

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The FFY 2006 Part C Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) staff in the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)/Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, in collaboration with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and local Infants and Toddlers Programs (LITPs). In preparation for submission of the APR in February 2008, MITP staff collected and analyzed data on Monitoring Priority Indicators #1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007) from the statewide Part C database, LITP program reports, corrective action plans, on-site monitoring activities, and State-level complaint investigations.

The State's Part C database is a web-based system that was specifically developed to collect and track data on the participation of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families in the monitoring priority areas identified by the State and the Office of Special Education Programs. Data collected at referral and from IFSPs for every eligible child and family is entered into the database by local staff. MSDE and LITP staff generate reports on a regular basis to monitor compliance and performance and audit for data validity and reliability.

Data for Indicator #4 was collected through NCSEAM Early Intervention surveys sent to all families active in local Infants and Toddlers Programs as of March 30, 2007, and was aggregated for reporting by a contractor with expertise in the development of the NCSEAM survey and the analysis of its results.

Indicator #3 in the State Performance Plan (SPP) has been updated to include initial progress data for children who began receiving early intervention services since December 2005, received services for at least six months and exited the program by June 30, 2007. Evaluation and assessment data was collected from the Part C database aggregated and reported by the database developer based on specifications consistent with OSEP reporting requirements.

The State is not required to report on Indicator #12 (Resolution Sessions) because it established Part C policies and procedures related to due process hearing requests.

New or revised Improvement activities have been included in the FFY 06 APR, and will be added to the SPP that is posted on MSDE's website after submission of the APR.

Stakeholder Input

Throughout FFY 2006, MSDE staff provided information and preliminary data on the Part C SPP/APR indicators and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders. Updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State/local performance data were provided at all SICC meetings in 2006-2007, and special presentations on the statewide data and the draft APR were made in November and December 2007 and January 2008.

In addition to the SICC membership documented in the SPP, representatives of LITPs, local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs), preschool programs, family support services, and other community-based partners attend monthly meetings of the SICC. SICC subcommittees assisted with the implementation of improvement activities for selected indicators in the SPP.

In October 2007, MSDE held its annual Early Intervention/Special Education Leadership Conference for LITP Directors, local Directors of Special Education, local Family Support parent representatives, and Chairs of the SICC and State Special Education Advisory Committee. The three-day conference continued the previous year's focus on the IDEA 2004 accountability requirements for State and local agencies involved in the provision of early intervention and special education services, a review of preliminary data to be submitted in the State's Part C and Part B APRs in February 2008, and an overview of the Maryland's process for making Local determinations.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Alan Coulter from the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) was the main presenter for the 2007 Leadership Conference as he was in 2006. Mr. Coulter updated State and local leaders on current federal reporting requirements and impact on States and local early intervention programs, and worked with State and local program representatives to review and analyze State and local data and improvement strategies. This conference provided an opportunity for local administrators, providers, and family representatives to understand the IDEA accountability framework and the relationship of local performance to State results and the State's determination under IDEA, to review and discuss current indicator data compared to the State targets, and to focus on local strategies to improve local performance.

Public Reporting

MSDE will make the APR and revised SPP available to the public on the MSDE website shortly after submission to the Office of Special Education Programs on February 1, 2008. Copies of the APR and revised SPP will be provided to LITPs, the SICCC, and other stakeholders simultaneously.

As required in IDEA 2004, MSDE will report to the public on the performance of LITPs on Part C Indicators # 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007). Performance data in numbers and percentages will be reported for each LITP, along with the State target, State performance data, and a narrative description of the indicator. In partnership with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE), MSDE has developed an accessible and state-of-the-art format for local and State performance data that is available at mdideareport.org. Through a map of the State, the public can click on the desired jurisdiction and see the performance data of the LITP in that jurisdiction on all the APR indicators, compared to the State targets and performance. In addition, the public will be able to select a particular indicator and view the performance of all LITPs for that indicator against the State target and performance. The SPP/APR website will be linked to related reports and data MSDE's website to provide a context for early intervention and special education performance data.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Part C database, verified by LITPs, validated by MSDE, and reviewed by the SICC.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 99.0%

