timelines are provided. For this calculation, the referral date is considered Day #1 and an untimely IFSP meeting would be any meeting held on Day #46 or later. When the date of an untimely IFSP meeting (46 days or later from the referral date) is entered into the database, a prompt appears requesting that the reason for the late meeting be entered. Summary and individual child record data generated by the 45-day timeline report are validated by State and LITP staff. In particular, questionable and missing/not entered reasons for late meetings are confirmed by LITPs and included in the reported data.

Data collection, reporting and analysis

Compliance on the 45-day timeline indicator was tracked by the MSDE and LITPs throughout the reporting period. Reasons for untimely meetings were identified and strategies for correction and improvement were implemented. Reasons for meetings not held within timelines were tracked in the database.

In FFY 2009, the MSDE redesigned Maryland’s IFSP and Online IFSP Database. The major focus of the redesign was to create a more family-focused document. The revised Online IFSP Database gives users the ability to complete the IFSP online with IFSP data being entered directly into the database. It is hoped that this process will help to decrease data entry errors by data entry staff. In FFY 2011, the MSDE implemented an “off-line solution” to the database, allowing for the completion of an IFSP in the Online IFSP Database without Internet access. With this implementation, providers can
complete the IFSP with the family and have the data from the IFSP sync with the database at a later time. In FFY 2013, the MSDE continued the development of the online IFSP database. Suggestions for online IFSP database updates were obtained through an IFSP Users Group that meets semi-annually and includes data managers, local directors, CTE staff, and State staff.

OSEP Response
The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
**Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

**Required Actions from FFY 2012**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, <strong>not including correction of findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7A, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of noncompliance identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012

At the systemic level, 12 instances of noncompliance, less than 100% compliance, were identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator, and all were corrected within 12 months or less or prior to written notification. The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through LITP and the MSDE data analyses of data periods subsequent to the identified noncompliance. Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442) consistent with timely evaluation, assessment, and IFSP development. The MSDE found that all systemic incidences of noncompliance were corrected with 100% compliance achieved (Prong 2). This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes included by local programs in Improvement Plans or Corrective Action Plans.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012

For FFY 2012, there were 151 individual incidences of noncompliance identified. The State reviewed the records of all 151 children whose evaluation, assessments, and IFSPs were not provided within the 45-day timeline in FFY 2012 and verified that the evaluation and assessments were eventually provided and initial IFSPs completed (Prong 1).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correction of findings of noncompliance identified prior to FFY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of noncompliance not yet verified as corrected as of FFY 2012 APR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

**FFY 2013 Data**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C | 3,416 |
| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B | 3,416 |

**OSEP Response**
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.10%</td>
<td>99.10%</td>
<td>99.60%</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition
FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday.

Please explain

The State’s data also include children with transition steps and services added to the IFSP outside of the specified timeline as a result of documented delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services</th>
<th>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status: Did Not Meet Target
Slippage: No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) 511

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data reported for Indicator 8A were based on a database review of Early Intervention records of all children who transitioned between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The MSDE and LITPs conducted online record reviews of all transitioning children to determine the percentage of children
Exiting Part C with timely transition steps and services. In FFY 2010, the MSDE began requiring transition outcomes to be entered directly into the IFSP database. This enabled the MSDE to obtain these data through electronic record review beginning in FFY 2011, whereas in prior years the MSDE had to conduct site visits with the sole purpose of collecting these data. In FFY 2012, changes were made to the predefined transition reports in the IFSP database to capture the “transition outcome” fields. Missing and/or unclear data were validated with local programs to ensure a complete analyses of data. These changes have enabled the MSDE to report on all children who transitioned in the reporting year for the first time in FFY 2013.

In FFY 2013, the MSDE generated state and local reports throughout the reporting period from the statewide Part C database, and validated data in conjunction with LITPs. The statewide database comprises every IFSP, including the Transition Outcomes (Steps and Services) information for all eligible children in Maryland. Once the reports are generated, local programs are asked to validate missing or unclear data before the reports are rerun and finalized.

OSEP Response
The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
- Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012

There was 1 identified incidence of noncompliance for indicator 8A in FFY 2012. This incidence of noncompliance was corrected at the systemic level within one year of notification (Prong 2). The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through subsequent local and the MSDE data analyses, prior to the closing of the CAP or IP to verify 100% compliance.

Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442) consistent with timely transition planning. The MSDE found that the systemic incidence of noncompliance was corrected with 100% compliance achieved. This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes included by the local program through an Improvement Plan.

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012

In FFY 2012 there was 1 individual incidence of noncompliance identified. Although late, Transition Steps and Services were added to the IFSP for the identified child (Prong 1).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to
OSEP's clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled "Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations" to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The State's data for FFY 2008 were reported as 99.4%, not 90.4% as was indicated above.

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition
FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B</td>
<td>3,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the method used to collect these data

The statewide database comprises every IFSP, including the required child and family notification information. To report the target data for Indicator 8B, the MSDE generated monthly reports of all children older than 24 months of age. Each month, the MSDE generated a report with the names, addresses, phone numbers, and birthdates of all children 24-months and older. The reports were sorted by jurisdiction and then uploaded to a secure server for download by both Part C and Part B local staff. The requirement to notify the SEA is met automatically, since the DSE/EIS structure is birth through five.

Between 7/1/13 and 6/30/14, local school systems and the SEA were notified of all 3,416 of the children, potentially eligible for Part B, who transitioned during the time period (3,416/3,416). Notification for 3,084 children occurred at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday. Another 332 children were found eligible for Part C less than 90 days prior to their third birthday as a result of later referrals to the program. Notification still occurred for all 332 children. Therefore, timely notification to the SEA and LEA (or late notification with a valid reason) occurred for all children potentially eligible for Part B services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have a written opt-out policy?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSEP Response</td>
<td>The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

| None |

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

| |

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
**Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2005
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition
Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>94.70%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>96.40%</td>
<td>99.60%</td>
<td>99.40%</td>
<td>99.10%</td>
<td>98.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: □ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ▼ Yellow – Baseline ▶ Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition
FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

- Yes
- No

Please explain

Data also include children with documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B</th>
<th>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>98.40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status | Slippage
---|---
Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2013 Data) 6

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) 604

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014.
Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

For Indicator 8C, transition compliance data were tracked by the MSDE and LITPs throughout the reporting period. Children whose parents did not consent to participate in a transition-planning conference were not included in the numerator or denominator for 8C. In FFY 2013, six families declined or did not make themselves available to participate in a transition planning meeting for their family.

To report on Indicator 8C, the MSDE generated state and local reports throughout the reporting period from the statewide Part C database, and validated data in conjunction with LITPs. The statewide database comprises every IFSP, including the Transition Planning Meeting information for all eligible children in Maryland. The reports generated by the MSDE to report on Indicator 8C are based on the calculation of the number of days between the date of the transition planning meeting and the child’s third birthday. Once the reports are generated, local programs are asked to validate missing or unclear data before the reports are rerun and finalized.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;
B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012

At the systemic level, 10 instances of noncompliance, less than 100% compliance, were identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator, and all were corrected within 12 months or less or prior to written notification. The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through LITP and the MSDE data analyses of data periods subsequent to the identified noncompliance. Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442) consistent with the provision of timely transition planning meetings. The MSDE found that all systemic incidences of noncompliance were corrected with 100% compliance achieved (Prong 2). This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes included in Improvement Plans or Corrective Action Plans.

Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2012

For FFY 2012, there were 50 individual level incidences of noncompliance. The State reviewed the records of all 50 children whose transition planning meetings were not held within timelines in FFY 2012 and verified through the Online IFSP Database that the transition planning meetings were eventually provided, although late, for 47 children (Prong 1). Three children did not have a transition planning meeting due to systemic reasons and correction could not occur because the children left their program before the identification of noncompliance.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Three incidences of noncompliance were not correctable since the child and family left the program prior to the identification of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP identified and corrected a system defect related to calculating exceptional family circumstances for Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C during its review phase. Please refer to OSEP’s clarification announcement email and the attachment on the progress page titled “Exceptional Family Circumstances Calculations” to determine if your State must take any action.
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

#### Baseline Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: □ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ▶ Yellow – Baseline ▲ Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No target required because fewer than 10 resolution sessions were requested.

### OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

FFY 2013 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/12/2013</td>
<td>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/12/2013</td>
<td>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</th>
<th>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete Data</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.
Indicator 10: Mediation
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

## Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Grey – Data Prior to Baseline, Yellow – Baseline, Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

No target required because fewer than 10 mediation sessions were requested.

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.
### Indicator 10: Mediation

**FFY 2013 Data**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision  
**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)**

#### Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2014</td>
<td>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2014</td>
<td>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2014</td>
<td>2.1 Mediations held</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1 Mediations held</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.
Indicator 10: Mediation

Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.
Baseline Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>57.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>57.40%</td>
<td>58.40%</td>
<td>59.40%</td>
<td>60.40%</td>
<td>61.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Measure

Background of Data Collection for the MITP's SSIP Measure

In FFY 2010, for the federal reporting of child outcome results, Maryland began using the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) at entry and exit to compare progress to typical peers. In FFY 2011, Maryland began initial implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process into the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) process and form, with full implementation during FFY 2012.

In Maryland, the COS process is completed and documented on the Strengths and Needs Summary page of the IFSP which replaces the COSF as the mechanism for collecting, measuring, and reporting on the three early childhood outcomes. The Strengths and Needs Summary captures multiple sources of information including: the child’s present levels of development (gained through the evaluation/assessment process including naturalistic observation, parent interview, and team involvement), the family’s concerns, priorities and resources, and the family’s daily routines in natural environments. This information is utilized to summarize the child’s strengths and needs in the three early childhood outcome areas.

For each skill/behavior identified as a strength or need, the following questions are considered to guide the conversation with the family and to identify the appropriate COS Rating Descriptor for each of the three early childhood outcome areas:

- Are the skills and behaviors, demonstrated for this area, what one would expect for a child this age? (i.e., age-expected skills)
- If not, are they like those of a younger child? Are they the skills and behaviors that come just before the age-expected skills and behaviors? (i.e., immediate foundational skills)
- If not, are the skills and behaviors like those of a MUCH younger child? Are they much earlier than age-expected skills and behaviors or atypical? (i.e., foundational skills)

The COS Rating Descriptors are based on the child’s functioning across settings and situations in the three functional areas compared with what is expected given the child’s age. The COS Rating Descriptors use family-friendly language to assist families to understand their child’s development in relation to same-age peers and are matched to the COS 1 through 7 scale. Only the COS Rating Descriptors are written on the IFSP, not the 1 to 7 numbers. The 1 to 7 numbers are assigned in the database to calculate child progress data.

For each of the three early childhood outcome areas, the appropriate COS Rating Descriptor is documented on the Strengths and Needs Summary page under the question, “How Does My Child’s Development Relate to His/Her Same
In addition to the COS Rating Descriptor the following question is also required: “Has my child shown any new skills or behaviors related to (outcome area) since the last Strengths and Needs Summary?” “Yes, No or Not Applicable?” This question is identical to the progress question on the COSF, “Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to each outcome since the last outcomes summary? (yes or no).” When developing an initial IFSP and completing the COS entry, the answer to the question is “not applicable” since the child has not yet received early intervention services. At exit (or any other time the COS process is completed, e.g., at annual IFSP reviews) this yes/no question must be answered.

The MITP's SSIP Measure

The MITP's SSIP measure is aligned with Summary Statement #1 of Indicator 3a: Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in positive social-emotional skills, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Baseline and target data are inclusive of both children receiving services through an IFSP birth to three, as well as children receiving services through an Extended IFSP after age three. To be included in analyses, children birth to three must receive services for at least 6 months before exit and children older than three must receive service for at least 3 months before exit. The State's SSIP Measure is:

The Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program will substantially increase the rate of growth of positive social-emotional skills in infants, toddlers, and preschool age children in four local Infants and Toddlers Programs.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Description of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR)

The Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP), in consultation with internal and external stakeholders, identified the SIMR as substantially increasing the rate of growth of positive social-emotional skills in infants, toddlers, and preschool age children in four (4) Local Infants and Toddlers Programs (LITPs). The MITP’s SSIP measure is aligned with Summary Statement #1 of Indicator 3a: Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in positive social-emotional skills, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Description of State Program

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) coordinates Maryland’s Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C early intervention program, the MITP. Services to children and families in the MITP are provided by 24 LITPs in 23 counties and Baltimore City. From October 2012 to October 2013, those 24 LITPs served 16,547 infants, toddlers, and preschool age children through IFSPs and Extended IFSPs. On October 25, 2013, the MITP was serving 7,773 children birth to age three on an IFSP and an additional 1,086 children older than age three on an Extended IFSP.

Process Used for Developing Phase I of the SSIP

The data and infrastructure analysis began internally with a review of a broad base of information related to child and family outcomes from reports and data requests. Next, stakeholders reviewed the data, engaged in specific activities to analyze Maryland’s infrastructure, and participated in an iterative process over time with facilitated brainstorming activities to generate recommendations, including additional areas of data analysis. Identification of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) focused on the development of three components – what outcome area, where or which...
subpopulation group, and which LITPs would be initially involved. With the proposed SIMR, internal and external stakeholders identified root causes, a coherent set of improvement strategies, and developed a Theory of Action. While most of the face-to-face Phase I activities with stakeholders were completed by January 2015, they continued to be involved through email communications through March 2015.

Stakeholder Involvement
The MSDE, DSE/EIS is committed to transparency and strong stakeholder engagement throughout all phases of Maryland's State Systemic Improvement Plan. Maryland's stakeholders consist of agencies that are instrumental in decision-making and the provision of services to infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children in the State. In addition to internal stakeholders within the DSE/EIS at the MSDE, external stakeholders include parents, local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors, the MSDE Executive Team (including the Chief Performance Officer, Chief Academic Officer, and Chief Operating Officer), Preschool Special Education Coordinators, Directors of Special Education, Local Program Supervisors, Early Intervention Providers, members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), early care and education providers, Institutes of Higher Education, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene/Health Department, the Department of Disabilities, Head Start, Early Head Start, Parent Advocacy Groups and Family Support (e.g., Maryland Disability Law Center and the Maryland Family Network), Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Division of Early Childhood Development (DECD) at the MSDE, the Maryland Insurance Administration, Homeless Education at the MSDE, Foster Care at the MSDE, the Early Childhood Mental Health Project, the Governor's Office for Children, Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, the Maryland Screening Consortium, the Early Childhood Mental Health Steering Committee, and the Local Interagency Coordinating Councils. Some stakeholders were unable to regularly attend stakeholder workgroup meetings due to preexisting commitments, but provided significant input outside of meetings. The Assistant State Superintendent of the DSE/EIS and the MSDE Executive Team, for example, was heavily involved in each step of the SSIP process through internal planning meetings and document reviews.

Sustaining and strengthening stakeholder engagement is essential for a continuous, dynamic planning process as Maryland moves forward with the development, implementation, and evaluation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan. During each component of Phase 1 - Data Analysis, Infrastructure Analysis, State Identified Measurable Result, Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies, and Theory of Action, stakeholders served as both a critical sounding board and as vital decision-makers. The stakeholders listed throughout this document will be an integral part of the development of Phase 2 of the SSIP. Stakeholder engagement and input in Phase 1 occurred through formal and informal feedback loops including multiple face-to-face meetings, e-mails, surveys, and document reviews. A more detailed description of the participatory processes utilized during stakeholder meetings to reach critical decisions will be discussed with each component.

During the target setting process stakeholders provided input on baseline and target setting, including children receiving services through an IFSP birth to three, as well as children receiving services through an Extended IFSP after age three. Additionally, stakeholders proposed that each “SSIP local program” have its own baseline and target, if possible. If not possible, stakeholders recommended finding a way to weight the baseline and targets based on the size of the programs. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has indicated that only one baseline may be set, so the State, with technical assistance through the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center, has set the baseline and targets based on each program’s weighted size. Stakeholder involvement in Phase 1 has been invaluable to the overall development of the Maryland's State Systemic Improvement Plan.
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data Analysis

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Stakeholder Involvement

The Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) conducted numerous stakeholder workgroup meetings specific to data analysis. During each meeting, stakeholders were engaged through data presentations, small group analysis and discussion, opportunities for comments, and requests for additional data and data analysis. Prior to each meeting with external stakeholders, internal stakeholders analyzed system data, examined meaningful differences in data, and prepared data charts and graphs. The MITP data analyses with internal and external stakeholders occurred at five meetings with meeting notes/materials shared with the stakeholders after each meeting.

