

# STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

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

For reporting on  
FFY 2019

Maryland



**PART C DUE**  
February 1, 2021

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

##### 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.

Please see attachment

##### 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.

Please see attachment

##### 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.

Please see attachment

##### Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Please see attachment

#### Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)

YES

##### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program 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 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

Please see attachment

### Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

#### Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

### Intro - OSEP Response

The State did not provide verification that the attachment it included in its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

### Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

## Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	96.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.28%	98.37%	97.24%	97.86%	98.07%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
7,777	9,709	98.07%	100%	98.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*

1,772

**Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).**

The State's criterion for timely service delivery is the following: not later than 30 days from parental consent on the IFSP.

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

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, 2019 to June 30, 2020.

**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 7/1/2019 and 6/30/2020, 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 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 1,772 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., administrative error, 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.

On November 6, 2020, 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 2019, local data reports will be distributed in May 2021.

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 who are 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.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

The State's data collection and reporting for Indicator 1 was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

At the systemic level, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified twelve (12) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. To verify the correction of FFY 2018 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state's data system, from a data subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to

determine if those records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected regarding infants and toddlers who's services were provided in a timely manner. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2018, there were 220 individual level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that not have IFSP services provided in a timely manner. Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that services were initiated for all 220 children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each individual child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	89.70%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=	92.50%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%
Data	97.53%	97.37%	97.83%	97.44%	98.14%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	94.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	8,926
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	9,059

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
8,926	9,059	98.14%	94.50%	98.53%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If 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), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

### 3 - Indicator Data

Does your 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)? (yes/no)

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment

#### Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2015	Target>=	67.04%	61.05%	61.55%	62.05%	62.55%
A1	61.05%	Data	67.11%	61.05%	61.27%	61.11%	56.58%
A2	2015	Target>=	65.40%	59.00%	59.50%	60.00%	60.50%
A2	59.00%	Data	65.91%	59.00%	58.21%	53.19%	46.44%
B1	2015	Target>=	72.17%	65.11%	65.61%	66.11%	66.61%
B1	65.11%	Data	72.47%	65.11%	66.54%	66.13%	60.33%
B2	2015	Target>=	61.84%	53.65%	54.15%	54.65%	55.15%
B2	53.65%	Data	62.95%	53.65%	53.51%	49.16%	43.50%
C1	2015	Target>=	76.03%	71.80%	72.30%	72.80%	73.30%
C1	71.80%	Data	76.28%	71.80%	71.41%	68.42%	62.69%
C2	2015	Target>=	56.66%	48.94%	49.44%	49.94%	50.44%
C2	48.94%	Data	56.69%	48.94%	49.74%	45.84%	43.32%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1>=	62.55%
Target A2>=	60.50%
Target B1>=	66.61%
Target B2>=	55.15%
Target C1>=	73.30%
Target C2>=	50.44%

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

4,914

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	24	0.49%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,582	32.19%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,057	21.51%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,443	29.37%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	808	16.44%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in	2,500	4,106	56.58%	62.55%	60.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
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	2,251	4,914	46.44%	60.50%	45.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	35	0.71%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,507	30.67%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,271	25.86%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,522	30.97%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	579	11.78%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,793	4,335	60.33%	66.61%	64.43%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,101	4,914	43.50%	55.15%	42.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	22	0.45%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,532	31.18%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,237	25.17%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,773	36.08%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	350	7.12%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they	3,010	4,564	62.69%	73.30%	65.95%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,123	4,914	43.32%	50.44%	43.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.**

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	10,486
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	2,551

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Maryland began integrating the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process into the IFSP in FFY 2011 with full implementation during FFY 2012. The COS process was completed and documented on the Strengths and Needs Summary page of the IFSP which replaces the Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) as the mechanism for collecting, measuring, and reporting on the three early childhood outcomes.