To report the percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner between 7/1/06-6/30/07, MSDE’s database developer generated a report from the statewide Part C database comparing the IFSP meeting date and the projected service initiation date for all services on initial IFSPs and any service added during the time period with the State’s criteria for timely service delivery: not later than 30 days from the date of parent’s signature on the IFSP. The target data reported for this indicator includes data for all 24 LITPs. MSDE and LITPs verified family-related reasons or IFSP team decision making for the legitimate initiation of services outside the 30-day timeline and the report was modified based on the results of the State and local review and the LITP validation.

Number of eligible children	Number/Percent of children with services within timelines	Number/Percent family-related reasons validated through LITPs	Total number of children within timeline with LITP validation	Percent of children with timely delivery of services
6,623	6,155 92.9%	402 6.1%	6,557	99.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:**State monitoring and technical assistance activities:**

MSDE continued to monitor the implementation of the timely service requirement through the data system. The timely service indicator was added to the local data profile, which was distributed to all LITPs semiannually. MSDE required that all LITPs implement an improvement plan with strategies to achieve 100% compliance, to collect and validate the service initiation date for all IFSP services and the reasons why any service was not delivered in a timely manner, and to monitor compliance with the requirement on an ongoing basis. MSDE required that the improvement plan for this indicator be submitted with the annual local application for funds and the grant award for FFY 06 was contingent on approval of the plan.

Technical assistance on achieving compliance in this indicator and related IFSP decision making issues was provided to all LITPs at a statewide meeting and to specific LITPs which did not reach full compliance in this area.

Data collection, reporting, and analysis:

In April 2007, new fields related to this indicator were added to the Part C database, including the actual service initiation date and the reasons for untimely service initiation. The programming for timely service reports that can be generated by LITPs and MSDE for ongoing monitoring was completed in the fall of 2007, and will be used to generate the data for the local profiles and the APR for the next reporting period.

For FFY 2006, the database developer generated child-level and summary timely service reports from the database using the projected service initiation date. MSDE sent local data reports to each LITP with data from child records with untimely service initiation dates. LITPs reviewed each record and provided the reasons for untimely service delivery. If the documented reasons were related to a parent request, the unavailability of the child, or an IFSP team decision related to a child-based reason for service to be delivered outside the 30-day timeline, the service was not considered untimely. If the reason was related to a system issue (e.g., scheduling problems or staff unavailability), the service was considered untimely and the child whose service was untimely was not included in the State's percentage of children receiving timely services.

MSDE and LITPs identified modifications to the Part C database that would improve State and local capacity to track and audit initiation of services subsequent to the initial IFSP meeting within a reporting period. These modifications are planned as future improvement activities.

Addressing system capacity issues:

Staffing shortages, and federal and State funding which does not keep pace with the increasing number of infants and toddlers identified as being in need of early intervention services, have a direct effect on the capacity of LITPs to achieve full compliance and meet State targets. For FFY 2006, MSDE requested an additional \$6.7 million in State funding for LITPs in its Department budget. In fact, the State budget for the MITP was increased in the Governor's budget by only \$600,000, despite advocacy efforts by stakeholders at every level.

Without increases in federal and State funding, LITPs continue to seek additional local funds and to piece together budgets which in many cases, do not adequately support the staffing capacity needed to serve eligible children and families. In FFY 2007, neither federal nor State funding for the program was increased, and it appears likely that funding will not increase in FFY 2008. This is expected to have a negative effect on the performance at the State and local levels in the future despite the local commitment to using limited resources effectively to serve eligible children and families

Explanation of Progress or Slippage:

The percent of infants and toddlers who received timely early intervention services increased from 96% in FFY 2005 to 99% in FFY 2006. These percentages included children whose services were

State
delayed due to family-related reasons. The State did not have 100% compliance for this indicator but has continued to make progress in the timeliness of service delivery.