Below is a brief summary of each stakeholder meeting:

1) Stakeholder meeting #1 (12/5/13) – SPP/APR data were presented to stakeholders.
2) Stakeholder meeting #2 (4/29/14) – Preschool Suspension and Race Data (eligibility, withdrawal, loss of contact, etc.) were disaggregated by race.
3) Stakeholder meeting #3 (6/5/14) – Race Data were presented again. Child and Family Outcomes disaggregated. Stakeholders asked for Child and Family Outcomes to be disaggregated further.
4) Stakeholder meeting #4 (9/19/14) – Further disaggregation of Child and Family Outcomes. Child Find, Kindergarten Readiness, preschool suspension data, and KIDS COUNT mental health data were also presented.
5) Stakeholder meeting #5 (9/26/14) – A combined comprehensive presentation of all data analyses was given and stakeholders agreed that analysis was complete.

All stakeholders were invited to attend each meeting (except the 4/29/14 meeting, which was specific to statewide leaders) and then given the opportunity to provide input in the data analyses after meeting notes/materials were distributed. The specific attendance of stakeholders at those workgroup meetings is indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>12/5/13</th>
<th>4/29/14</th>
<th>6/5/14</th>
<th>9/19/14</th>
<th>9/26/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant State Superintendent, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Accountability Branch Chief, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITP Program Manager, Section Chief for Policy and Data, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Support and Technical Assistance Branch Chief, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Section Chief, Preschool Coordinator, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Quality Assurance Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Education Program Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Education Program Specialist, DECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSRRC TA Provider</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## External Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>12/5/13</th>
<th>4/29/14</th>
<th>6/5/14</th>
<th>9/19/14</th>
<th>9/26/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITP Directors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Coordinators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Special Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Program Supervisors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention Providers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Interagency Coordinating Council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes of Higher Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Mental Hygiene/Health Department</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development/Child Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Insurance Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of Data

Data analyses for Maryland’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) were completed using data from many different sources. In Maryland, all data related to SPP/APR and 618 data reporting are available in the MITP’s Online Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) Database, with the exception of complaint data and family outcomes data. The former is collected from the MSDE, DSE/EIS Complaint Database, while the latter is collected through a State-funded vendor. Additional data used in the Phase 1 of SSIP development were collected from the Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS), Consolidated Local Implementation Grant (CLIG) applications, the Ready at Five School Readiness reports, and other sources of data and reports, such as KIDS’ Count.

Online IFSP Database

The Online IFSP Database is a secure web-based application that serves as the primary case management tool for service coordinators and service providers working with children in the MITP. The main user function is the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of IFSPs. Since all IFSPs are entered into the Online IFSP Database through local users, the State has access to the IFSPs of all children and families receiving services through the MITP. In addition, local and state leaders utilize the data analysis functions of the Online IFSP to generate both predefined and dynamic reports to assist with programmatic data-informed decision-making.

Family Outcomes Survey Data

Data for the Family Outcomes Indicators 4A, 4B, and 4C are collected through the distribution of family surveys, compiled and aggregated by a MSDE contractor, and then analyzed by the MSDE staff. The survey utilized for these data are those recommended by the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM), with two additional items to address children/families receiving services through the Extended IFSP Option. These data are compiled for MITP’s Annual Performance Report. Additionally, local data dashboards are distributed annually to assist within programmatic decision-making and family outcomes.
The MSDE, DSE/EIS Complaint Database

The number and type of state complaints are monitored and tracked in the MSDE, DSE/EIS Compliant Database. These data are compiled and used for the MITP’s Annual Performance Plan. Data are analyzed for statewide patterns and targeted technical assistance is provided if patterns are identified.

Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS)

The MSDE, DSE/EIS, in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (CTE) has developed the Maryland Special Education and Early Intervention Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS). This system encompasses the integration of statewide demographic and outcome data with special education and early intervention services data collection tools through a linked special education longitudinal data warehouse. These data are useful for examining the long-term benefits of early intervention and special education.

Consolidated Local Implementation Grant (CLIG) Applications

The CLIG is designated as the single grant mechanism through which local jurisdictions receive federal and State funds to implement local early intervention programs in compliance with federal and State regulations, policies, and procedures. As part of each local program’s CLIG submission, information on local funding contribution is collected. This information is useful when determining the total level of program funding.

Other Sources of Data

Ready at Five School Readiness Data

Ready at Five is an organization, founded in 1992, with the mission of ensuring school readiness for all children in Maryland. Each year, Ready at Five publishes school readiness data, based on the performance of kindergarteners on the Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR) Work Sampling System (WSS). Children are identified as either fully ready, approaching readiness, or developing readiness in seven domains of learning: Language and Literacy, Physical Development, Social Studies, Scientific Thinking, Mathematical Thinking, The Arts, and Social/Personal Development. Statewide Readiness Data are published on the organization’s website, found here http://www.readyatfive.org/school-readiness-data/statewide-readiness-data-2014.html. Information from Ready at Five is disaggregated by subgroups and is useful for making programmatic decisions about reducing the school readiness gap for specific populations.

KIDS COUNT Data Center

The KIDS COUNT Data Center tracks the well-being of the nation’s children and families, including the number of children who have one or more emotional, behavioral, or developmental concerns. These data promote an overall state picture of how children and families are doing.

Maryland Excellence Counts in Early Learning and School-Age Child Care (EXCELS)

Maryland EXCELS is a voluntary Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which awards ratings to family providers, center-based, and public school child care programs, and school age before and after school programs that meet increasingly higher standards of quality in key areas. Maryland EXCELS includes standards in different areas of early care and education, including licensing, learning environments, staffing, and professional development, developmentally.
appropriate learning and program practices, child assessment, program administration and policies, and accreditation. The Maryland EXCELS database includes relevant information about each childcare program, to inform families and other stakeholders about the quality of these programs.

**Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (ECMHC) Database**

The ECMHC Outcomes Monitoring System (OMS) is a web-based data entry and tracking system developed by The Institute for Innovation and Implementation (The Institute) with funding from the MSDE. The ECMHC OMS provides ongoing monitoring of MSDE-funded ECMHC programs across the state of Maryland. Ongoing monitoring and evaluation strengthens implementation efforts of ECMHC, drives the improvement of outcomes for those served, and may help to secure additional funding for these vital programs that intend to enhance professional development for early care and education (ECE) staff and improve children's social and emotional development and school readiness. THE ECMHC OMS enables consultants to enter tracking and assessment data, which reduces the amount of time needed to manually maintain evaluation databases, reduces ECMHC consultant and program burden, and eliminates the need for duplicate data entry. Data from the ECMHC Database are used to monitor the fidelity of the Mental Health Consultants as well as individual and programmatic child-level results.

**Types of Data Analyzed**

During Phase I of SSIP development the MITP analyzed and disaggregated numerous types of data. Analyzed data were presented at stakeholder meetings for feedback and suggestions for additional data analyses were considered. The MITP started with broad data analysis and became more focused after each stakeholder meeting. The types of data analyzed included:

1) *State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Compliance and Results Data, including 618 data, disaggregated over time and by jurisdiction;*

2) *Child Find Data, disaggregated by referral source and jurisdiction;*

3) *Race Data, disaggregated by percent eligible/ineligible, withdrawal from services, loss of contact, and jurisdiction;*

4) *Family Outcomes Data, disaggregated by race, eligibility criteria, primary family language, age at referral, length of time in the program, relationship to the child, and child outcomes data;*

5) *Child Outcomes Data, disaggregated by Medical Assistance (MA) status, length of time in the program, eligibility status, age at referral, race, number of community settings, jurisdiction, primary service setting, natural vs. non-natural environment, MA and jurisdiction, MA and eligibility criteria, MA and race, and funding per child. Child Outcomes data were also compared to national data and examined over time;*

6) *MSDE, DSE/EIS Complaint Data, disaggregated by year, jurisdiction, and type of complaint.*

7) *Kindergarten Readiness Data, disaggregated by race, domain, gender, disability vs. no disability, income status, jurisdiction, and year;*

8) *Preschool Suspension Data, disaggregated over time, by race, and by jurisdiction;*

9) *KIDS COUNT Data, national mental health data disaggregated over time;*

10) *Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Report and Data, evaluation results;*

11) *Maryland EXCELS Data, program enrollment and quality data; and*

12) *Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (SEFEL) Informal Survey, LITPs were surveyed about the extent of SEFEL training of providers in each jurisdiction.*
**Data Findings**

Data were examined using the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) meaningful differences calculator.

1) **Compliance** – Generally, high levels of compliance were found throughout the state. Correction of noncompliance by all programs has occurred in a timely manner consistent with OSEP’s 09-02 Memo. No indication that compliance data have a direct connection with results data was found.

2) **Child Find Data**
   a. **Referrals** – Increase in referrals over past 3 years.
   b. **Referral Sources** – Decrease in referrals by physicians over past 3 years with increases in referral by parents.

3) **Race** – Local programs were much more likely to lose contact with African American families than families of other races. This is relatively consistent across the state. More recent data suggest that this is improving.

4) **Family Outcomes**
   a. **Trends** – Not much variability noted from year to year (~95%).
   b. **Race** – Slightly higher outcomes reported by Asian families.
   c. **Eligibility Criteria** – No meaningful differences noted.
   d. **Primary Language** – No meaningful differences noted.
   e. **Age at Referral** – Families of children referred between the ages of 2 and 3 were more likely to report that they know their rights than families of children referred between ages 1 and 2. Families of children referred before age 1 were more likely to report that they can communicate their children’s needs and can help their children develop and learn than families of children referred between ages 1 and 2.
   f. **Length of Time in the Program** – Families in the program longer generally had better outcomes than families in the program for less time.
   g. **Relationship to Child** – Fathers were more likely to report they knew their rights and can help their children develop and learn than mothers.
   h. **Gender** – Families of female children were more likely to report that they can communicate their children’s needs and can help their children develop and learn than families of male children.

5) **Child Outcomes**
   a. **Trends** – A recent change in data collection methodology (the inclusion of COS into the IFSP process) prevents making conclusions based upon trends.
   b. **Extended IFSP Option** – Small sample sizes and several changes to the ending age of the option prevents drawing conclusions specifically about this population.
   c. **Comparison to National Data** – MITP data are higher than the national average for 5 of 6 subindicators.
   d. **Local Jurisdiction Data** - More LITPs were below the State target for indicators 3a SS#1 (11 LITPs) and 3c SS#1 (11 LITPs) than other indicators 3a SS#2 (8 LITPs), 3b SS#1(8 LITPs), 3b SS#2 (7 LITPs), and 3c SS#2 (5).
   e. **Medical Assistance (MA) Status** – Children with MA tend to make less progress in the program than children without MA.
   f. **Length of Time in the Program** – Children with 19-24 months in the program tend to make the most progress.
   g. **Eligibility Criteria** – Children with 25% delays tend to make more progress in social-emotional development and knowledge and skills than other eligibility categories. Children with atypical development are the most likely to leave at age level.
   h. **Age at referral** – Children are less likely to leave the program at age level if they are referred older than...
when they are referred younger.

i. **Race** – In general, African American children do not make as much progress in the program as children of other races.

j. **Number of Community Settings** – Children who spend time in at least 4 different community settings are more likely to make substantial progress or leave the program at age level in Social Emotional Development than children who spend almost no time in community settings.

k. **MA by jurisdiction** – Across jurisdictions, children with MA tend to make less progress than children without MA.

l. **MA by Race** – Unlike other races, African American children without MA are not more likely to make substantial progress in social emotional development than those with MA.

m. **Funding** – In general, the total amount of program funding seems unrelated to outcomes except for the 6 programs with the lowest funding per child. These 6 programs tend to have lower outcomes.

6) **MSDE, DSE/EIS Complaint Data**

   a. Small sample sizes limit the drawing of conclusions, but state complaints do not seem to be indicative of a larger systemic issue.

7) **School Readiness**

   a. **Trends** – Full readiness has improved since FFY 2001 and has been relatively consistent for the past 2 years.

   b. **Race** – Hispanic children tend to be less ready for school than other children for every domain except social-emotional. African American children are least likely to be fully ready in the social-emotional domain. White children tend to be the most ready for school.

   c. **Domain** – The lowest two domains are Scientific Thinking and Language Arts & Literacy. The highest two domains are Physical Development and the Arts. All domains showed an increase from 2012/2013 to 2013/2014 except the Physical Development and Social and Personal Development domains.

   d. **Gender** – No differences were noted.

   e. **Disabilities** – The school readiness gap increased by 1 percentage point in FFY 2013. The gap has increased by 18 percentage points since FFY 2001. The gap is 29 points in FFY 2013.

   f. **Income** – The gap decreased from 18 percentage points in FFY 2001 to 11 percentage points in FFY 2013.

   g. **Disabilities by Domain** - The school readiness gap for children in special education is larger in the area of social and personal development than all other school readiness domains.

8) **Suspension Data**

   a. **Race** – African Americans have the highest rate of suspension in both general and special education. The rate of suspension is much higher than their prevalence in the population.

   b. **Preschool Suspension** – In FFY 2011, approximately 5 times as many preschool-age children were suspended compared to FFY 2010. In FFY 2012, approximately 4 times as many preschool-age children were suspended compared to FFY 2010.

9) **KIDS COUNT Data**

   a. **National Data** - Compared to other states, Maryland was ranked 12th in the nation on the overall well-being of its children based on 16 indicators in four domains: economic well-being, education, health, and family and community. Maryland ranked 14th, 8th, 14th, and 19th in the four domains, respectively. Maryland also ranks 15th in the nation in the number of children who have one or more emotional, behavioral, or developmental conditions.

   b. **Trends** – Maryland was ranked 10th in the nation in overall well-being in 2012 and 2013, but slipped to 12th in 2014. The economic ranking remained consistent at 14th, education decreased from 5th to 8th, health
decreased from 8th to 14th, and family and community increased from 20th to 19th.
c. Emotional and Behavioral Issues – Maryland has approximately 204,000 (about 17% of its population) children with one or more emotional, behavioral, or developmental conditions.

10) Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Data
   a. Program Evaluation Data – Children referred for the child-focused ECMHC intervention showed an improvement of social-emotional functioning. In addition, the ECMHC reduced the overall problem behaviors reported in classrooms. Parents of children served by the ECMHC Project reported a decrease in parenting stress.

11) Maryland EXCELS
   a. Current EXCELS Data - Over 3,600 programs participating; most programs are currently published at Level 1 – the lowest level, with 136 programs currently published at highest level.

12) Informal SEFEL Survey Data
   a. Most LITPs indicated either that staff had not been SEFEL trained or that they needed to be retrained. The training that most providers received was specific to classroom settings. Almost all programs reported that they had not used the SEFEL parent modules with families.

Overall Data Quality

The MSDE, DSE/EIS has adopted a data informed decision-making approach to programmatic improvement. As a result, the MITP places great importance on the ability of local programs to provide timely and accurate data. To help foster the provision of timely and accurate data, the state has and continues to implement a variety of strategies.

IFSP Database Structure

The Online IFSP Database was built with a mechanism to detect data entry errors in order to improve the accuracy of data entry. For example, when inaccurate dates are entered into the system, a message appears during data entry to indicate that there is a problem with the data. The Database also has an audit function that ensures that all required information is entered into the system before an IFSP can be made “active.”

The Referral Information and IFSP Online Database and Reporting System Manual

This document provides comprehensive instructions for completing an IFSP online or entering IFSP and other child/family data into the database system, as well as system requirements for its use. It also provides step-by-step instructions for data analysis through the Online IFSP’s built in reporting section.

IFSP Process Guide

The IFSP Process Guide assists service coordinators and related service providers in understanding the IFSP process in order to successfully complete the IFSP with the family. In addition to process instructions, the guide includes examples of high-quality strengths and needs summaries and child/family outcomes.

Local Determinations
In order to emphasize the importance of timely submission of high quality data, the MITP has incorporated this requirement into its local determination criteria. Local programs are required to submit all data, including programmatic and fiscal reports, in a timely and accurate manner.

**Birth Through 21 Record Reviews**

As part of the MSDE, DSE/EIS birth through 21 monitoring process, monitoring staff from the MSDE, DSE/EIS examines Early Intervention Records (EIRs) for the presence of documentation that supports family related reasons for missing timelines. The MITP’s goal is to ensure that documentation in the EIR is consistent with data entry.