On October 1, 2018 the Maryland IFSP process, document, and online tool was revised and requires more robust child and family assessment activities as well as a more integrated COS process. My Child and Family's Story now includes three Assessment sections: Natural Routines/Activities and Environments, Our Family's Resources, Priorities, and Concerns, and the Assessment Summary: Present Levels of Functional Development. The first assessment section on natural routines and activities is completed through a Routines-Based Interview (RBI), the completion of the Scale for the Assessment of Family Enjoyment within Routines (SAFER), or the completion of the Everyday Routines and Activities section on the IFSP. The Family Resources, Priorities and Concerns section includes the ability to upload an Ecomap and utilizes prompts to assess the family's resources, priorities, and concerns, and includes service linkages. Finally, the Assessment Summary: Present Levels of Functional Development summarizes all sources of information, including conversations with the family, observations of the child in daily routines, the eligibility evaluation across the five developmental domains, child and family assessment activities, and outside reports, in order create a plan that fits well with the child's developmental strengths and interests.

The Assessment Summary: Present Levels of Functional Development documents all of the information gathered within each of the three early childhood outcomes areas: developing positive social skills and relationships, acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and using appropriate behaviors to meet needs. Using the COS Rating Prep Tool for each of the three early childhood outcome areas, teams document the discussion and identification of the child's skills and behaviors compared to other children the same age as either Foundational, Immediate Foundational, or Age-Expected. Together with the family, teams review the Assessment Summary, share information about typical development and age-anchoring while reviewing the COS Rating Prep Tool, elicit additional thoughts or information from the family and then use the Decision Tree for COS Summary Rating Discussions. The required online Decision Tree Procedural Facilitator guides teams to reach consensus about the appropriate COS descriptor statement. 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 checked on the IFSP. In addition to the COS Rating Descriptor the following question is also required: "Has my child shown any new skills or behaviors related to this area since the last summary?" "Yes, No or Not Applicable?" 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 annual reviews and at exit this yes/no question must be answered.

Prior to FFY 2015, the COS was only required at entry and exit and best practice guidance was provided to local programs to complete the COS process at every annual IFSP review. The online IFSP document allows for multiple interim COS ratings. In December 2015, MSDE distributed a Child Outcomes Summary Technical Assistance Bulletin requiring the COS progress/rating to be completed at every annual IFSP review. The revised IFSP process and online tool now requires the entire Assessment Section of the IFSP to be updated and completed at every annual evaluation, along with the completion of a COS interim and/or exit rating. Additional guidance has been provided in the MITP IFSP Process and Document Guide as well as an updated version of the COS Technical Assistance Bulletin. These resources are posted on the MSDE website.

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

In FFY 2017, revised Birth to Kindergarten COS training of trainers were held in five regions with the expectation for all staff to be trained or retrained in the COS process. The Maryland Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes Gateway website was created to support COS training and the implementation of the COS process with fidelity. These revised COS trainings were designed to help participants understand implementation of the COS process with fidelity, ensuring the consistent use of the Maryland four core components of the COS process (authentic assessment, age-anchoring, COS Rating Prep Tool, and Decision Tree) and to assess competency in the COS rating process. The expectation for the trainers who attended was to conduct local training of all birth to kindergarten staff and culminate the training with the completion of the Maryland COS Competency Check. The Maryland COS

Competency Check is now required for all early intervention staff with the ultimate goal being that every provider pass both the knowledge check and the case study competency. The DEI/SES provides annual COS Competency Check reports to ensure that providers are meeting the competency requirements. In FFY 2018, the DEI/SES developed the Maryland COS Process Fidelity Checklist in response to local leaders requesting a tool to monitor fidelity. Additionally, COS data reports, including COS Entry and data visualizations, continue to be updated and revised to support the State and local programs with using COS data for program improvement.

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

### **3 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3 - OSEP Response**

### **3 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

#### Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2006	Target>=	83.00%	85.00%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%
A	76.00%	Data	95.86%	98.10%	98.18%	97.91%	97.52%
B	2006	Target>=	81.20%	83.40%	85.60%	87.80%	90.00%
B	74.00%	Data	95.37%	97.31%	97.74%	98.05%	97.88%
C	2006	Target>=	89.50%	90.00%	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%
C	81.00%	Data	95.50%	98.21%	97.88%	98.31%	98.15%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A>=	93.00%
Target B>=	92.50%
Target C>=	92.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment

In preparation for the current 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.

No changes to baselines are being proposed for FFY 2019 but as required by the OSEP, the MSDE has set targets for all results indicators for FFY 2019. To set targets, the MSDE obtained stakeholder feedback through a survey sent to MITP stakeholders, including Local Special Education Directors, Local Infants and Toddlers Directors, and all members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Survey results guided target setting and proposed targets are included with this APR submission.