Sixty-six of the 6,623 (1%) eligible infants and toddlers for the reporting period did not have a timely service initiation date. Systemic reasons identified for the untimeliness included staff scheduling errors (21%), staff shortage (52%), weather (2%), and other system-related issues (25%). In FFY 2006, only six of 24 programs had any untimely service initiation dates and all 24 programs achieved substantial compliance with this requirement.

The number and percentage of children whose services were not initiated within the State's timeline because of family-related reasons increased by 5% in FFY 2006. In FFY 2005, LITPs were unable to document the reasons for all untimely services because the reasons were not tracked in the database and the time period for validation was not sufficient in some cases to review all the paper records manually. In FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, if LITPs could not document the reasons for untimely initiation of services, MSDE considered the services untimely.

Progress toward the target for this indicator can be attributed to several factors, including LITP implementation of local improvement activities required in their annual local applications to MSDE. In addition to improvement plans, progress toward the target can also be attributed to changes within the statewide database that allowed jurisdictions to document reasons for service initiation dates that were beyond the 30-day timeline. As a result, LITPs have targeted their improvement strategies on the issues that are specifically affecting the timely initiation of services.

Noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. See Indicator #9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

New/Revised Improvement Activities

In FFY 2007 - FFY 2010, MSDE will complete and fully implement modifications to the Part C database to refine data collection, reporting, and analysis related to timely service provision (e.g., electronic reports with reasons for and comparisons of untimely projected and actual service initiation dates), and a change in the database structure which would more closely align the addition of services to IFSP meeting dates.

In FFY 2007 - FFY 2010, MSDE will require a Corrective Action Plan as part of enforcement actions when an LITP does not attain substantial compliance in this indicator. An LITP that does not meet the State target of 100%, but has attained substantial compliance will be required to implement an improvement plan.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Part C database, verified by LITPs, validated by MSDE, and reviewed by the SICC.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	89.0% of active eligible children will receive early intervention services primarily in natural environments (e.g., home and community settings)

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: 89.6%

To report on the percent of infants and toddlers who receive early intervention services primarily in natural environments, MSDE generated a report from the statewide database, which calculated the frequency of services delivered in all settings for all eligible children with IFSPs on 10/27/06. In addition, MSDE reviewed a report of all services that were not provided in natural environments to determine the presence of justifications on IFSPs.

Number and Percent of children whose Primary Setting is a Natural Environment (n=6717)

Home	Community Setting	Total in NE	Total in Other	Percent in NE
5,458	562	6,020	697	89.6%

697 or 100% of children had justifications on the IFSP when services were not provided in natural environments.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:**State monitoring and technical assistance activities:**

MSDE includes the percentage of children primarily receiving services in natural environments on local data profiles distributed to LITPs two times annually. Also included on the profile is the percentage of services not provided in INE that have justifications on the IFSP.

If below State target, LITPs were required to include an improvement plan for the natural environments (NE) indicator in their annual local application to MSDE. LITPs were required to report progress on the NE indicator in semiannual and final program reports. If justifications were missing in the database for services not provided in NE, LITPs were required to review the early intervention record and enter justification as they appeared on the IFSP.

At the 2006 State Leadership Conference, MSDE and consultants presented a session on providing services in the NE for children with autism or autism-like symptoms, doing assessments that include functional components, developing functional outcomes, and collaborating with child care, library and other community programs. Local programs developed strategies on how to enhance NE service provision within their own counties and shared this information with other county representatives attending the conference.

At statewide Service Coordinator Resource Group meetings, MSDE staff, contractor and local ITP programs presented information related to providing early intervention services in the NE, doing functional evaluations and understanding/developing appropriate justifications if services are not provided in the NE. MSDE participated in training at local ITP programs on providing services in the NE and on developing appropriate justifications when services are not provided in the NE.

The on-line Maryland Early Childhood Gateway section on evaluation and assessment in the NE and IFSP development and implementation in the NE was revised and incorporated into the above trainings mentioned.