**Data Reports**

The MITP runs reports in multiple formats to ensure consistency across data reports. The MITP works with the software developer to resolve programming issues. The Online IFSP Database also includes audit reports, which help verify the presence and accuracy of data. MITP runs these reports periodically and recommends that LITPs run the reports monthly to ensure high-quality data. Sample audit reports include: “Greater than 33 months old and no Transition Meeting Date,” “Inactive Status but no inactive date entered,” “Service start date is after the ending date,” and “Services entered but don't start within 30 days of the first meeting.”

**Improvement Plans/Corrective Action Plans**

The MITP requires that LITPs submit data to the Online IFSP Database in a timely and accurate manner and assigns Improvement Plans and/or Corrective Action Plans when local programs fail to do so.

**Assurances**

The MITP includes language in the Assurance section of the annual Consolidated Local Implementation Grant (CLIG) application that local programs will provide timely and accurate data for all children receiving early intervention services.

**Professional Learning and Technical Assistance**

The MITP conducts hands-on statewide trainings to roll out major changes to the Online IFSP Database. The MITP conducts on-site and Online IFSP Database technical assistance to LITPs to help ensure competence with data entry and database report capabilities.

**Child Outcomes Data Quality**

The MITP believes that its child outcomes data are generally of high quality and ECTA's State Outcomes Data Quality Profile supports this belief. The MITP continues to ensure high data quality through the implementation of the following strategies:

**Child Outcomes Missing Data**
In the past, the MITP had concerns about the amount of missing child outcomes data. The MITP began assigning Improvement Plans and Corrective Action Plans for local programs with large amounts of missing data. This concern has also been addressed through the Child Outcome Summary (COS) integration process. In other words, by integrating the COS into the IFSP document, it is not viewed by local providers as a process separate from service delivery. Instead, local IFSP teams use the COS process as a way to inform outcome development, service delivery discussions, and progress monitoring. The MITP also included a field in the database to indicate reasons for missing COS data. These reasons include: “not in the program for at least 6 months,” “attempts to contact unsuccessful,” “parent withdrawal,” “moved out of state,” and “deceased.” The MITP continues to implement strategies to decrease the amount of missing COS data.

Child Outcomes Data Accuracy

In an effort to strengthen the integration of the COS process into the IFSP process, additional improvement activities were completed. These included the development of a COS Tutorial, which was intended to assist early intervention professionals to understand and effectively measure early childhood outcome results. The online tutorial was designed to supplement direct face-to-face training and provide an ongoing resource for implementing the integration of COS into the IFSP process.

Two video resources were created to increase the accuracy of COS data and promote family-centered practices: Engaging Families in the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process and Functional Outcomes and School Readiness. These resources were created to help early intervention service providers develop a deeper understanding of the importance of eliciting functional information from families, to anchor discussions of a child’s strengths and needs in age-expected development, to utilize collaborative decision-making for the COS ratings, and to create functional child outcomes integrated into family routines, even when the outcome is specifically focused on school readiness.

The accuracy of COS data continues to be addressed statewide through professional learning opportunities and ongoing technical assistance. The annual local Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plan includes a requirement for the inclusion of local/regional training(s) and/or technical assistance on the utilization of the COS process for all new and experienced staff responsible for completion of the COS integrated into the IFSP process. Specific individualized technical assistance around the COS process, child outcomes data quality, and child outcomes data analysis continues to be provided by the MITP at program request. State and local stakeholders are in agreement that continued professional learning efforts around the accuracy of COS data must be provided on a regular basis to all early intervention staff, including the implementation of the COS Competency Check currently being piloted at the national level.

Compliance Data

During the Data Analysis process, the MITP considered all SPP/APR data, including compliance data. The MITP’s compliance data are generally high (>95%) and local programs continue to correct noncompliance within one year of notification. LITP compliance data are also, in general, very high. There is not much variability between programs in terms of compliance levels. In analyzing data, there does not appear to be a link between compliance data and child and/or family outcomes.

Additional Data Required

The MITP believes, and stakeholders agree, that no additional data are required for the Data Analysis component.
Data Conclusions

The MITP’s compliance, 618, and family outcomes data are generally very high. Correction of noncompliance continues to occur in a timely manner consistent with OSEP’s 09-02 Memo. The MITP’s child outcomes data are consistent with national data (if not slightly higher) and have been deemed generally valid and accurate by ECTA.

Specific data findings have led to the MITP and its stakeholders concluding that there is a need to increase positive social-emotional development of infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities. These include:

- The school readiness gap for children in special education is largest in the area of social and personal development;
- The relation of Maryland children’s well-being, compared to other states, is decreasing;
- Unlike other races, African American children without MA were not more likely to make substantial progress in positive social-emotional development than African American children with MA;
- African American children are least likely to be fully ready in the social-emotional domain and the most likely to be suspended in school;
- Approximately 5 times as many preschoolers were suspended in FFY 2011 compared to FFY 2010 and approximately 4 times as many preschool-age children were suspended in FFY 2012 compared to FFY 2010;
- Social-emotional development was one of two school readiness domains that did not show improvement from 2012/2013 to 2013/2014;
- Almost half of LITPs are below the state target for positive social-emotional skills summary statement #1; and
- Most LITPs self-identified a need for additional social-emotional training.
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement
Plan
Analysis of State Infrastructure

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Stakeholder Involvement

The MITP engaged in a systemic process to analyze the capacity of Maryland’s infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity at the local level in relation to the SIMR. Prior to meeting with external stakeholders, internal stakeholders generated a description of each of the seven infrastructure components described below. With the help of its stakeholders, the MITP analyzed its current infrastructure and examined the capacity of the infrastructure to support improvement at both the state and local levels, using the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analyses. It should be noted, however, that stakeholders decided to discuss the components of Professional Learning and Technical Assistance together and for that reason they are combined in the discussion below.

Infrastructure analyses with internal and external stakeholders occurred at two workgroups and meeting notes were shared with all stakeholders after the meetings. All stakeholders were invited to attend each meeting and then given the opportunity to provide input in the infrastructure analysis after meeting notes were distributed. These stakeholders will be instrumental in supporting the MITP to implement Phase 2 of the SSIP.

The specific attendance of stakeholders at those workgroups is indicated below.

### Internal Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>9/19/14</th>
<th>10/2/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MITP Program Manager, Section Chief for Policy and Data, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Section Chief, Preschool Coordinator, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Quality Assurance Specialist,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the stakeholder workgroup meetings above, internal MSDE stakeholders representing the State Superintendent’s Executive Team received a presentation on the IDEA State Systemic Improvement Plan process on
February 5, 2015. The Executive Team includes the Assistant State Superintendent from each MSDE division, as well as the Chief Performance Officer, Chief Academic Officer, and Chief Operating Officer. During the meeting, attendees reviewed and participated in a combined SWOT analysis for Part C (Early Intervention Services, Birth - 4) and for Part B (Special Education, 3 -21). For this meeting it was decided for several reasons to combine the Part C and Part B SWOT analyses. An important reason was that the MSDE, DSE/EIS is responsible for both Part C and Part B programs. As such, the Division has a strategic plan that spans the birth through 21 early intervention and special education services. It was decided that taking this unified approach with the representatives of the Executive Leadership provided a comprehensive approach to address both infrastructure analysis and to begin to consider Phase 2, infrastructure development. By approaching the infrastructure analysis in this unified manner, stakeholders were able to see the extent to which there were cross program strengths and opportunities for improvement.

Overview of Maryland’s Infrastructure

Early intervention and education has been a critical part of Maryland’s commitment to promote the success of every young learner, including the development of their social-emotional skills. The MSDE is the lead agency for the MITP (Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), with interagency coordination through the Department of Mental Health and Hygiene, the Department of Human Resources, the Department of Disabilities, and the Governor’s Office for Children. The MSDE became the lead agency for the Part C program in 1997, and in 2005 all other early childhood programs were placed under the umbrella of the MSDE, allowing for increased collaborative efforts and support for all young children, including infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities.

At the MSDE, the DSE/EIS coordinates the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program. The MSDE, DSE/EIS provides leadership, support, and accountability for results to Local School Systems (LSS), Public Agencies (PA), and stakeholders through a seamless, comprehensive system of coordinated services to children and youth with disabilities, birth through 21, and their families. The MSDE, DSE/EIS’s bold vision is for all children, including children with disabilities, to be ready for school, achieve in school, and be prepared for college, careers, and community living as a result of their participation in Maryland’s early intervention and special education programs.

Extended IFSP Option

In 2009, the MSDE, MITP received a $14.4 million grant from the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The grant money provided Maryland the opportunity to implement the Extended IFSP Option, giving families the choice for their child to remain on an IFSP after age three. To be eligible for the Extended IFSP Option, children must currently be in the MITP before age 3 and be found eligible for Part B preschool special education services. Families of eligible children are able to continue receiving services on an IFSP until the beginning of the school year following the child’s fourth birthday. However, at any time a family may choose to end IFSP services and transition to preschool special education services delivered through an IEP. Once the family makes the choice, through written notification, to terminate services through an IFSP and pursue services through and IEP, the choice to return to services on an IFSP is no longer available.

The Extended IFSP Option combines family education, service coordination, and year-round services with special instruction, in the form of educational outcomes to promote school readiness. The extension of IFSP services beyond the third birthday incorporates the strength of special education/preschool education program with the existing Infants and Toddlers Program’s family-centered model. Since Maryland began offering this family choice, over 8,000 families have elected to remain on an IFSPs after age 3. The implementation of the Extended IFSP Option has been a catalyst in
Maryland’s mission of creating a seamless and comprehensive statewide system of coordinated early intervention and education services, for young children with disabilities birth through five and their families, and to narrow the school readiness gap.

The DSE/EIS Strategic Plan

Rolled out in October 2013, the DSE/EIS strategic plan, Moving Maryland Forward, is a five-year plan designed to guide the work of the DSE/EIS and the MSDE, compel stronger interagency and intra-agency collaboration in support of children and families, and serve as a necessary resource for partners and stakeholders. Moving Maryland Forward was developed and informed by the innovative thinking of stakeholders across Maryland, including Local School System superintendents, special education directors, LITP directors, preschool special education coordinators, instruction and curriculum specialists, family advocates and support coordinators, parents, and community partners. The plan focuses essential resources, expertise, and support on narrowing the achievement gap between Maryland’s children with disabilities and their nondisabled peers.

Moving Maryland Forward is implemented through the four core functions of the MSDE, DSE/EIS, which include Leadership, Accountability For Results, Technical Assistance and Program Support, and Fiscal and Resource Management. The plan consists of four Action Imperatives: Early Childhood; Professional Learning; Access, Equity, and Progress; and Secondary Transition. These Action Imperatives are addressed through each of five branches in the MSDE, DSE/EIS cross-matrix leadership structure and are critical for narrowing the gaps in school readiness, school achievement, and readiness for adult life after school. These gaps will be narrowed through four key strategies: Strategic Collaboration, Family Partnerships, Evidence-Based Practices, and Data-Informed Decisions. Please refer to the Attachment: Strategic Plan – Moving Maryland Forward.

The MITP has integrated the key components of Moving Maryland Forward into its SSIP. Improvement strategies are discussed in the context of Moving Maryland Forward’s four key strategies. Additionally, the MITP’s Theory of Action was written to include the four core functions of the MSDE, DSE/EIS.

Race to the Top: Early Learning Challenge Grant (RTT-ELCG)

On December 16, 2011, Maryland received a four-year, $50 million grant award from the United States Department of Education under the national Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant competition. The RTT-ELCG program supports states in building statewide systems that raise the quality of early learning and development programs and increases access to high-quality programs for children with high needs, so that all children can enter kindergarten ready to succeed. The RTT-ELCG in Maryland consists of ten projects with the following goals:

1. Project 1: Create 24 local early childhood councils.
2. Project 2: Implement a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) for all early learning and development programs.
3. Project 3: Build capacity for quality, including the Making Access Happen project.
4. Project 4: Revise the existing early learning standards to align with Maryland’s College and Career Readiness Standards (MCCRS).
5. Project 5: Conduct professional development to promote the use of early learning standards by all early learning and development programs.
6. Project 6: Revise Maryland’s comprehensive assessment system in early childhood, including the Maryland Model for School Readiness.

7. Project 7: Support children’s health and behavioral needs through early intervention and prevention programs. Maryland’s Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation in Pediatric Care provides detection and intervention by pediatricians and family practitioners.

8. Project 8: Create a coalition for family engagement.

9. Project 9: Establish Leadership Learning Academies to enable early childhood educators who work with children ages 4 to 7 to learn rigorous, yet developmentally appropriate instructional practices that support the MCCRS.

10. Project 10: Expand the Early Care and Education Data System. To enhance professional development processes, the Child Care Automated Tracking System will be expanded to provide access to professional development plans, applications for grants and incentives, and an online training approval application.

Several projects have important linkages to the MSDE, DSE/EIS and the infants, toddlers, and children receiving early intervention or special education services that are worth noting in more detail:

Project 1 – Local Early Childhood Councils: Local Early Childhood Councils in all 24 Maryland jurisdictions have coordinated grant efforts and developed local action plans to improve school readiness for all children, including children with disabilities. Many councils are specifically targeting enhanced results for young children with disabilities and are beginning to engage in specific initiatives targeting this specialized population. Collaboration between Local Early Childhood Councils and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils is recommended as best practice in supporting young children with disabilities and their families.

Project 2 – Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS): The focus of this project is to enhance and administer a full-scale implementation of the TQRIS called Maryland EXCELS with the ultimate goal of increasing the quality of childcare for all children in Maryland. Maryland EXCELS offers families with disabilities information on identifying and selecting high quality childcare programs that meet their child’s individual and unique needs.

Project 3 – Quality Capacity Building: The RTT-ELCG provided fiscal resources to the MSDE, DSE/EIS to implement the Making Access Happen initiative. Making Access Happen was designed to increase the participation of three- to five-year-old children with disabilities in public and private community-based early care and education settings through the delivery of job embedded professional development. At the heart of expanding access in the Making Access Happen program is the development of practitioners’ skills in universal design for learning (UDL) and collaborative practices to narrow the school readiness gap for all children. The project uses a training-of-trainers reflective coaching model to build local program capacity through enhanced professional learning, including the use of video. With Birth - Five early intervention/preschool special education taking the lead, local early care and education partners work in collaboration to build capacity through ongoing professional learning on evidence-based practices to expand access and promote positive school readiness outcomes for young children with disabilities.

Project 4 – Early Learning Standards and MCCRS: In this project, stakeholder groups, including state and local representation from preschool special education, convened to create the alignment to MCCRS and develop the Guide to Early Childhood Pedagogy. Resources, references, and early learning strategies address inclusive and fully accessible curriculum strategies to meet the needs of young children with disabilities.
Project 6 – Early Childhood Assessment: Part of this project includes the implementation of developmental screening by licensed childcare programs and providers with the goal of identifying children with developmental delays and disabilities. Beginning July 1, 2016, all licensed programs and providers will be required to conduct a developmental screening for all children within 90 days of entry into childcare. In addition to the developmental screening at entry, children birth to three will be screened twice annually and children three years to kindergarten entry will be screened once annually.

Project 7 – Children’s Health and Behavioral Needs: Part of this project focuses on expansion of SEFEL for use by Early Care and Education Providers and families with young children. Training as part of Project 7 provides strategies for successfully meeting children’s individual needs in areas of social and emotional development and to support the early identification of young children with potential delays in social and emotional development. Data analysis continues to guide future efforts to reduce the school readiness gap for children with disabilities.

Project 9 – Leadership Learning Academies: This project promotes rigorous, yet developmentally appropriate teaching practices for early childhood. These Academies include specialized and general educators, including early care and education partners, to create a continuity of instruction across early childhood general and special education.