Throughout FFY 2019, the 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 SICC meetings throughout the reporting period. Annually, the draft APR and data are presented to the SICC.

Throughout the survey period and after a response rate indicating lower response rates than last year. On November 9, 2020 it was determined, with input from all Special Education Directors/Supervisors, to keep the survey open until the end of the month. This decision was based on the possible impact of COVID-19 on survey response rates. The last survey that was included in the report, arrived on 11/30/2020.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	9,769
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,650
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,558
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,612
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	1,532
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,597
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	1,538
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,598

Measure	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	97.52%	93.00%	96.65%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	97.88%	92.50%	95.93%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	98.15%	92.00%	96.25%	Met Target	No Slippage

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Question	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	NO

**If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

The State continues to focus on achieving representativeness through improvement plans for local programs with lower response rates. In addition, survey information, strategies to increase parent response rates, and State assistance is provided through State and Regional Meetings with Local Family Support Coordinators and Special Education Directors, Supervisors, and Compliance personnel.

**Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

In support of the effort to meet federal reporting requirements for State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 4, ICF administered the Early Intervention Services Family Survey of the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP). Surveys were completed by the parents/guardians of children who received early intervention services through the MITP program in 2019-20. The Survey was launched in mid-September and closed at the end of November.

As in prior years, the 2019-2020 Survey consists of items obtained from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) item bank. The Survey includes 22 core questions, two demographic questions, and two questions for parents of children older than three receiving early intervention services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).

MSDE provided the ICF team with the names and addresses of children between the ages of birth through 4 years who received early intervention services through the MITP program in 2019-2020; a total of 9,769 households. A survey packet addressed to the "Parent or Guardian of [name of child]" was prepared for each household. Each child was also assigned a unique identifier; this identifier was included on each printed survey. Printed surveys were batched by county and delivered in boxes to the appropriate county's Local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) director. It was decided that the directors were still responsible for distributing the surveys to families during the COVID-19 pandemic via direct mail. In previous years, providers were able to hand deliver surveys to parents during their Infants and Toddlers meetings and services with families. Directors also received a Frequently Asked Questions document that contained answers to common questions about the purpose of the survey in order to assist families with any questions they may have.

Families also had the opportunity to complete the survey in English or Spanish online. Families could either use the identifier located on their printed survey to login to the survey, or they could complete an alternative version of the survey that did not require them to login. Respondents completing the alternative version of the survey were required to answer several demographic questions that are not included on the primary version of the survey. A bilingual telephone and email help desk were maintained for parents for the duration of the survey. The value of Indicator 4 is determined by calculating the percentage of respondents that agreed with three statements. Each of the three statements corresponds to a separate Indicator.

Over the past year, early intervention services have helped me and/or my family:  
4a: know about my child's and family's rights concerning early intervention services. (Item 19)  
4b: communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child and family. (Item 17)  
4c: understand my child's special needs. (Item 21)

**Response Rates:**

A total of 9,769 surveys were distributed to families. In total, 1,650 completed surveys were returned – resulting in an adjusted response rate of 17.3% (which is down 22.8 percentage points from last year). The reduced response rate is most likely due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which restricted how some jurisdictions could provide services to families. Also, the additional responsibilities of families who are assisting their children with online learning may have impacted the response rate.

Six jurisdictions achieved an adjusted response rate of at least 35%, and 12 jurisdictions (50% of all local jurisdictions) achieved a response rate of at least 20%. Statewide, 1,580 surveys were completed in English (95.8%) and 70 surveys were completed in Spanish (4.2%). In 11 of the 24 jurisdictions, there were no surveys completed in Spanish. Paper surveys were more common than online surveys. Overall, 1,188 paper surveys were completed (72.0% of all surveys), while 462 surveys were completed online.

**Survey Representativeness:**

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. Respondents were asked to indicate their child's age when first referred for early intervention services. A total of 1,627 respondents answered this question. Of the respondents who answered this question, 79.2% (n=1,289) indicated that their children had been referred to MITP between birth and age two, while 20.8% (n=338) of families were referred when their child was 2-3 years old.