Data collection, reporting and analysis:

MSDE reported 618 data for this indicator in the APR, but 6/30 data on the percentage of children served in NE is provided to LITPs so that progress can be tracked over time. MSDE reviews the actual justifications entered in the Part C database, and verifies that justifications are based on the needs of the child. Prior to the submission of 618 data reported in this indicator, MSDE runs an audit report and reviews the settings that are entered under the Other category. When settings in the Other category appear to be community-based settings, MSDE contacts LITPs and clarifies the definition of NE settings and includes them in the appropriate category.

Addressing system capacity issues:

Due to inadequate staffing/funding and increased referrals, some LITPs struggled to provide services in the appropriate NE settings. Some LITPs have increased service collaborations with child care, Early Head Start, library, and other community programs and have been able to train paraprofessionals to provide special instruction under supervision by a special educator.

Explanation of progress or slippage:

In FFY 2006 the State met its target of 89%. Eighteen of 24 LITPs achieved the State target.

Achievement of the target was accomplished by requiring LITPs to complete improvement plans as well as by providing trainings for LITPs which emphasized increasing the inclusion of infants and toddlers with disabilities in community programs and IFSP decision making that supports the provision of services in the NE. Another factor was statewide promotion of the web-based Maryland Early Childhood Gateway (mdecgateway.org), with tutorials on evaluation/assessment and IFSP development and implementation. These tutorials include lessons on how to incorporate NE and functional practices in evaluation/assessment and IFSP development and implementation.

State

There were no findings of noncompliance identified through the State data system. Noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 through State-level complaint investigations for absence of justifications on the IFSP for services not provided in NE was corrected in a timely manner. See Indicator #9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

New/Revised Improvement Activities

In FFY 2007 - FFY 2010, MSDE will require an LITP to do improvement plans when the State target is not met. LITPs will report their progress in semiannual and final program reports.

In FFY 2007 - FFY 2010 MITP will implement methods of informing referral sources, families and other stakeholders of evidence-based practices for providing early intervention services in NE. Methods will include:

1. Maryland Early Childhood Gateway website;
2. The publication of the revised "Physician's Guide to Early Intervention"; and
3. Local public awareness efforts.

In FF 2007 - FFY 2009, MSDE staff, Mid-South Technical Assistance Center staff and Baltimore City ITP staff will develop and implement strategies to improve the percentage of services provided in natural environments considering challenges encountered in an urban environment.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the distribution of parent surveys, compiled and aggregated by an MSDE contractor, and analyzed by MSDE staff to develop State and local program improvement activities.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: 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 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>74% of families participating in Part C report that early intervention services helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>72% of families participating in part C report that early intervention services helped the family effectively communicate their children’s needs</p> <p>82% of families participating in part C report that early intervention services helped the family help their children develop and learn</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 06:

PART C Early Intervention Family Survey Report For Data Collected in 2007

SPP/APR Indicator #4A: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

A. Know their rights.

Standard: A .95 likelihood of a response of “agree,” “strongly agree” or “very strongly agree” with this item on the NCSEAM survey’s Impact of EI Services on Your Family scale:
“Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family: know about my child’s and family’s rights concerning Early Intervention services.”

Percent at or above indicator 4A standard (539): 76% Actual Numbers: 1083/1427

SPP/APR Indicator #4B: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs.

Standard: A .95 likelihood of a response of “agree,” “strongly agree” or “very strongly agree” with this item on the NCSEAM survey’s Impact of EI Services on Your Family scale:
“Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family: communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child and family.”

Percent at or above indicator 4B standard (556): 74% Actual Numbers: 1055/1427

SPP/APR Indicator #4C: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

C. Help their children develop and learn.

Standard: A .95 likelihood of a response of “agree,” “strongly agree” or “very strongly agree” with this item on the NCSEAM survey’s Impact of EI Services on Your Family scale:
“Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family: understand my child’s special needs.”