The RTT-ELCG has served as a vehicle for increased collaboration between the Division of Early Childhood Development and the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services. With a focus on high needs populations, many initiatives have been inclusive of young children with disabilities and their families. The MITP is integrating and aligning specific components from the RTT-ELCG into the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

Infrastructure Components

The MSDE, DSE/EIS considers infrastructure to be comprised of seven major components. Each component contributes to performance data in Maryland. The components are governance, accountability/monitoring for results, data, fiscal, quality standards, professional learning, and technical assistance. Since the components of professional learning and technical assistance are very closely related, they are discussed together in this analysis. For each component the MITP has provided an overview of the State’s structure based on the analysis conducted by the MITP and its stakeholders, as well as a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis. The SWOT Analyses were completed in stakeholder workgroups and then sent to additional stakeholders for further feedback. The results from the SWOT Analyses are summarized in chart form within each infrastructure component.

Governance Component

In Maryland, 24 LITPs implement a family-centered early intervention program for young children with developmental delays and disabilities and their families, through coordination with the Maryland School for the Deaf and the Maryland School for the Blind as well as local interagency partners. The Local Lead Agency (LLA) in 19 jurisdictions is the Local School System (LSS), while in 5 jurisdictions it is the local health department, with each LITP having a single point of entry. Governed by the federal IDEA through the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR), services are provided by LITPs to infants, toddlers and preschoolers (birth – age 4) and their families. Maryland is the only State implementing the Extended IFSP Option offering families of eligible children the choice to remain on an IFSP after age three, until the beginning of the school year following the child’s 4th birthday
A robust State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) that includes family members actively engages, advises, assists, coordinates, and collaborates with the MSDE regarding the provision of services for children with disabilities birth through age five. Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs) serve the same role for the 24 LITPs. Annually, a joint SICC/LICC meeting provides the opportunity for communication, collaboration and relationship building with stakeholders, including families and partners at all levels.

Organizational/Administrative Structure

The MSDE, DSE/EIS organizational structure is based upon principles of collaboration and shared responsibility. The Division is organized by five branches: Policy and Accountability; Programmatic Support and Technical Assistance; Family Support and Dispute Resolution; Interagency Collaboration; and Resource Management. Birth through five staff are integrated within each branch. The Division matrix organizational design integrates knowledge and skills for improvement of compliance and results, and ensures consistent communication within the DSE/EIS, throughout the Department, and with external stakeholders and partners. A monthly Cross-Divisional Birth-Five meeting enhances communication and collaboration. Please refer to the Attachment: Cross-Matrix Leadership.

Through the implementation of cross-matrix leadership, the Division is committed to the following essential principles in order to improve results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with developmental delays and disabilities and their families:

- **Transparency:** Maintaining an open door to stakeholders and regularly keeping our stakeholders informed through formal and informal feedback loops, including quarterly birth through twenty-one special education and early intervention leadership meetings, the Annual Leadership Conference/Professional Learning Institute, meetings of the Assistant State Superintendent’s Advisory Council, and regularly scheduled convening of advisory groups, including the State Interagency Coordinating Council, Special Education State Advisory Committee, and the Education Advocacy Coalition. Division staff also meet with birth through five family support providers in each local jurisdiction, including two statewide meeting and several regional meetings, annually.

- **Collaboration:** Continually engaging stakeholders through participatory processes that promote innovation, the sharing of best practices, and dissemination of research and evidence-based models. We are also committed to strengthening partnerships and planning with other MSDE Divisions and external stakeholder groups.

- **Equity, Excellence, Efficiency:** Serving stakeholders in a timely and effective manner, ensuring the availability of ‘real-time’ data for effective decision-making, and accelerating dissemination of models of best practices quickly and effectively throughout Maryland.

- **Accountability:** Improving results for all infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with developmental delays and disabilities served in LITPS. The MSDE, DSE/EIS has developed a tiered system of analysis, monitoring, and support to identify LITPs in need of differentiated support and technical assistance. Further detail about the State’s accountability processes are described in the Accountability section below.
IDEA Requirements

The MSDE, DSE/EIS has the responsibility under the IDEA to have a comprehensive system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the IDEA, State laws, and applicable federal and State regulations. The MSDE, DSE/EIS conducts comprehensive early intervention record reviews to ensure LITPs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and COMAR. The State’s monitoring protocols are discussed in further detail in the Accountability/Monitoring for Results Infrastructure Component section.

The IDEA provides parents certain rights and procedural safeguards. These safeguards include formal dispute resolution requirements, such as mediation, formal complaints, resolution sessions, and due process hearings. The MSDE, DSE/EIS collects and analyzes data on an ongoing basis using the parent contact and dispute resolution database to ensure effective statewide implementation of the dispute resolution system.

Effective Policies, Procedures, and Practices

Maryland has policies and procedures aligned with the IDEA, 34 CFR §303, Maryland State law, and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) to support the state implementation of the IDEA. Each LITP is responsible for developing policies, procedures, and practices for effective implementation in accordance with federal and State requirements to ensure the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Natural Environment (NE). The MITP has embedded the review of LITP policies, procedures, and practices within existing components of general supervision.

Below is the SWOT Analysis for Governance completed by stakeholders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Extended IFSP provides a more seamless birth through five system of services</td>
<td>• Variability among jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online IFSP data system – IFSP, referral, and family information is available for all children/families</td>
<td>• Collaboration between the DSE/EIS and the Division of Early Childhood Development, (however, it is improving).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early Childhood Intervention and Education staff and the Division of Early Childhood Development in same department</td>
<td>• Lack of needed staff support; hiring freezes and budget cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Matrix leadership w/early intervention in all Branches in the DSE/EIS</td>
<td>• Administrative burdens and increasing paperwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Braided funding Initiative, combining resources</td>
<td>• Not all the “players” are known – organizations; agencies; groups, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making Access Happen (MAH) Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stakeholders play a major role in system development
- Birth mandate state – no cost to families
- Broad eligibility criteria – greater percentage of children served in Maryland than in many other states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC)</td>
<td>● Change in State Leadership in Annapolis (potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Evolving collaboration between the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) and the Division of Early Childhood Development</td>
<td>● Competing interests of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Transition to results based outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Maryland Learning Links website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Grant Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Local Early Childhood Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Assistant State Superintendent with Early Childhood expertise and passion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Partnerships for less administration/procurement issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● State/local silos: May be broken by local Early Childhood Advisory Councils and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Change from compliance-driven to results-driven accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability/Monitoring for Results Component

Maryland’s System of General Supervision

The MSDE, DSE/EIS comprehensive system of general supervision is the Differentiated Framework and illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. This framework utilizes comprehensive information from the Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) process to assign every LITP to one of four tiers, each with a defined level of general supervision and differentiated engagement. This section describes the MCIR, the general supervision components of the four tiers of the Differentiated Framework, and the
SWOT analysis conducted with stakeholders.

Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR)

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has revised its monitoring priorities to ensure a balance between compliance and results by placing a greater emphasis on accountability and technical assistance (TA) activities that focus on improving the MSDE capacity to develop, strengthen, and support improvement at local levels. In response to OSEP’s shift in monitoring priorities, the MSDE, DSE/EIS has revised its monitoring procedures and now has increased the emphasis on requirements related to improving educational results for children and youth with disabilities. This is accomplished through Maryland’s Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR) process. The primary focus of the MCIR process is to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities and their families and ensuring that the MSDE meets the program requirements within IDEA.

The MSDE, DSE/EIS utilizes qualitative and quantitative results from multiple sources and processes to make monitoring decisions. While some monitoring activities are universal for all, other monitoring activities are customized to examine areas of need. These areas are identified through a variety of sources such as, but not limited to:

- State Performance Plan performance;
- Indicator data verification;
- Other data reviews;
- Policy and Procedures reviews;
- Grant reviews;
- Fiscal data;
- Medicaid monitoring;
- Family support data;
- State complaints; and
- Advocacy organization concerns.

Each LITP is monitored annually through a desk audit, data verification, and cross-divisional data analysis of SPP Indicators, local priorities, and fiscal data. Additionally, cyclical comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every 6 years in each LITP. The purpose of comprehensive monitoring is to ensure the LITPs:

- Have policies and procedures in place that are consistent with State and federal regulations;
- Are compliant with the State and federal regulations;
- Have a system of general supervision in place to monitor child progress and make data informed decisions; and
- Are focused on improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with developmental delays and disabilities, and their families.

Monitoring at any time may be conducted either off-site as a desk audit or on-site depending on the nature of the monitoring activities. The method selected is dependent upon the activity and the information that is or is not accessible online and the practicality involved in acquiring the necessary documents needed for the review.

Desk Audit
A desk audit refers to a review of data, IFSPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by MSDE, DSE/EIS staff. It may be the single method used to complete a review or may be used in combination with an on-site visit. After the completion of the desk audit, the MSDE, DSE/EIS staff may request further documentation or data to clarify potential findings of noncompliance or verify correction of noncompliance.

On-Site Monitoring

On-site monitoring refers to a review of data, IFSPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by the MSDE, DSE/EIS staff within the LITPs. On-site monitoring is specifically used to carry out those activities that are not practical to complete through a desk audit by the MSDE, DSE/EIS staff. Examples of on-site monitoring may include but are not limited to a review of early intervention records for Medicaid monitoring, provision of related services, data-entry verification, etc.

Case Study Reviews

The MSDE, DSE/EIS staff conducts case study reviews of an individual child’s early intervention record. This allows the reviewer to gauge/conclude whether the child is being provided with appropriate services, which is evidenced by continued growth and progress towards child and family outcomes.

Interviews

Interviews are conducted with service providers and parents. This measures consistency of implementation and understanding of practices across the local program. Additionally, the MSDE, DSE/EIS staff are able to ascertain the knowledge of local program staff pertaining to the implementation of the child’s IFSP and the responsibilities of staff.

Data Verification

The MCIR process verifies data, documents compliance with both the IDEA and the COMAR regulatory requirements, and provides technical assistance for the timely correction of identified findings of noncompliance. Findings of noncompliance concerning the records of individual children with disabilities always result in verification of correction using a two-prong process. First (Prong 1), the records in which the noncompliance was first identified are reviewed to determine that correction has occurred, or, the requirement was completed (for timeline violations), unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction or the parent has withdrawn consent. Then (Prong 2), a subsequent review of a sample of records is conducted by the MSDE, DSE/EIS to determine the level of compliance. If both reviews result in 100% compliance, then correction has been achieved and the corrective action is closed.

Directed Onsite Visits

The MSDE, DSE/EIS reserves the right to conduct a directed onsite visit at any time based on multiple sources of data indicating potential concerns, evidence of repeated concerns, or a pattern of concerns over time. These concerns may come from examining data reported to the MSDE as part of the accountability system and other sources of information, such as interactions and conversations with parents, advocates, and/or district personnel. The purpose of the directed onsite visit
is to monitor compliance and identify areas of need. The scope of each directed onsite visit is based on presenting concerns including relevant regulatory requirements. This is determined on a case-by-case basis and may include a targeted review of any of the following: SPP/APR Indicators, 618 data, fiscal management, IDEA requirements, or implementation of any other State and federal regulatory requirements.

Ongoing technical assistance may be provided to support improvement efforts, based on needs identified during any and all monitoring activities. Annually, comprehensive information from the MCIR process is used to assign each LITP to one of four tiers of general supervision and engagement within the Differentiated Framework.

Linking Funds for Program Improvement

The MITP, as part of its annual application for local funding requirements, requires that LITPs assign funding to areas of noncompliance or poor performance. Funding is required to be linked to improvement if the data show a history of two or more required Corrective Action Plans (CAP) for a Compliance Indicator over a two-year period, data result in the assignment of a CAP for the most recent data period, and/or data show a history of not meeting the State target for a Results Indicator, as determined by the requirement of an Improvement Plan in two or more data periods over a two-year period.

Differentiated Framework

Each LITP is unique, and their needs for general supervision and engagement from the MITP vary greatly depending upon numerous factors. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) allows the MSDE, DSE/EIS staff to monitor and provide technical assistance and support to programs in a more effective, efficient, and systematic manner. The MSDE, DSE/EIS has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for program support and technical assistance to provide a four-tiered system of monitoring and supports to address the needs of each LITP. Each tier of the framework contains two components: general supervision and engagement. The corresponding support/engagement an LITP can expect to receive is differentiated and based on that agency’s assigned tier of supervision. Please refer to the Attachment: Differentiated Framework.

The Differentiated Framework’s four tiers support the Division in directing attention to LITPs in need of more comprehensive engagement, technical assistance, and support in order to enable those programs to meet indicator targets, improve results, narrow the achievement gap, correct identified noncompliance, and maintain compliance. This represents the foundation of a comprehensive Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) to integrate a continuum of resources, strategies, structures, and practices.

An LITP is assigned to a tier based upon performance on SPP/APR compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and findings identified through monitoring. This information is used to provide differentiated technical assistance that focuses on building capacity to improve results and directs State resources to those LITPs that are the lowest performing (See also Professional Development/Technical Assistance Infrastructure Component). At the same time, LITPs that are achieving success are recognized and provided with the support needed to publish and disseminate successful best practices.
A majority of the LITPs are currently in the **Universal Tier of General Supervision**. This represents LITPs that have met identified performance and compliance criteria, resulting in a determination status of “Meets Requirements” or are in the first year of “Needs Assistance.” The LITPs assigned to the Universal Tier of General Supervision have no findings of noncompliance or have corrected all findings of noncompliance within one year and have maintained compliance.

The **Universal Tier of Engagement** is statewide professional learning and technical assistance to support statewide needs based on overall State trend data (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to early intervention and special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide technical assistance include State and regional professional learning, online tools, resources through the Maryland Learning Links website, Q&A Documents, and Technical Assistance Bulletins.

An LITP receiving a determination status of “Needs Assistance” for two or more consecutive years or “Needs Intervention” is assigned to the **Targeted Tier of General Supervision**. An LITP in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for identified noncompliance, and/or, although noncompliance may be corrected within one year, compliance is not sustained.

Targeted monitoring occurs semi-annually and includes customized data analysis with real-time local and State data. Activities may include, but are not limited to: early intervention record reviews using selected sections of the MSDE, DSE/EIS record review document, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of the LITP’s system of general supervision, interview questions, and/or case studies. State and local joint cross-departmental and cross-divisional teams are formed to address identified needs. The LITP develops a local Improvement Plan, which is submitted to and approved by the MSDE, DSE/EIS.

The **Targeted Tier of Engagement** focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, and technical assistance) to address the needs of the LITP on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LITP from needing substantial support. The LITP leadership is required to engage with the Division to review State and local data and information in order to implement an Improvement Plan that is approved by the MSDE, DSE/EIS to build capacity to effectively address the identified needs. Evaluation and periodic feedback are critical elements of Targeted Engagement. A Targeted Assistance and Support Committee (TASC) consisting of jointly identified local and state cross-Divisional members provides performance-based and responsive support.

Continuing up the **Differentiated Framework** tiers, an LITP with a determination status of “Needs Substantial Intervention” is assigned to the **Focused Tier of General Supervision**. These LITPs continue to have findings of noncompliance, have active CAPs for two or more years, and demonstrate little progress despite general and targeted technical assistance.

Focused monitoring is comprised of enhanced and differentiated monitoring and in-depth data analysis, and requires the participation of the State and local superintendent as well as identified stakeholders. Focused monitoring occurs quarterly and may include, but is not limited to: early intervention record reviews using selected sections of the MSDE, DSE/EIS record review document, a review of the LITP’s real time data, a review of policies, procedures, and practices, a review of
the LITP’s system of general supervision, interview questions, provider observations, and case studies. A Focused and Comprehensive Action Plan is jointly developed by the LITP and the MSDE, DSE/EIS.

The State Superintendent and the MSDE, DSE/EIS Assistant State Superintendent work closely with the local School Superintendent or local Lead Agency Head to develop a cross-departmental, cross-divisional State and local implementation team. The MSDE provides increased oversight activities to assess progress and may direct federal funds, impose special conditions, and/or require a regular submission of data. The LITP leadership is required to participate in a quarterly joint State and local Focused Intervention and Accountability Team (FIAT) meetings to review progress.

At this level, the goal of the **Focused Tier of Engagement** is to direct substantial support to address the continuous lack of improvement of the LITP through significant systems change. A multi-faceted State and local leadership team meets regularly to develop and implement an action plan designed to affect systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. Principles of effective systems change, implementation, evaluation, and sustainability are foundational elements of the technical assistance. Frequent feedback and general supervision is maintained throughout the provision of the technical assistance.