The survey respondents reported that the majority of children in the sample who were receiving services were male (62.3%, n=1,015), while 615 of the respondent's children receiving services were female (37.7%). Respondents were asked to classify their relationship to the child receiving early intervention services (n=1,645). Overwhelmingly, mothers completed the survey (86.6%), followed by fathers (8.3%). Foster parents, grandparents and others accounted for the remaining 5.1% of respondents.

In addition to discussing the demographic characteristics of respondents' children, certain characteristics were analyzed and compared to the population for which the sample is drawn to determine if the sample is representative of the population. Demographic data for the population and most of the sample were obtained from the 2019 MSDE master file of families receiving early intervention services. The two racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (51.1%) and Black or African American children (26.4%). With regard to race/ethnicity, parents of White children were overrepresented by 10.72 percentage points. Black or African Americans and Hispanic or Latino survey respondents were underrepresented by 3.75 and 6.68 percentage points, respectively.

The most common exceptionality evident in the MITP population is a developmental delay of at least 25%, with 67.3% of the population reporting this disability. The second most common exceptionality or disability statewide is a physical or mental condition with likely developmental delay (25.2% of the population). The third category of exceptionalities, atypical development or behavior, constitutes 7.5% of the population. Parents of children who have at least 25% Development Delay (DD) were slightly underrepresented among survey respondents, as well as parents of children who have an Atypical Development or Behavior (AD/B). Parents of children Diagnosed Physical or Mental Condition with High Probability of Developmental Delay (DD) were slightly overrepresented by the survey. Only one group reached the 3% threshold, parents of children who have at least 25% Development Delay (DD), which accounted for the largest percentage of responses as well. Overall, the sample was representative of the population with regard to exceptionalities/disabilities of the students.

In general, the survey was fairly representative across all key respondent demographic variables, although not fully representative. The 2019-2020 response rate of 17.3% (a sharp decrease of 22.8 percentage points) is most likely due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the difference in the process for distribution and collection of surveys and how counties have had to adjust when offering services. The State continues to make efforts to ensure a representative sample. MSDE requires LITPs with low response rates are required to complete and submit an Improvement Plan. As response rates

increase, so does the State's representativeness. As school buildings and other opportunities become available for face-to-face services, the potential response rates may increase moving forward.

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

The State attributes the decrease in response rate, at least in part, to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

**4 - OSEP Response**

**4 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.24%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	1.51%	1.52%	1.53%	1.54%	1.55%
Data	1.53%	1.61%	1.59%	1.53%	1.68%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	1.56%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	1,116
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	69,926

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,116	69,926	1.68%	1.56%	1.60%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Compare your results to the national data

Compared to the average national data percentage of children birth to 1 year of age receiving early intervention services (1.37%), Maryland served 1.60% of the resident population of children birth to 1 year of age. Maryland exceeds the national average by .23 percentage points and the percentage served is ranked 16th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

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

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	2.88%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	3.05%	3.10%	3.15%	3.20%	3.25%
Data	3.50%	3.55%	3.68%	3.86%	3.99%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	3.30%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	9,059
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	213,893

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
9,059	213,893	3.99%	3.30%	4.24%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Compare your results to the national data

Compared to the average national data percentage of children birth to 3 years of age receiving early intervention services (3.70%), Maryland served 4.24% of the resident population of children birth to 3 years of age. Maryland exceeds the national average by .54 percentage points and the percentage served is ranked 16th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

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

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

#### Measurement

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) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	92.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.87%	98.06%	98.53%	97.16%	95.94%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5,255	7,845	95.94%	100%	97.60%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### 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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

2,402

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

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, 2019 and June 30, 2020.

**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.

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. This process helped to decrease data entry errors by data entry staff. In FFY 2018, the Maryland IFSP and Maryland Online IFSP Data System underwent major revisions including usability of the online tool to support both compliance and results. The revised data system includes a dashboard display of important information needed by service coordinators, service providers, and data managers to manage their workload and achieve program objectives.

In addition to general notification regarding ongoing workflows, the dashboard supports the monitoring of Part C Indicators in a variety of ways. This dashboard is dynamic and displays elements and information based on the role of the user.