Percent at or above indicator 4C standard (516): 81% Actual Numbers: 1163/1427

PART C APR

Maryland

State

Number of Valid Responses: 1,427
 Measurement reliability: 0.90-0.95

Mean Measure: 676
 Measurement SD: 191

On July 23, 2007, 6,395 surveys were mailed to **all** families with active eligible children as of 3/30/07. For families who indicated that Spanish was their primary language in the Part C database, the survey was sent out in Spanish. Of the 6,395 surveys sent out, 1,476 were returned, for an overall 23.1% response rate and a 1.9% margin of error (95% confidence level). Of the 1,476 surveys returned for measurement scaling and statistical analysis, 1,427 provided measurable data on the survey's Impact on Family scale, resulting in an effective response rate of 22.3% (and shifting the margin of error to 2.0%). The data meet or exceed the NCSEAM 2005 National Item Validation Study's standards for the internal consistency, completeness, and overall quality expected from this survey.

In the percentages of families who reported that early intervention services helped them for each subindicator, the numerators are the numbers of families who agreed, strongly agreed, or very strongly agreed with related items on the survey, and the denominators are the number of valid survey responses.

4A. Know their rights:	1083/1427	76%
4B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	1055/1427	74%
4C. Help their children develop and learn	1163/1427	81%

Extent to which Results are Representative:

Race/Ethnicity	Percentage Served in 10/06 Child Count	Percentage of Survey Responses
American Indian	0%	0%
Asian	5%	5%
Black (Not Hispanic)	32%	18%
Hispanic	9%	8.5%
White (Not Hispanic)	54%	68.5%
Total	100%	100%

The chart above indicates that the percentages of survey responses from Asian and Hispanic families are representative of those populations, while responses from African American families are underrepresented and responses from white families are overrepresented. MSDE shared the local aggregate survey response data with each Local Infants and Toddlers Program, and required that each LITP develop an Improvement Plan for this indicator to be submitted with the Local Application for funding, which includes the following:

- a) Steps to improve the response rate and representativeness of responses to the statewide family survey, such as identifying ways that family support staff and service coordinators can assist families to complete the survey;
- b) Steps to involve local stakeholders to understand the purpose of the survey, and importance of family benefit;
- c) Steps to identify targeted improvement activities based on local survey results and other local sources of information on family benefit;
- d) Description of how ranked survey items will be used as a guide for providers and families.

Weighting the results by ethnic group did not make a meaningful difference in the family survey data. When results were weighted the percentages changed from 76%, 74%, and 81% to 74%, 73%, and 81%. The largest change was 2% for indicator 4a. This change is still within the 95% confidence limits of the original number. Therefore, 76% with a 1.1% margin of error and a 2.2% confidence interval means that 76% is anything between 73.8% and 78.2% which is 76 plus or minus 2.2.

Since weighting the data produced no significant difference in the overall family survey results, MSDE is reporting the actual results because they will be more meaningful for local improvement efforts.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:

Understanding the Data:

During FFY 2006 several improvement activities were completed to assist all stakeholders in understanding the data.

- MSDE worked closely with the contracted vendor to analyze the baseline data and develop a plan for informing and educating stakeholders about the results.
- On March 6, 2007 MSDE held a statewide stakeholders meeting, which included families, family support coordinators, administrators, service coordinators and SICC members in order to review and discuss the baseline results and ways to use the results to plan program improvement activities. The presentation "Baseline Data Addressing Part C Indicator #4: Family Outcomes" was facilitated by the contracted vendor, William Fisher and the family survey developer, Batya Elbaum. This meeting provided stakeholders with a better understanding of the family survey data and how to begin moving forward with local improvement efforts.

Local Improvement Planning:

Additional improvement activities during FFY 06 began to link the purpose and usefulness of the survey results to local improvement efforts.

- MSDE developed a framework for local improvement planning as part of the local application and grant process that included:
 - Improvement in the understanding of the purpose and use of the survey results;
 - Improvement in response rates particularly with regard to those families who are culturally diverse; and
 - Engagement of local stakeholders to understand and analyze local baseline results and begin to consider targeted local improvement activities.
- MSDE reviewed each local application and provided technical assistance as needed to ensure that a family survey improvement plan was in place. In many local applications, the family survey data was used to integrate additional family support services activities within local public awareness and professional development efforts.
- MSDE provided additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions regarding the family survey data through phone consultation and on-site visits.