At the highest tier, the **Intensive Tier of General Supervision**, an LITP fails to progress and correct previously identified noncompliance despite receiving technical assistance and support. The failure to comply has affected the core requirements, such as the delivery of services to infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with developmental delays and disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight. The LITP enters into a formal agreement with the MSDE to guide improvement and possibly additional sanctions. The LITP informs the MSDE of its unwillingness to comply with core requirements.

The **Intensive Tier of Engagement** focuses on providing support based on a Formal Agreement that is developed to guide improvement and correction with onsite supervision. The MSDE may direct, recover, or withhold State or federal funds.

*Below is the SWOT Analysis for Accountability/Monitoring for Results completed by stakeholders:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online IFSP data system</td>
<td>Compliance driven but starting to focus more on outcome data and IFSP quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows for supervision of state, local, and provider level data</td>
<td>Lack of longitudinal child outcomes data due to change in data collection methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State oversight of data system</td>
<td>Determining child and family outcomes related to specific early intervention providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking funds for program improvement requirement in the application for local funds</td>
<td>Variability in/across</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Data Component

In Maryland, all data related to SPP/APR reporting are available in the MITP’s Online IFSP Database, with the exception of complaint data and family outcomes data. The former is collected from the MSDE, DSE/EIS Complaint Database, while the latter is collected through a State-funded vendor.

The Online IFSP Database is a secure web-based application that serves as the primary case management tool for service coordinators and service providers working with children and their families in the MITP. The main user function is the development and monitoring of Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs). IFSPs are entered into the Online IFSP Database through local users and the State has access to the IFSPs of all children receiving services through the MITP. In addition, local and state leaders can utilize the data analysis functions of the Online IFSP to generate both predefined and dynamic reports, including reports that display child outcomes progress, to assist with programmatic data-informed decision-making. Data collected at referral and from IFSPs for every eligible child and family are entered into the database by local staff. The MITP and the LITPs generate reports on a regular basis to monitor statewide and local compliance/results and audit for data validity and reliability.

Evidence that the data on the processes and results component is part of a State’s or an LITP’s system of general
supervision and includes the following:

- Data are collected as required under the IDEA and by the U.S. Secretary of Education.
- Data are routinely collected throughout the year.
- The LITPs submit data in a timely and accurate manner.
- Data are available from multiple sources and used to examine performance of the LITPs.

State Performance Plan (SPP)

The SPP is the MITP’s plan to improve the 11 results and compliance indicators established by the OSEP. This plan contains a description of the MITP’s efforts to implement the requirements of Part C of the IDEA, including how it will improve performance on indicators. As part of the SPP, each indicator has a target set by the OSEP for compliance or by the State for results. All targets set by the State are approved by the SICC. The SPP is located on the MSDE website: www.mdideareport.org

Family Outcomes Survey

To collect family outcome information, the MITP uses survey questions recommended by the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM). The survey includes 22 core questions followed by two demographic questions, including the relationship of the survey respondent to the child and the child’s age when first referred to early intervention. Two additional questions are asked of parents of children who continued to receive services on an Extended IFSP after age three. Family survey data are collected, compiled, and analyzed by the MITP’s vendor. The State and local programs with sample sizes greater than five are provided with a comprehensive dashboard that disaggregates the family outcomes data. Each dashboard analysis includes survey response rate, representativeness, responses, and results. These dashboards are instrumental for understanding local program results, as well as overall family outcomes results statewide.

The MSDE, DSE/EIS Complaint Data

The IDEA provides parents certain rights and procedural safeguards. These safeguards include formal dispute resolution requirements, such as mediation, formal complaints, resolution sessions, and due process hearings. The Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch collects and analyzes data on an ongoing basis using the parent contact and dispute resolution database to ensure effective implementation of the dispute resolution system.

Longitudinal Accountability Data Support System

The MSDE, DSE/EIS Longitudinal Accountability Data Support System (LADSS) encompasses the integration of statewide demographic and outcome data with special education and early intervention services data collection tools through a linked special education longitudinal data warehouse. The LADSS allows for progress monitoring, service logging, and embedded high quality professional development and supports.

The Division of Early Childhood Development Data Sources

- Ready at Five - Ready at Five annually publishes school readiness data, based on the performance of

- Maryland EXCELS - Maryland EXCELS is a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), that awards ratings to registered family childcare providers, licensed childcare centers (e.g., Head Start, Letter of Compliance facilities, and school age-only childcare), and public pre-kindergarten programs that meet increasingly higher standards of quality identified areas. Maryland EXCELS is currently voluntary and is designed to increase parent and provider awareness of the key elements of high quality childcare. A database has been created to collect the QRIS data for continual monitoring and analysis of high quality childcare.

*Below is the SWOT Analysis for Data completed by stakeholders:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online IFSP data system provides real time data and advanced reporting capabilities</td>
<td>Quality of child outcomes data – need competency check for Child Outcome Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State staff provide data results in various ways for local jurisdictions and State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC)</td>
<td>Aggregation of data leads to heterogeneity and inability to break things down further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Birth through Five Legislative Booklet highlighting early intervention and preschool special education data and accomplishments</td>
<td>Data system allows for only one eligibility category determination so data conclusions are difficult when children are eligible in more than one category (25% delay, atypical, high-probability condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real time data</td>
<td>Lack of quality assurance/IFSP quality at local level in some jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFSP Users Group, stakeholder involvement in development of IFSP requirements, and database specifications</td>
<td>Family Survey mainly includes those very happy or those who are very upset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High response rates for family survey</td>
<td>No current consistent way to verify the reliability of COS ratings – need COS Competency Check</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater use of parent survey data</td>
<td>Unknown consequences of results from better eligibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiscal Component

Within the MSDE, DSE/EIS, it is the primary responsibility of the Resource Management and Monitoring Branch working in conjunction with the Division of Business services at the MSDE to ensure effective procurement, use, and oversight of MSDE, DSE/EIS resources. This Branch also provides for the effective, fiscal subrecipient monitoring of all recipients of the IDEA grant funds throughout Maryland, including the LITPs, LSSs, PAs, and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). Through grants management staff, the Branch also ensures fiscal accountability in accordance with federal and State regulations for federal and State funds administered by the MSDE for the benefit of children with disabilities, ages birth through 21. The Branch assists LITPs and other subrecipients through the application, reporting, and fiscal management of those funds. Technical assistance relative to fiscal matters, is also provided to all LITPs and grant subrecipient agencies, as well as the monitoring of subrecipient compliance with State and federal grant regulations, including the Code of Federal Regulations, IDEA, Education Department General Administrative Regulations, General Education Provisions Act, Office of Management and Budget Circulars, and COMAR. The Branch additionally provides data and information to the Division leadership in support of programmatic interventions and to facilitate funding determinations and resource allocations. The Branch is also responsible to manage major Special Education State Aid grants and to act as the Fiscal Agent for the Children’s Cabinet Interagency Fund.

The MSDE, DSE/EIS system of general supervision includes oversight in the distribution and appropriate use of IDEA funds at both the state and LSS/PA level. As part of this system, the MSDE, DSE/EIS ensures that fiscal resources are directed to SPP indicator improvement, including child and family results, or the correction of noncompliance. The MSDE, DSE/EIS provides fiscal oversight and monitoring to determine if the LSS/PA has mechanisms and procedures for ensuring fiscal accountability in the distribution and use of IDEA funds; obligates and liquidates funds in a timely fashion; and appropriately manages maintenance of effort. Under the fiscal management of funds, the MSDE, DSE/EIS requires each LSS/PA to submit a Consolidated Local Implementation Grant (CLIG) for IDEA Part C and each LSS to submit a Local Application for Federal Funds (LAFF) for IDEA Part B. The MSDE, DSE/EIS requires that the application is developed with stakeholder input and approved by the local board of education and that midterm and final progress reports are submitted on time. Each LSS/PA is subject to a review of projects and expenditures.
The MSDE, DSE/EIS maintains fiscal responsibility using several strategies. To ensure fiscal certainty, the MSDE, DSE/EIS requires the development of strong Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) documenting agency responsibility in the program. Additionally, the MSDE, DSE/EIS has implemented a *Braiding Funds to Blend Programs* strategy, which gives local programs the option to use discretionary funds to support one or more priorities to specifically focus on results. For the past 5 years, the CLIG has included a “*Linking Federal Funds to Program Improvement*” component. Local programs with poor results or patterns of noncompliance are required to designate funding toward improvement.

Below is the SWOT Analysis for Fiscal completed by stakeholders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Braiding funds strategy – combining resources</td>
<td>● Level state funding for years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Birth mandate state – can use Part B funds on early intervention</td>
<td>● Fairly level federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Assistant Superintendent with passion for Early Childhood</td>
<td>● State continues to have “budget shortfalls”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Continued funding for Extended Option when no designated state or federal funding was available</td>
<td>● Sustainability of Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Grant (RTT-ELCG) efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Some Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Grant (RTT-ELCG) funding going to the MSDE, DSE/EIS to support access and quality</td>
<td>● As a birth mandate state, the MITP cannot charge family fees or bill private insurance for IFSP services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Online IFSP data system provides real time data for fiscal decision making based on program needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strong MSDE, DSE/EIS fiscal monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● New governor?</td>
<td>● Increase in new referrals and numbers served with level funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Increased funding for public pre-kindergarten</td>
<td>● Variability in local funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Focus on results may provide support for additional funding through data progress</td>
<td>● Hiring freezes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality Standards Component
Healthy Beginnings

In Maryland, Healthy Beginnings: Supporting Development and Learning from Birth through Three Years of Age are developmental and learning guidelines supporting a comprehensive high quality system of services for young children. These guidelines were developed to ensure that anyone who cares for infants and young children has the knowledge and resources to support and encourage children during the ongoing process of growth and learning. Specifically designed for caregivers of infants and toddlers from birth through age three, Healthy Beginnings provides knowledge and support around child care and child development, while an online Activity Planner provides fun, developmentally appropriate activities that build on young children’s skills and promote all kinds of learning.

Over the past several years, the MITP has placed a strong focus on understanding typical development as Maryland moved to measuring child outcomes utilizing the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process integrated into the IFSP process. The Healthy Beginnings indicators and activities have been incorporated into the Online IFSP as resource documents and as part of a “Typical Development Wizard.” This allows IFSP teams to have immediate access to information about typical development crosswalked with the three early child outcomes.

Maryland’s Early Learning Standards

Maryland’s Early Learning Standards are now a part of Maryland’s College and Career-Ready Standards. The State Board adopted these Standards in June 2010 and schools began implementing in the 2013-2014 school year. To align with the new state standards, Maryland is currently in the process of moving from The Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR) to Ready for Kindergarten (R4K)/Maryland’s Early Childhood-Comprehensive Assessment System (EC-CAS). This research-based assessment and instructional system is designed to provide teachers, families, and the early childhood community with a common understanding of what children know and are able to do upon entering kindergarten. All kindergarten children, including children with disabilities, are assessed in the fall of their kindergarten year to determine their level of readiness across seven domains. This assessment reflects the ability of each child to demonstrate skills, knowledge, behaviors, and interests that are indicators of future school success. The Division of Early Childhood Development/Early Learning Office coordinates and monitors the implementation of the R4K/EC-CAS at the local school level, provides professional development and technical assistance to the early childhood community, and analyzes and publishes the MMSR/R4K assessment results.

The newly implemented R4K provides a single coordinated system for recognizing the needs and measuring the learning progress (knowledge, skills, and abilities) of all children from 36 to 72 months (3 to 6 years of age) in seven domains of child learning: social and emotional development, physical development, language and literacy, mathematical thinking, scientific thinking, social studies, and the arts. The new Early Childhood - Comprehensive Assessment System/R4K has two components.

- **The Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA)** is administered to all incoming kindergarteners, measuring school readiness in seven developmental domains. The KRA provides a snapshot of school readiness levels, making it possible to confidently determine if entering students have the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to succeed in kindergarten. The KRA also identifies the individual needs of children, enabling teachers to make informed instructional decisions. Maryland completed the first administration of the KRA in the fall of 2014 and results are still pending.

- **The Early Learning Assessment (ELA)** measures the progress of learning in young children, 36 to 72 months, across five levels of learning progressions across the seven domains. They describe the pathway that children typically follow as they learn or the sequence in which knowledge, skills, and abilities develop. Each child's
progress is monitored along a continuum and tracked over time. In this way, early educators working with 3- and
4-year-olds can create individualized learning opportunities and plan interventions, if needed, to ensure that children
are on the path of kindergarten readiness. At this time the ELA is still under development, with 2015 being the pilot
year.

While the R4K is organized into 7 domains of learning, the MSDE, DECD’s Supporting Every Young Learner: Maryland’s
Guide to Early Childhood Pedagogy Birth to Age 8 emphasizes that executive functioning and self-regulation are the key to
being successful in all seven domains. The Social and Emotional Development domain makes up almost one-third of the
KRA and the ELA. This acknowledges, based on research, the strong role social foundations play in a child’s readiness for
school.

Maryland EXCELS

High quality childcare is important because the early years are critical when it comes to building social, emotional, and
cognitive skills. The MSDE, DECD created Maryland EXCELS as part of the RTT-ELCG to increase the quality of child
care programs in Maryland. Maryland EXCELS is a voluntary Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS)
that recognizes the accomplishments of early childhood and school age programs and providers. EXCELS has five levels
that offer a pathway to high-quality and includes standards in different areas of early care and education, including
licensing, learning environments, staffing and professional development, developmentally appropriate learning and program
practices, child assessment, program administration and policies, and accreditation.

The EXCELS program is beneficial for both families and child care providers because it provides information to families to
help them choose a high quality child care and education program and articulates to the public the level of quality.
Childcare providers participating in Maryland EXCELS have the opportunity to share information and resources about the
quality of care in their program. Advertising an EXCELS level demonstrates to parents and the community that providers
are committed to excellence and are continually working toward greater achievements.

Suitable Qualifications

The MSDE/MITP has established policies relating to the creation and maintenance of personnel standards pursuant to
COMAR 13A.13.02.08(I) and 34 CFR §303.119. There are two components to Maryland’s Personnel Standards for Early
Intervention Service Providers:

1. Personnel providing early intervention services to eligible children and their families shall meet the highest
   requirements in the state that apply to the profession or discipline in which a person is providing early
   intervention services.

2. Personnel providing early intervention services under this part to eligible children and their families in excess of
   15 percent of employment hours shall meet:
   a. Highest requirements in the state that apply to the profession or discipline in which a person
      is providing early intervention services; and
   b. Suitable qualifications.

Suitable qualifications (SQ) requirements include a minimum of 120 contact hours of documented
pre-service and/or in-service training, as well as on-site consultation in nine competency areas. Identified
competency areas focus on cross-disciplinary topics that are considered essential to providing family-
centered early intervention services and include: Infant and Toddler Development (Typical), Infant and Toddler Development (Atypical), Infant and Toddler Assessment (Instruments), Infant and Toddler Assessment (Procedures), Family Assessment, Family Partnerships, Early Intervention Service Options, Strategies, and Instructional Practices, Team Process, and Service Coordination. At present, the MITP is working to revise the Personnel Standards document to include content indicators consistent with the Agreed Upon Mission and Key Principles for Providing Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments (Workgroup on Principles and Practices in Natural Environments, OSEP TA Community of Practice: Part C Settings, 2008) and the DEC Recommended Practices (Division for Early Childhood, 2014).

*Below is the SWOT Analysis for Quality Standards completed by stakeholders:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Local programs know child and family outcomes</td>
<td>● Passive complaint reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● State is highly compliant</td>
<td>o Parents don’t know how to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Standards are publicly reported, stakeholders are involved</td>
<td>● As the number of Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) staff has decreased, there is a less intimate relationship with the MSDE/MITP and local Infants and Toddlers Programs (LITPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Real time data system (online IFSP data system)</td>
<td>● Question reliability of Child Outcome Summary (COS) without a competency check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Tailored state engagement to program needs</td>
<td>● Professional development: local versus national perspective, lack of funds toward opportunity to attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Family outcomes survey and input</td>
<td>● Services for children who are medically fragile – need more collaboration among agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Child Outcome Summary (COS) integration into the IFSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Child Outcome Summary (COS) process gives a better view of child for IFSP development</td>
<td>● Providers not evenly prepared:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Formal reporting and review of data</td>
<td>o Child Outcome Summary (COS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Increase networking among local programs</td>
<td>o Adult learning styles to build family/caregiver capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coaching and mentoring (change in culture/adult learning styles)</td>
<td>o Child care provider communication/coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Opportunity to use information from Family</td>
<td>● Fear of change: new ways of thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Learning and Technical Assistance Components

The MSDE, DSE/EIS has several key mechanisms in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities and their families. Discussed previously under Quality Standards, Maryland has a robust system of Personnel Standards. Other mechanisms to ensure quality services and improve results include Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plans, the Tiered System of Engagement, and ongoing professional learning activities and resources.

Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plans

Yearly, each Local Lead Agency (LLA)/LITP is required to submit a Consolidated Local Improvement Grant (CLIG) designated as the single grant mechanism through which local jurisdictions receive federal and State funds to implement local early intervention programs in compliance with federal and State regulations, policies, and procedures to support positive results. A requirement of the annual CLIG submission is a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plan describing how the local early intervention system provides and coordinates training and technical assistance on an interdisciplinary basis, to the extent appropriate for public and private providers, primary referral sources, Family Support Network/Preschool Partners Coordinators, parents, paraprofessionals, and service coordinators to improve outcomes for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities, including children in the Extended IFSP Option, and their families.

The CSPD Plan developed by each local jurisdiction includes, as appropriate, training on the basic components of the early intervention system; the coordination of transition services from the Infants and Toddlers Program to Preschool Special Education services, or another appropriate early childhood program; the implementation of evidence-based practices through early intervention service options, strategies and instructional practices; and the development, implementation, and incorporation of educational outcomes in the IFSP that promote school readiness, including pre-literacy, language, and numeracy skills. Training activities typically include parents together with early care and education providers and are intended to assist families and caregivers with enhancing specific areas of a child’s development to support their participation as full partners in the development and implementation of the IFSP.

Training needs are assessed in a variety of ways and may vary from individual to individual and year to year. A formal written survey of training needs is one mechanism for gathering information to support the focus of the CSPD Plan. Other sources of information that are considered when assessing local training needs include:

- Specific data-informed decision-making based on child outcomes, family outcomes, child find practices, and/or natural environments practices;
- Evidence-based and recommended practices;
- Family and child issues currently challenging the program;
- Local, state, and national issues, trends, focuses; and/or
The MSDE supports an evidence-based data-informed decision making process (Team-Analyze-Plan-Implement-Track or TAP-IT) to assist jurisdictions to align local CSPD Plans with conclusions drawn from the review and analysis of the local suitable qualifications report, self-monitoring, local data profiles, improvement plans, corrective action plans, complaints and investigations requiring corrective actions, and other data related to program improvement.

The method and results of the needs assessment are clearly summarized in the data summary section of the CSPD Plan with the list of anticipated in-service topics reflecting the results of the local needs assessment and based on the Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning. Specific documentation about the actual professional learning provided and the results of those professional learning experiences is included in the local Final Program Report.

Required local CSPD Plan components in FFY 2013:

a) A summary of the specific data on which the plan is based that supports the need for the proposed training activities. Data includes the results of the local training needs assessment of public and private providers, primary referral sources, Family Support Network and Preschool Partners coordinators, parents, paraprofessionals, and service coordinators, in addition to other data analysis results;

b) The specific purpose for which the identified training is being sponsored (i.e., areas of non-compliance and performance, program improvement/results, required corrective actions, suitable qualifications, etc.);

c) A description of each training activity, including anticipated dates, training level, topic, presenters, audience, supportive resources, and planned follow-up to evaluate and support transfer of training to practice (i.e., coaching, communities of practice, etc.); and

d) Evaluation levels, instruments, methods or procedures, and the anticipated degree of training impact on the local early intervention system.

An additional requirement of each local CSPD Plan is the inclusion of local/regional training(s) and/or technical assistance on the utilization of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process for all new and experienced staff responsible for completion of the COS integrated into the IFSP process. Jurisdictions can access technical assistance from the Programmatic Support and Technical Assistance Branch in the MSDE, DSE/EIS to support local/regional planning and implementation efforts for customized COS professional development. Additionally, Maryland's online COS tutorial can be accessed through www.marylandlearninglinks.org to supplement face-to-face training.

After CLIG submissions are received by the MITP, each local CSPD Plan is reviewed by designated staff (i.e., programmatic, data, and fiscal MSDE liaisons) through the utilization of a comprehensive template created to ensure all required plan components are adequately addressed. Approval of each local CSPD Plan is required to maintain robust professional learning for all early intervention providers, families and other early care and education professionals. When local CSPD plans are missing data or other required components, specific technical assistance is provided to support local plan approval. Designated MITP staff also reviews Final Program Reports to ensure appropriate implementation of each local CSPD Plan.

The MITP believes that it is important that all IFSP teams are considered “COS competent,” as defined by the ECTA Center COS Competency Check (COS-CC). The COS-CC will be a required component of CSPD plans beginning in FFY 2016. The purpose of the COS-CC is to provide states with a mechanism to verify that program staff have the basic
competencies to conduct the COS process. Once released by the ECTA Center, the COS-CC will also help the MITP and local programs identify professional development needs. The MITP expects that all individuals (100%) on IFSP teams will be determined COS competent by the end of FFY 2016. All newly hired program staff will be expected to be COS competent within 1 calendar year of hire.

**Ongoing Professional Learning Activities and Resources**

In order to improve program quality and services to positively impact child and family outcome results, the MITP, in collaboration with numerous partners, provides resources, training, consultation, and technical assistance to local LITP directors, service providers, community partners, stakeholders, and parents in numerous formats and forums. Dissemination of these trainings, resources, media, and tools to strengthen child outcomes and the early intervention and education services provided to infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities, and their families, is supported through the MSDE, DSE/EIS website [www.marylandlearninglinks.org](http://www.marylandlearninglinks.org) in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University (JHU)/Center for Technology in Education (CTE).

Several online professional learning resources have been highly utilized for providing ongoing training and support to all early care and education professionals as well as families.

- **The Maryland Learning Links (MLL)** website is a site co-owned by the MSDE, DSE/EIS and the JHU CTE. The site was created to provide guidance and resources related to early intervention and special education in Maryland. The site is structured into six main topic areas or channels, including Early Learning, Individualized Education, Professional Learning, Leadership, Family and Community, and Policy. Also included on the site are sections for blogs, communities of practice, and a calendar of events. In addition to content embedded on the site, MLL also provides helpful links to other sites.

- **The Embedded Learning Opportunities (ELO)** website assists IFSP teams with selecting learning experiences to integrate into families’ daily routines in an effort to enhance young children’s development of functional skills and behaviors across the three early childhood outcomes. The website is organized by four common daily routines in which parents/caregivers and children engage: mealtime, bath time, bedtime, and playtime. Within each routine area, various activities are presented by age group (birth through 5 years). Each activity enhances growth and development in relation to age-specific indicators from Maryland’s Healthy Beginnings Developmental Guidelines. Professionals can use the website with families to identify relevant activities to work toward the accomplishment of children’s IFSP outcomes. Information/content can be copied directly from the site and pasted into a provided Activity Matrix template to give to the child’s parent(s) or caregiver(s) [http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/10634](http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/10634).

- **The Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Tutorial** assists early intervention professionals and families to understand and be successful with measuring early childhood outcome results utilizing the COS process integrated into Maryland’s online IFSP. The online tutorial supplements direct face-to-face training and provides an ongoing resource for implementing the COS process in early intervention and engaging families in the COS process in Maryland. [http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/128970](http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/128970).

- **The Birth-Five Evaluation and Assessment Module** is an online professional learning resource designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of evaluation and assessment (birth – five), including definitions, purposes, legal requirements, recommended practices and family partnerships. Throughout the module, the learner is engaged in Checks for Understanding to assess knowledge of content. Reflection activities are utilized along with IFSP and IEP toolkits to assist the learner with effectively synthesizing assessment information. Learners are introduced to an evidence-based, data-informed decision making model to ensure purpose-driven evaluation and assessment. Differentiated learning is supported through resource links to regulations, videos, other modules and
Maryland Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning website is based on the research from the Center on the Social and Emotional Foundation for Early Learning (CSEFEL) which promotes a framework for teaching social and emotional skills to young children. The MSDE, in collaboration with the University of Maryland School of Social Work/Institute for Innovation and Implementation, developed evidence-based, user-friendly, online training modules to assist early childhood educators as they promote children’s social-emotional development and address the challenging behavior and mental health needs of young children. The training is divided by age group for Infants and Toddlers Program staff and preschool program staff. The trainings are divided into 4 modules, each one containing a pre and post assessment and downloadable handouts. https://theinstitute.umaryland.edu/sefel/about/index.cfm

The Prematurity and Atypical Development Professional Learning Series is a website designed to equip early intervention professional learning facilitators with the information and materials needed to deliver a 5-module training series on prematurity and atypical development. The modules include: The ABCs and 123s of Prematurity, Diagnoses Associated with Prematurity and Developmental Implications, Understanding and Using Adjusted Age with Infants Born Prematurely, A Potpourri of Interventions for After the NICU, and Atypical Development-Increasing Awareness. Each module includes a Facilitator’s Guide, Learning Objectives, Video Presentation, and Participant Handouts along with a pre-post assessment. http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/273786

The MSDE targets specific universal professional learning activities to local early intervention and early care and education leaders. These include the annual MSDE, DSE/EIS Professional Learning Institute with an early childhood strand, quarterly face-to-face Birth through 21 Leadership professional learning, and monthly Birth through 21 Leadership teleconferences. This year the focus of the professional learning activities for early intervention leaders is high-quality, functional, routines-based IFSPs with the rollout of a reflection tool and training modules.

Additional universal professional learning activities are focused on Part C service coordinators with an annual/bi-annual technical assistance forum based on a needs assessment survey. Topics for this year’s forum included policy updates, collaborative teaming in the IFSP/Child Outcomes Summary Process, innovative online resources to support evidence-based practices, and family partnerships.

**Technical Assistance**

Through the Division’s strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward*, the MSDE, DSE/EIS focuses on building the capacity of LITPs, local school systems, public agencies, and institutions of higher education to narrow the performance gap and enable all children to be kindergarten ready. The Division works collaboratively with other Divisions within the MSDE to improve performance on statewide accountability measures, including Ready 4 Kindergarten, and achievement of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards.

- **Tiers of Engagement** provide the differentiated tiers of support and technical assistance to an LITP based on identified results and compliance criteria. The Tiers of General Supervision and Engagement were described earlier in the Accountability/Monitoring for Results component but the Tiers of Engagement are again discussed briefly below.  **Please refer to the Attachment: Differentiated Framework.**
  - The Universal Tier of Engagement is statewide professional learning and technical assistance to support statewide needs based on overall State trend data (e.g., performance on SPP Indicators, child outcomes, and student achievement). This includes general information related to early intervention and special education policies, procedures, and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide technical assistance include State and regional professional learning, online tools, resources through the Maryland Learning Links website, Q&A Documents, and Technical Assistance Bulletins.
The Targeted Tier of Engagement focuses on professional learning and support (training, coaching, and technical assistance) to address the needs of the LITP on specific topics identified through general supervision. It is a responsive and proactive approach to prevent the LITP from needing substantial support.

The goal of the Focused Tier of Engagement is to direct substantial support to address the continuous lack of improvement of the LITP through significant systems change. A multi-faceted State and local leadership team meets regularly to develop and implement an action plan designed to affect systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels.

The Intensive Tier of Engagement focuses on providing support based on a Formal Agreement that is developed to guide improvement and correction with onsite supervision. The MITP may direct, recover or withhold State or federal funds.

**Team, Analyze, Plan, Implement, Track (TAP-IT)**

The TAP-IT process is the universal delivery system for improved results through the MSDE, DSE/EIS Differentiated Framework: Tiers of Engagement. TAP-IT ensures purposeful resource allocation and collaborative effort in support of research-based actions that narrow the achievement gap for children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. Through TAP-IT the MSDE, DSE/EIS partners with LITPs around five levers for change (based on State Education Agency (SEA) Levers for Change in Local Education Agencies and Schools, Redding, 2013):

- **Opportunity** by braiding of resources to support innovative practices;
- **Incentives** through Statewide recognition of child progress and gap reduction;
- **Systemic Capacity** by providing Statewide data systems that include the Longitudinal Accountability Decision Support System (LADSS), Maryland Online IFSP, and the Maryland Online IEP (MOEIP);
- **Local Capacity** building through expert consultation, establishment of Communities of Practice (CoP), training, coaching, and opportunities for diagnostic site reviews; and
- **Intervention** through the MSDE, DSE/EIS Differentiated Framework - Tiers of Engagement that include universal support for internal decision-making processes based on implementation science and dissemination of proven practices with demonstrated results.

The TAP-IT process begins with the formation of an implementation team comprised of LITP and the MSDE, DSE/EIS representatives who operate in a clearly defined partnership. The team collects current, relevant data sources (for example: SPP/APR indicator data, Ready at Five - School Readiness Data, Maryland Online IFSP Database, and Family Survey Data), analyzes the data using an agreed upon protocol, plans interventions and aligns resources, implements with support and resources identified, and tracks ongoing progress to scale up as appropriate. Please refer to the Attachment: TAP-IT.

**Below is the SWOT Analysis for Professional Learning/Technical Assistance completed by stakeholders:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Web-based Maryland Learning Links portal for professional learning</td>
<td>● Face to face instruction lacking (staff capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Online IFSP data system provides real time data to help make decisions about specific program needs</td>
<td>● Shortage of specialized therapist and experienced providers in some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Internships of college</td>
<td>● No options for recruitment/retention bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Limited knowledge on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunities
- Professional development to be provided across the field
- Coordinated training across jurisdictions with high-level experts (save funding by

### Threats
- Some Local School Systems do not have time and/or funding to participate in early intervention training
- High caseloads leave limited time for professional
coordinated effort and collaboration  
- Serving on local ECAC and other stakeholder groups  
- State effort to unify professional learning  
- Family Support Services, Judy Centers, local Early Childhood Advisory Councils (ECACs), LICCs (but not sure how they are using the information)  
- Need to coordinate education at Institutes of Higher Education to combine all early childhood educators  
- Be inclusive of more outside agencies, programs in a stream-lined, effective way and target on those not interested yet  
- What is the data from other programs that could guide professional learning/technical assistance?  
- IFSP Quality Reflection Tool being developed

development  
- Lack of inclusion of smaller entities in large scale professional learning/technical assistance – leading to lower outcomes in some smaller jurisdictions  
- Direct technical assistance not always provided after professional learning opportunities – need follow-up  
- Engrained philosophy of some providers  
- Missed services during professional learning activities – legal threat and fiscal implication for missed billing opportunities and the cost of substitute providers

System Strengths and Areas for Improvement: Summary of Major SWOT Analysis Findings

Through its SWOT Analysis with stakeholders, the MITP identified several strengths that were common themes embedded in multiple infrastructure components. For example, the MITP’s online IFSP data system was mentioned as a strength in each of the identified infrastructure components. The data system better enables the MITP to examine State, local, and provider level data. In addition, access to real time data helps the MITP make programmatic decisions, including those related to governance, accountability, quality standards, professional learning, technical assistance, and fiscal considerations. Access to these data will be instrumental during the Infrastructure Development of Phase II.

Another strength identified via SWOT Analysis is the MITP’s involvement of stakeholders. In particular, the MITP involves stakeholders in decision-making for each infrastructure component. Throughout the year, the MSDE, DSE/EIS provides numerous opportunities for stakeholders to help guide the birth through five system in Maryland. Examples include the SICC, Special Education State Education Committee (SESAC), Professional Learning Institute meetings, IFSP Users Group meetings, state initiative workgroups/taskforces, the Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC), and statewide webinars/teleconferences. No major decisions are made without discussion with internal and external stakeholders.

The stakeholder SWOT analysis identified relevant areas for improvement within and across the system. More than anything else, collaboration was mentioned as something that is a current weakness or threat. Stakeholders felt that better
collaboration with numerous partnering agencies is needed to ensure that children with behavioral and mental health concerns are provided with an appropriate continuum of services, including those that provide services to children considered medically fragile. For example, stakeholders identified the collaboration between the MSDE, DSE/EIS and the MSDE, DECD as something that is getting better but still needs improvement. In addition, lack of adequate State and local collaboration with the Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Project and other mental health providers was identified as a threat to our system. And, better coordination among agencies is important to ensure adequate use of resources and a better connected system of professional learning. It is important to note that increasing collaboration with outside researchers was viewed as an opportunity to aid in data-informed decision making.