Information that is found on the dashboard includes:

- Real-time alerts whenever an online referral is received (so that action is taken right away)
- List of children and their 45-day timelines (with ability to drill through to the child's record)
- List of children and their 30-day timelines (with ability to drill through to the child's record)
- Number of upcoming IFSP meetings, with ability to drill through to a full report which can be sorted and filtered
- Number of children older than 36 months and still active (to remind users of cases that need to be closed to maintain the integrity of the data)
- Number of children who are in TPM range (with ability to drill through to a full report which can be sorted and filtered)
- Number of children with Extended IFSPs (for at-a-glance resource planning)

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

The State's data collection and reporting for Indicator 7 was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
13	13	0	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

At the systemic level, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified thirteen (13) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance (achieved 100%). To verify the correction of FFY 2018 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state's data system, from a data subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected regarding infants and toddlers who had an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2018, there were 405 individual level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that did not have an initial evaluation and initial assessment, and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that initial evaluations, assessments and IFSPs were provided for all 405 children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each individual child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

**7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	97.60%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.95%	99.97%	99.82%	99.93%	99.77%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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. (yes/no)

NO

If no, 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. Data also include 38 children, who had transition steps and services added to their IFSP, but late due to noncompliance. The reason for all 39 incidences of noncompliance was "staff errors." As mentioned, all 39 children, although late, had transition steps and services added to their IFSP as required.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,689	4,546	99.77%	100%	99.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**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" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

818

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

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, 2019 and June 30, 2020.

**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 analysis of data. These changes enabled the MSDE to report on all children who transitioned in the reporting year for the first time in FFY 2013 and continuing to present.

In FFY 2019, 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.

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

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

At the systemic level, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified six (6) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance (achieved 100%). To verify the correction of FFY 2018 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state's data system, from a data subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected regarding infants and toddlers who had an IFSP developed 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. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2018, there were ten (10) individual level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that did not have an IFSP developed with transition steps and services at least 90 days and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that transition steps and services were added to the IFSP for all 10 children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each individual child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8A - OSEP Response**

**8A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	98.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,546	4,546	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Number of parents who opted out**

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

**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 MSDE is the lead agency and the DEI/SES structure is birth to kindergarten in nature.

Between 7/1/19 and 6/30/20, local school systems and the SEA were notified of all 4,546 of the children, potentially eligible for Part B, who transitioned during the time period (4,546/4,546). Notification for 4,112 children occurred at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. Another 434 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 4,546 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.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

NO

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

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 include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020.

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

The statewide database comprises every IFSP, including the required child and family notification information. The MSDE ensures accurate data through data validation monitoring and through the assignment of Improvement Plans for untimely and/or inaccurate data. Since the MSDE provides these data to the LEA and SEA on a monthly basis, the MSDE ensures notification is provided for every child found eligible for early intervention services.

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

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8B - OSEP Response**

**8B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	92.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.06%	99.35%	99.62%	99.75%	99.38%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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)

NO

If no, please explain.

Data include children with documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Data also include 39 children who's transition conferences were held untimely as a result of noncompliance and 1 child who did not have a transition conference as a result of noncompliance. Of the 39 children with untimely transition conferences, 20 were late due to staff/administrative errors, 18 were late due the COVID-19 pandemic, and 1 was late due to an interpreter issue. The child who did not have a transition conference (due to staff/administrative errors) was no longer within the jurisdiction once noncompliance was identified, so a transition conference could not be held.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,662	4,546	99.38%	100%	99.11%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**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" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

28

**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 not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

816

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

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 include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020.

**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 2019, twenty-eight (28) 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.

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

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

At the systemic level, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified nine (9) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance (achieved 100%). To verify the correction of FFY 2018 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state's data system, from a data subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected regarding infants and toddlers who had a 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. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2018, there were twenty-seven (27) individual level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that did not have a transition conference held at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that transition conferences were held for 25 children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. They 2 children who did not have a TPM were no longer within the jurisdiction once noncompliance was identified, so transition conferences could not be held. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each individual child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8C - OSEP Response**

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because when providing the time period in which data were collected, the State reported, "Data include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

**8C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=					
Data					

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

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

There were no resolution sessions in FFY 2019.

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = ((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=					
Data		100.00%			

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

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

There were no mediations held in FFY 2019.

The State's data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**10 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

#### **Name:**

Marcella Franczkowski

#### **Title:**

Assistant State Superintendent

#### **Email:**

marcella.franczkowski@maryland.gov

#### **Phone:**

4107670238

#### **Submitted on:**

04/20/21 1:45:57 PM