A common theme identified as an opportunity across infrastructure components in the SWOT Analysis was the State and federal shift towards results driven accountability. Stakeholders proposed that demonstrating increased results presents an opportunity for increased funding. To this end, stakeholders viewed the integration of COS into the IFSP as a better way to view the child during IFSP development and believed that better child outcomes will result from this integration. In addition, they identified the newly developed IFSP Reflection Tool (see Coherent Improvement Strategy #3) as an opportunity to refine local program practice in developing IFSPs that use authentic and appropriate information to develop functional outcomes and routines-based supports and services for young children and their families. The development, implementation, and evaluation of functional, routines-based IFSPs, it is believed, will lead to better results for children and their families.

Conclusions

Engaging in a thorough data review and infrastructure analysis has led to several critical conclusions. Data indicate that social-emotional development is one of two school readiness domains that have not increased, the special education gap is largest in social-emotional development, and the numbers of preschool age children being suspended is increasing. These data points are congruent with the information identified in infrastructure analysis indicating that: training in social-emotional development needs to be more widespread; children and families need better access to high-quality childcare and mental health services; and collaboration with families, childcare, early childhood mental health, and other early care providers needs to be strengthened.
**Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

**Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities**

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement**

*The Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program will substantially increase the rate of growth of positive social-emotional skills in infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children in four local Infants and Toddlers Programs.*

**Description**

**Stakeholder Involvement**

After a comprehensive review of the State’s data and infrastructure, as well as current research relating to school readiness, the MITP engaged stakeholders in discussion regarding a proposed SIMR on November 19, 2014. All stakeholders felt that the ultimate goal should be school readiness, but there was some disagreement on which child outcomes indicator(s) was most related to readiness. The discussion was immediately narrowed to social-emotional development and knowledge and skills. Some stakeholders felt that the focus should be on knowledge and skills because of its more direct link to school readiness. Others, however, emphasized the importance of executive functioning and approaches toward learning as they relate to social-emotional development. Much of the November 19th meeting was related to stakeholder discussion about social-emotional versus knowledge and skills and then whether Summary Statement #1 or Summary Statement #2 was more appropriate. Ultimately, the group reached consensus to focus on a substantial increase in social-emotional skills over knowledge and skills because they believed that positive social-emotional development is the foundation for school success and that the attainment of knowledge and skills is difficult when challenging behaviors interfere with that attainment.

On November 19th, the MITP also proposed that 3 to 4 LITPs would be “SSIP programs” and stakeholders were all in agreement. During the discussions about potential “SSIP programs”, LITP names were not used, only county numbers, to avoid any bias from stakeholders. The MITP wanted decisions to be made based on data and infrastructure, not on an unrelated stakeholder agenda or bias. After reaching consensus on substantially increasing positive social-emotional development, the proposed SIMR was discussed at two additional meetings (December 10, 2014 and January 8, 2015) with consensus being reached by the end of each meeting. With input from the stakeholder meetings, MSDE reviewed data and initiatives and determined that the SIMR would initially include work with four local programs.

Selection of the SSIP programs was based on numerous factors. First, the local programs needed to have the capacity to implement identified improvement strategies and/or the ability to make changes to their infrastructure that would enable them to have the capacity. Second, the MITP and its stakeholders believe that it is important that the strategies and activities implemented as part of the SSIP process ultimately can influence State data for SPP/APR Indicator 3. As a
result, the MITP identified four programs that account for about one-third of the MITP’s total Part C child count. Third, it was important to have programs with varying structures because the ultimate goal is to implement SSIP strategies on a larger scale. For this reason, the MITP selected two programs that were Health Department lead agencies and two programs that were Education lead agencies. Fourth, demographic variables were also considered during the selection. The selected programs were around major urban areas and those that were more rural in nature. Finally, it was important that the programs selected would have interest and buy in to the SSIP process. Prior to finalization of the selection of local programs, each of the proposed SSIP programs was contacted to confirm their interest in the participation in the SSIP process.

The specific involvement of stakeholders taking part in SIMR discussions is provided below:

**Internal Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>11/19/14</th>
<th>12/10/14</th>
<th>1/8/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MITP Program Manager, Section Chief for Policy and Data, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Section Chief, Preschool Coordinator, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Quality Assurance Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C Monitoring Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Office of Childcare at MSDE, DECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### External Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>11/19/14</th>
<th>12/10/14</th>
<th>1/8/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITP Directors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Coordinators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Program Supervisors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention Providers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Interagency Coordinating Council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes of Higher Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Mental Hygiene/Health Department</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development/Child Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Insurance Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Office for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Family Network (Family Support)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Screening Consortium Members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICC Chairs/Members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Research

Science has established a compelling link between social/emotional development and behavior and school success (Raver, 2002; Zins, Bloodworth, Weissberg, & Walberg, 2004). Academic achievement in the first few years of schooling appears to be built on a foundation of children’s emotional and social skills (Raver, 2002). Young children cannot learn to read if they have problems that distract them from educational activities, problems following directions, problems getting along with others and controlling negative emotions, and problems that interfere with relationships with peers, teachers, and parents. “Learning is a social process” (Zins et al., 2004).
The National Education Goals Panel (1996) recognized that a young child must be ready to learn, e.g., possess the prerequisite skills for learning in order to meet the vision and accountability mandates of academic achievement and school success. Academic readiness includes the prosocial skills that are essential to school success. Research has demonstrated the link between social competence and positive intellectual outcomes as well as the link between antisocial conduct and poor academic performance (Zins et al., 2004). Programs that have a focus on social skills have been shown to improve outcomes related to dropout and attendance, grade retention, and special education referrals. They also have improved grades, test scores, and reading, math, and writing skills (Zins et al., 2004). “From the last two decades of research, it is unequivocally clear that children’s emotional and behavioral adjustment is important for their chances of early school success” (Raver, 2002).

The State's SSIP Measure

Through both data and infrastructure analyses, as well as through a thorough review of current research, the MITP has identified a need to focus on social-emotional development. As such, the MITP has developed the following SIMR:

The Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program will substantially increase the rate of growth of positive social-emotional skills in infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children in four local Infants and Toddlers Programs.

The State's SSIP measure is aligned with Summary Statement #1 of Indicator 3a: Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in positive social-emotional skills, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Once the SIMR was defined the MITP and its stakeholders discussed the creation of baseline and target data. At any given time, one identified SSIP program serves between 20% and 25% of all children in the MITP, whereas the other three programs combined serve about 10%. As a result, stakeholders proposed weighting the baseline and targets based on program size. Therefore, the baseline was set using a calculator provided by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center. This calculator uses each local program’s child count to create a weighted baseline. It is expected that, as a result of the strategies and activities listed below, the SSIP programs will experience significant gains in social-emotional data equal to at least one percentage point per fiscal year beginning in FFY 2015. Baseline and target data are inclusive of children receiving services through an IFSP birth to three, as well as children receiving services through an Extended IFSP after age three. To be included in analyses, children birth to three must receive services for at least 6 months before exiting and children older than three must receives service for at least 3 months before exiting. The baseline and targets for the Part C SSIP through FFY 2018 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Baseline FFY 2013</th>
<th>FFY 2014</th>
<th>FFY 2015</th>
<th>FFY 2016</th>
<th>FFY 2017</th>
<th>FFY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>57.40%</td>
<td>57.40%</td>
<td>58.40%</td>
<td>59.40%</td>
<td>60.40%</td>
<td>61.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Stakeholder Involvement

As stakeholders were engaged in identifying coherent improvement strategies and ultimately the Theory of Action, two overarching questions were an integral part of all discussions:

1) What would Maryland need to see at the state and local levels for administrators, practitioners, and families to improve positive social-emotional skills of young children with disabilities?

2) What specific improvement strategies would the state need to implement to support positive social-emotional skills of young children with disabilities?

The MITP led discussions around improvement strategies over three stakeholder workgroup meetings. During the first workgroup meeting, stakeholders were asked to identify root causes for low social-emotional child outcomes scores, regardless of whether or not the causes were actionable. The following root causes were identified: homelessness, toxic stress, lack of education about parenting strategies, inadequate high-quality and affordable childcare with consistent staff, parental disabilities, cultural awareness, access to and provision of adequate child and caregiver mental health services, family transiency, poverty/economics, genetics, parent-school mismatched expectations, lack of prenatal care, language barriers, parent inability to read child cues, adult learning strategies, substance abuse, lack of awareness of resources by families and staff, transportation, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), teen parents, caregiver and service provider rigidity, inadequate knowledge of social-emotional development by providers, inadequate understanding and use of evidence-based social-emotional strategies, family status, unaligned attachment styles, and gender stereotypes.

At both the first and second workgroup meeting, stakeholders were asked to consider actionable root causes linked to the data analysis and infrastructure analysis. These included the data analysis indicating lower social-emotional school readiness scores for young children with disabilities, the low outcome data in some programs and the variability in the outcome data around positive social-emotional skills for young children with disabilities, the concerns about the competency of providers to build family capacity and implement evidence-based practices with fidelity (e.g., the inconsistent implementation of SEFEL in early care and education programs throughout the state), the need to improve the quality of childcare (EXCELS), the need for improved collaboration between the MSDE, DSE/EIS and the MSDE, DECD, particularly with regard to the ECMHC Project in some jurisdictions, the inconsistent use of data-informed decision-making at all levels, the concerns about COS data quality, the concerns about IFSP quality, and the concerns about effective and efficient professional learning and technical assistance.

Additionally, at both the first and second workgroup meetings, members discussed potential improvement strategies in the
context of the Hexagon Tool for Assessing Evidence-Based Practice Readiness of Fit. This tool facilitates a discussion by reviewing six broad factors in relation to the strategy:

- **NEED** – Is the improvement strategy aligned with early care and education, parent, and community perception of need and is data supporting the need?
- **FIT** – Does the improvement strategy fit with current initiatives and priorities, early childhood principles, and good practices?
- **RESOURCES AND SUPPORT** – are resources available to support the strategy, such as programmatic, staffing, technology, data systems, coaching, and supervision?
- **EVIDENCE** – is there evidence to support use of the improvement strategy – in the early childhood literature, developmentally appropriate practice?
- **READINESS FOR REPLICATION** – are resources available to support implementation – administrative support, professional learning and TA availability, qualified providers?
- **CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT** – does the state have the capacity to support local program implementation – administrative support, qualified staff, stakeholder support?

Based on all the above discussions, stakeholders generated numerous improvement strategies for substantially increasing the rate of growth of positive social-emotional skills of infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities:

- Focus on family assessment - particularly through the use of the Routines Based Interview (RBI), implementation of the Seven Key Principles for Providing Early Intervention in Natural Environments, and the DEC Recommended Practices for Assessment and Family Practices
- Stronger collaboration with other home visiting programs (i.e., Early Head Start, Parents as Teachers)
- Stronger collaboration with child care community - Maryland EXCELS
- Stronger collaboration with mental health providers, in particular the Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Project
- Full implementation with fidelity of Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (SEFEL) for early intervention providers, early childhood mental health consultants, and child care providers
- Stronger focus on reflective coaching with families and other caregivers (i.e., child care providers)
- Continuation of Making Access Happen initiative
- Embedding data-informed decision-making at all levels
- Child Outcomes Summary - Competency Check
- Utilization of the Implementation Science Framework/Research

At the third workgroup meeting, stakeholders were presented with the previously identified improvement strategies and were given the opportunity to provide additional input on those or other strategies. Additional improvement strategies that were identified included:

- Stronger collaboration with healthcare providers
- Stronger collaboration with Institutes of Higher Education
- Focus on high-quality, functional, routines-based IFSPs

After each meeting, notes/materials were shared with all stakeholders to allow for input from those who could not attend.
The specific attendance of stakeholders at those groups is indicated below.

**Internal Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>11/19/14</th>
<th>12/10/14</th>
<th>1/8/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MITP Program Manager, Section Chief for Policy and Data, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Section Chief, Preschool Coordinator, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Quality Assurance Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C Monitoring Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Office of Childcare at MSDE, DECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Education Program Specialist, DECD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>11/19/14</th>
<th>12/10/14</th>
<th>1/8/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITP Directors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Coordinators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Program Supervisors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention Providers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholders felt strongly that the MSDE, DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: Moving Maryland Forward provided a solid foundation for Maryland’s SSIP and that while many improvement strategies were already in place, many ongoing strategies and practices needed to be strengthened. Additional discussion with stakeholders around both the feasibility and impact at both the local and State level helped to combine, narrow down, and better organize improvement strategies to specifically focus on stronger collaborative practices, targeted technical assistance, and capacity building for data-informed decision-making.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

Promoting social-emotional development for Maryland infants and toddlers is the priority for Maryland’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This priority is in alignment with Moving Maryland Forward: The DSE/EIS Strategic Plan, which focuses on kindergarten readiness as one of four Action Imperatives. During the Division’s strategic planning process, four key strategies were identified to help improve results for children with disabilities and their families in Maryland. These key strategies are:

- Family Partnerships – The MSDE, DSE/EIS will continue to create and sustain strong family partnerships and will support school and community personnel in their efforts to encourage families, as their child’s first teacher, to make active and informed decisions that contribute to their child’s success;
- Strategic Collaboration – The MSDE, DSE/EIS will employ strategic collaboration with partners across State agencies, across divisions within the MSDE, among public education agencies, with Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs), and with families, advocates, and community partners, in order to promote access for all children to high-quality teaching and learning;
Evidence-Based Practices – The MSDE, DSE/EIS will promote the adoption and implementation with fidelity of evidence-based practices to narrow school readiness and achievement gaps. The MSDE, DSE/EIS will identify and share evidence-based practices, including multi-tiered systems of academic and behavioral supports, to ensure equitable access to high-quality instruction that leads to child/student progress; and

Data-Informed Decision Making – The MSDE, DSE/EIS will increase the capacity to make data-informed decisions at the state and local levels by providing access to real-time child/student data. The MSDE, DSE/EIS will support the implementation of an evidence-based and customized data analysis and decision-making process.

These broad key strategies continue to be essential in every aspect of the work of the DSE/EIS as well as the implementation of MITP’s SSIP. To substantially increase positive social-emotional outcomes of young children with disabilities the MITP will focus on a set of coherent improvement strategies to do the following:

1) Provide leadership for strategic collaboration and resource management;
2) Provide technical assistance and programmatic support focused on family partnerships and evidence-based practices; and
3) Ensure accountability with a focus on results through data-informed decision-making.

These improvement strategies were identified as a priority by stakeholders and were selected because they fit within the state’s current capacity and resources, as well as provide a coherent approach to the State’s specific needs: 1) narrow the school readiness gaps in social-emotional development, 2) increase collaborative practices, 3) build family capacity to support positive social-emotional development, 4) scale up the use of evidence-based practices, 5) provide effective professional learning opportunities, and 6) increase the use of data-informed decision-making. While previously implemented improvement strategies have addressed positive social-emotional skills in the broad sense, the selected coherent improvement strategies place a laser focus on results for substantially increasing positive social-emotional skills by supporting local infrastructure and capacity to implement evidence-based practices with fidelity. The MITP is building on current effective strategies and initiatives while adding new supportive coherent improvement strategies. It is important to note that these coherent improvement strategies are evidence-based and are/will be rolled out with careful and thoughtful planning using the principles of Implementation Science.

Implementation Science is the study of methods to promote the integration of research and evidence into practice. There are four functional stages of implementation with sustainability being embedded in each. According to Metz and Bartley (2012), they are:

1) Exploration – During this stage teams will assess needs, examine innovations, examine implementation, and assess fit;
2) Installation – During this stage teams will acquire resources, prepare the organization, prepare implementation, and prepare staff;
3) Initial Implementation – During this stage teams will use data to assess implementation, identify solutions, and drive decision making;
4) Full Implementation – During this stage the new learning occurs at all levels and becomes integrated into practice, organization, and system settings and practitioners skillfully provide new services.

Implementation Science seeks to examine the causes of ineffective implementation and to investigate new approaches to improve programs. As a result, the incorporation of Implementation Science helps ensure that interventions/changes to programs are implemented effectively and consistently over time. The MITP believes that the incorporation of
Implementation Science into each improvement strategy increases the likelihood of success and decreases the likelihood that strategies will lose their effectiveness over time.

**MITP Key Strategy #1 – Provide leadership for strategic collaboration and resource management.**

The MITP and LITPs are connected and have relationships with statewide and local programs and services that support families with young children. Emphasis to maintain and strengthen these partnerships is an ongoing process and examples include but are not limited to:

1) **Maryland's Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (ECMHC) Project**: The MITP believes that collaboration with the ECMHC Project will result in a more seamless system of services for children with atypical social-emotional development. Collaboration will also help retain children with behavioral and mental health needs in quality childcare programs who would otherwise be expelled.

2) **Home Visiting Programs**: The MITP believes that collaboration with home visiting programs will increase access to evidence-based programs that provide developmental and parenting support to families.

3) **Maryland EXCELS**: The MITP believes that the continued expansion of the Maryland EXCELS system will result in higher-quality childcare with better emotional support, thereby producing better social-emotional outcomes for children in the MITP and throughout Maryland.

4) **Health Care Providers**: The MITP believes that continued collaboration with healthcare providers will result in better coordination of services, earlier referral and, consequently, better child outcomes.

5) **Making Access Happen (MAH)**: The MITP believes that the continuation of the MAH initiative, even after RTT-ELCG funds are expended, will result in more children three through five with developmental delays and disabilities, being supported with their typically developing peers in high quality environments.

The MITP believes that strengthening partnerships/collaboration with the projects, programs, and agencies listed, including those that are part of the MSDE, DECD will result in a more comprehensive and seamless system of services for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with developmental delays and disabilities.

State and local level leaders recognize the importance of nurturing relationships at every level, which requires ongoing, continuous collaborative partnering. Based on the research regarding structures for implementation, the following new improvement strategies will be implemented to maintain and strengthen the above collaborations:

1) **Statewide Leadership Implementation Team** - The MITP will form a Statewide Leadership Implementation Team with key decision-making leaders from the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, the Division of Early Childhood Development - including a representative from the Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Project and the childcare community, the chair of the SICC (a healthcare provider), the University of Maryland School of Social Work, the Johns Hopkins University School of Education, Parents’ Place of Maryland (MD’s Parent Information and Training Center), and other critical partners based on stakeholder input. This team will serve as a model for local leadership implementation teams, ensure that improvement strategies at every level are based on evidence and utilize the principle of Implementation Science, as well as strengthen fiscal management and collaborative efforts for results.

2) **Local Leadership Implementation Teams** - Local Leadership Teams will be identified to strengthen existing local collaborations, develop new partnerships as appropriate, and receive ongoing support from the state team to address fiscal management and implementation drivers such as selection, training, coaching, and the data-informed decision-making needed for implementation of evidence-based practices.
The MITP believes that the development of Statewide and Local Leadership Implementation Teams will enhance state/local infrastructure and will result in evidence based-strategies being implemented with fidelity.

MITP Key Strategy #2 – Provide technical assistance and programmatic support with a focus on family partnerships and evidence-based practices.

As part of the MSDE, DSE/EIS strategic plan, the MITP has placed a strong focus on family partnerships and evidence-based practices. Family-centered principles are a set of interconnected beliefs and attitudes that shape program philosophy and behavior of personnel as they organize and deliver services to children and families. Family-centered practice is a way of working with families that increases their capacity to care for and protect their children. In particular, family-centered means focusing on children's needs within the context of families.

Ongoing practices within Maryland LITP's that exemplify this strategy include:

1. **DEC Recommended Practices/Agreed Upon Mission and Key Principles for Providing Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments** - Maryland has adopted both the DEC Recommended Practices (Division for Early Childhood, 2014) and the Agreed Upon Mission and Key Principles for Providing Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments (Workgroup on Principles and Practices in Natural Environments, OSEP TA Community of Practice: Part C Settings, 2008). Maryland has incorporated both documents into its Personnel Standards and Suitable Qualifications Requirements. Technical assistance and programmatic support focused on both Recommended Practices and Key Principles will continue to be a priority.

2. **Family Assessment** - Research shows that children learn best in the context of everyday routines and activities (e.g., Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). The provision of family assessment is included in both the IDEA, as well as the Code of Maryland Regulations. The intent of this requirement is to invite families to voluntarily share information to help early intervention providers to adequately address family concerns, priorities, and resources related to supporting their child's learning and development. This process also helps families identify their available supports to help attain desired outcomes. Technical assistance and programmatic support focused on high-quality family assessment will continue, with an emphasis on evidence-based family assessment tools.

3. **Reflective Coaching** - Coaching is an evidence-based strategy used in training by program supervisors and early intervention providers and in service delivery by early intervention providers and families. Coaching is considered a competency driver in Implementation Science (Metz & Bartley, 2012). The idea is that even though new skills are introduced through training they must be practiced and mastered with the help of a coach.

   In 1997, Campbell forwarded the notion of an early intervention service provider as a coach, rather than a direct therapy provider. In this role, the early intervention provider would be in a position alongside the family, instead of taking a more lead role (Hanft & Pilkington, 2000). Research shows that family involvement results in greater early intervention effects (Shonkoff & Hauser-Cram, 1987; Ketelaar, Vermeer, Helders, & Hart, 1998).

   Rush and Shelden (2005) define coaching as “an adult learning strategy in which the coach promotes the learner’s ability to reflect on his or her actions as a means to determine the effectiveness of an action or practice and develop a plan for refinement and use of the action in immediate and future situations.” In early intervention in Maryland, service providers use reflective coaching to help parents develop their interaction abilities with their children to help support development. In other words, coaching is essentially capacity building within families to increase families’ abilities to promote learning and development.
Coaching consists of five components:

1. **Initiation** – Identification of a joint plan that includes the purpose and the anticipated outcomes of the coaching process;

2. **Observation** – Observation of an existing strategy or new skill. The purpose is to assist in building the competency of the person being coached;

3. **Action** – Real life activities that serve as the incorporation of the new skills;

4. **Reflection** – Questioning of the person being coached about what is currently happening, what he or she wants to happen, and about strategies to merge the two; and


*The MITP believes that the continued implementation of the DEC Recommended Practices, Key Principles and Practices for Providing Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments, high quality family assessments, and reflective coaching will support families, early intervention providers, and other early care and education staff to embed social-emotional learning opportunities into daily routines, which will result in better fidelity of implementation and increased family/caregiver capacity, resulting in better social-emotional outcomes for Maryland's children.*

In addition to focusing efforts on continued refinement of current practices, **new** improvement strategies to be implemented within the targeted jurisdictions will include:

1. **Routines Based Interview** - The benefits of family-directed assessments were discussed above. As part of the SSIP process, the MITP plans to roll out the Routines Based Interview (RBI) (McWilliam, 2010) in select jurisdictions. The RBI supports the MITP's adoption of the *Mission and Key Principles for Providing Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments* and the *DEC Recommended Practices*. The RBI is a semi-structured interview that was designed to establish a positive relationship with the family, obtain a rich and detailed description of child and family functioning, and result in a list of outcomes and goals chosen by the interviewee. During the interview, the interviewer assesses the child’s engagement, independence, and social-relationships with everyday routines, as well as the family’s perceptions of how the child is participating in daily routines. Use of the RBI will assist IFSP Teams in developing outcomes that are routines-based, functional, and meaningful to the family. Also, the RBI will increase the ability of IFSP Teams to ask about and gather information about social-emotional needs and to support the identification of outcomes related to social-emotional needs through conversations with families.

*The MITP believes that the integration of the RBI as a family assessment tool will result in higher quality, more contextually appropriate IFSPs, including specific IFSP outcomes related to social-emotional needs, supports, and capacity building, and, consequently, better positive social-emotional outcomes for young children with disabilities.*

2. **Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning** - Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (SEFEL) is a framework that uses evidence-based strategies to promote the social-emotional development and school readiness of young children birth to age 5. This conceptual model was developed by The Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL). CSEFEL is a national resource center for disseminating research and evidence-based practices to early childhood programs across the country.

It is also important to note that the SEFEL framework aligns with other Maryland State initiatives. SEFEL incorporates a multi-tiered system of support. This multi-tiered model is similar to the Positive Behavior
Interventions and Support System (PBIS) model that has been adopted in many Maryland public schools. By introducing this framework in early intervention systems, it improves the continuum of services that are available to our infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities. This alignment provides common language, uses evidence based interventions, and allows for richer collaboration between professionals that are serving and teaching Maryland children from birth to 21.

The training and implementation model that will be used to disseminate the SEFEL framework first involves building capacity at the state level. The State Leadership Implementation Team will identify evaluation tools to measure implementation fidelity, create a system to collect and analyze child outcome data, and carefully select a cadre of professional development experts to deliver training and provide external coaching to establish high-fidelity implementation. Each targeted jurisdiction will have access to both face-to-face technical assistance and virtual support to help guide them through levels of implementation of SEFEL. Providing high levels of post-training support and coaching will increase the likelihood that systemic change will occur. Detailed descriptions of the SEFEL implementation plan will be provided in Phase II of the SSIP.

The MITP believes that the integration of the SEFEL framework and strategies into local programs will increase both provider and family awareness and knowledge about typical and atypical social-emotional development, including both identification and the use of appropriate strategies and that the use of reflective coaching as a follow-up to professional learning on social-emotional development will increase the competency of early intervention providers to recognize opportunities to integrate social-emotional support across settings and activities with families.

MITP Key Strategy #3 – Ensure accountability with a focus on results through data-informed decision-making

Ongoing Practice - TAP-IT Protocol

As part of the MSDE, DSE/EIS strategic plan, the Division has adopted an evidence-based data analysis and decision-making process based on implementation science, called the TAP-IT Protocol. TAP-IT stands for Team, Analyze, Plan, Implement, and Track and this process guides State/local leaders and practitioners through a structured examination of data, inquiry, and evaluation. This protocol guides: 1) the formation of implementation teams, 2) the analysis of comprehensive data to determine specific needs at each level of the system, 3) action planning to address the identified need at each stage of implementation, 4) ongoing support (through the implementation team) for implementation of innovative practices to address needs, and 5) tracking progress and implementation fidelity. The MITP will support the use of the TAP-IT Protocol within local leadership implementation teams.

It is anticipated that the continued use of Implementation Science and the TAP-IT protocol will provide support within local programs to engage in data-informed decision-making around scaling up evidence-based practices that support positive social-emotional development of young children.

New improvement strategies to be implemented within the targeted jurisdictions will include:

1. IFSP Reflection Tool – Developing High-Quality Functional, Routines-Based IFSPs - The MITP has created and will begin rolling out the IFSP Reflection Tool and its three companion modules. The IFSP Reflection Tool was developed by MSDE and stakeholders to assist lead agencies and service providers in refining their practice in
developing IFSPs that use authentic and appropriate information to develop functional outcomes and routines-based supports and services for young children and their families. The tool is a self-assessment that may be used for professional learning and program improvement; it is not an evaluation of any kind.

The MITP believes that the integration and use of the IFSP Reflection Tool will provide additional data to local implementation teams and will support data-informed decision-making and action planning to better address positive social-emotional skills of young children with disabilities and to build family/caregiver capacity to embed positive social-emotional skill development within daily routines.

2. **Data Quality – Child Outcome Summary Competency Check** - Appropriate data-informed decision-making cannot occur without valid and accurate data. To help ensure accurate data, the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) is currently creating the Child Outcome Summary – COS Competency Check (COS-CC). The COS-CC is being created to provide states with a mechanism to verify that early intervention staff have the basic competencies to complete the COS process. The COS-CC will also assist the MITP and local programs identify professional learning needs. At present, the COS-CC has not yet been released. However, when it is released the four targeted jurisdictions will be considered for an initial pilot. Over the next several years the COS Competency Check will then become a requirement in Maryland for all providers involved in the COS process.

The MITP believes that the requirement of all IFSP teams to be COS competent will result in more accurate child outcomes data which can then be used to make appropriate data informed decisions, including those supporting the development of positive social-emotional skills.

**Conclusions**

The application of Implementation Science will be utilized in the four targeted jurisdictions beginning with the formation of a local implementation team. While the above set of coherent improvement strategies have been identified by stakeholders through data and infrastructure analysis, including the identification of root causes, the local implementation teams in each jurisdiction will guide how and when these strategies will be installed. During Phase 2 of the SSIP, additional work with stakeholders will be completed to assist the MITP in further development of a logical sequence for implementation of the coherent improvement strategies, evaluation of the strategies, and the specifics around the actual implementation plan, including steps, outcomes, resources needed, scale up plan, and timelines.
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Theory of Action

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in EI services programs and EI providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: [Maryland Part C Theory of Action]

Description of Illustration

Stakeholder Involvement

Using OSEP’s Theory of Action as a guide, stakeholders developed the MITP’s Theory of Action with two workgroups. After a total of 11 draft Actions were developed by the two groups, they went through several iterations to arrive at a more manageable Theory of Action aligned with both the Core Functions of the MSDE, DSE/EIS and OSEP’s Theory of Action. The major components of this Theory of Action include Leadership, Technical Assistance, Accountability for Results, and Resource Management.

The attendance of specific stakeholders is listed below.

**Internal Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>12/10/14</th>
<th>1/8/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MITP Program Manager, Section Chief for Policy and Data, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Section Chief, Preschool Coordinator, DSE/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C Monitoring Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Specialist, DSE/EIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Office of Childcare at MSDE, DECD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth through Five Education Program Specialist, DECD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>12/10/14</th>
<th>1/8/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITP Directors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Coordinators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Program Supervisors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention Providers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Interagency Coordinating Council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes of Higher Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Mental Hygiene/Health Department</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development/Child Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Insurance Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Office for Children</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Family Network (Family Support)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MITP Theory of Action

The MITP’s Theory of Action aligns with the MSDE, DSE/EIS Core Functions as described in *Moving Maryland Forward: Leadership, Technical Assistance, Accountability, and Resource Management*. Incorporated throughout the Theory of Action are the MITP’s Key Improvement Strategies to: provide leadership for strategic collaboration and resource management; provide technical assistance and programmatic support focused on family partnerships and evidence-based practices; and ensure accountability with a focus on results through data-informed decision-making.

The MITP anticipates that the three SSIP Key Improvement Strategies will lead to the achievement of improved results for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities and their families. Each Key Strategy represents a sequence of strategic actions that have a rationale based on data and infrastructure analysis. The MITP's Theory of Action and strategies will provide an indication of whether MITP is on the right track. As such, the graphic representation will help the MITP and its stakeholders develop evaluation strategies for both progress and implementation fidelity in Phase 2 of the SSIP process.

The Theory of Action explicitly articulates the rationale of how these strategies fit within the *Moving Maryland Forward* strategic plan’s Core Functions and will build the capacity to lead to meaningful change:

- The strategic leadership efforts supported by the MITP with all of its stakeholders (families, local jurisdictions, other MSDE division, state agencies, early childhood higher education preparatory programs, and other early care and education partners) to continue to build a collaborative vision for implementing an efficient, effective, comprehensive, and coordinated birth to five system of services will lead to a shared vision by local programs. Local programs will develop a highly efficient and effective infrastructure that encourages linkages, coordination and access to mental health services, and high quality early intervention/early care and education services among all partnering agencies.

- The technical assistance provided by the MITP to create an implementation infrastructure that utilizes data and evidence-based practices with fidelity will lead to systems of support within and across agencies to enhance provider skills to identify typical and atypical social-emotional development, to promote strategies to support positive social-emotional development, and to increased access to cross-agency intervention.

- Holding local jurisdictions accountable for clearly identified, measurable results, including increased data quality and public awareness activities, and engaging early intervention and early care providers in the data informed decision process (TAP-IT) to continuously improve programs focused on the social-emotional development of infants, toddlers, and preschool age children and the capacity of families to foster that development will lead to early intervention and early care providers having the tools for using data to improve: a family’s understanding and knowledge of social-emotional development; the co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation of high-quality, functional, routines-based IFSPs; data quality; the utilization of evidence-based strategies with fidelity; and access to early intervention and mental health services.

- The alignment of allocations and resources to specifically address identified issues and the efficient, effective, and equitable use of technical assistance and other resources by the MITP will lead to LITPs coordinating and aligning resources and funding streams that improve system effectiveness, evidence-based practices, and ensure efficient use of resources.
The MITP believes this Theory of Action will drive change that results in substantially increasing the rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills of infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities in Maryland.
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