Collaboration with Parent-to-Parent Networks:

- MSDE collaborated with parent-to-parent networks throughout the state by providing training and technical assistance to local Family Support Network, Preschool Partners, and Partners for Success coordinators and by continuing to develop working relationships with the Parents' Place of Maryland, the Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council, and local agencies that provide specific support group activities.

- On March 13, 2008 MSDE is co-sponsoring a statewide training on cultural diversity and outreach strategies for all stakeholders involved in parent-to-parent networks in Maryland.

Explanation of progress or slippage:

The family survey results from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006 changed slightly. Indicator 4a changed from 74% to 76%, Indicator 4b changed from 72% to 74%, and Indicator 4c changed from 82% to 81%. While slight changes occurred across the three indicators these changes were not statistically significant to indicate progress or slippage.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities
Timelines / Resources for FFY07**

New/Revised Improvement Activities

The Maryland State Department of Education will continue the improvement activities described above in order to meet the proposed targets for this indicator. In addition, MSDE will collaborate with local stakeholders to explore different methods of survey distribution during FYY 2007 and FYY 2008.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Part C database, verified by LITPs, validated by MSDE, and will be reviewed by the SICC.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:	
A.	Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
B.	Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	The percent of infants and toddlers birth to one with IFSPs will be equal to or greater than 1.50% of the infants and toddlers of the same age in the general population.

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: 1.34%

Based on the data provided by OSEP on www.ideadata.org, Maryland served 1.34% of its 2006 resident birth to one population in the reporting period.

- A. Of the 23 States classified by OSEP as having a broad eligibility definition in 2006, Maryland ranks 11th. When the number of at-risk infants and toddlers are excluded, Maryland ranks 10th.
- B. Compared to national data, Maryland served .28% more children birth to one than the national baseline and ranked 15th among the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and reporting territories. When the number of at-risk infants and toddlers are excluded, Maryland ranks 14th.

Birth-One Population Served	2006 Resident Population	Percent Served
996 (10/27/06 snapshot)	74,094	1.34%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:**State monitoring and technical assistance activities:**

MSDE continued to monitor the local implementation of child find requirements through the data system and technical assistance (TA) was provided as needed. For example, MSDE provided TA to an LITP, which recently changed local lead agencies, experienced a substantial drop in the referral of children 0-1 with high probability conditions. The new lead agency implemented strategies with hospital referral sources to correct this reduction of referrals.

LITPs were required to develop improvement plans in their local applications if the previous year data for the 0-1 child find indicator was below the State target. All LITPs were required to include Public Awareness Plans in their local applications, which included trend and referral source data, and data disaggregated by race/ethnicity groups. Strategies to improve participation of any underserved groups were also included. MSDE staff reviewed these plans and provided technical assistance as necessary. LITPs were required to report child find data in their semiannual and final program reports, which included explanations of increases or decreases in percentages served.

MSDE reviewed research on the demographic factors that included child identification in the early intervention system and the recommended practices for states to improve child find outcomes and revise State targets.

Interagency Child Find Activities:

MSDE and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH) continued to implement mechanisms to exchange data from the Part C and Universal Newborn Hearing Screening databases to ensure that infants diagnosed with hearing loss are referred to LITPs.

MSDE ensured that LITPs and local Departments of Social Services continued to jointly implement local policies and procedures to ensure that infants and toddlers who are victims of child abuse and neglect or drug involvement are screened and, when appropriate, referred to LITPs.

MSDE and the SICC developed a first draft of the "Physician's Guide to Early Intervention". Also, the SICC, at the request of DHMH, considered new research on the link between low levels of lead exposure and development and discussed lowering the lead level for eligibility under the high probability condition criteria.

MSDE collaborated with the Maryland Academy of Pediatrics and DHMH to plan the implementation of the new American Academy of Pediatrics guidelines for developmental screening as part of primary care. Several LITP directors also participated in this collaboration to improve the referral process to LITPs, and the ongoing communication with pediatric primary care physicians.

MSDE and DHMH collaborated on an Autism Screening Pilot Project to improve early identification of autism by pediatricians and appropriate referrals to early intervention.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage:

The percentage of children birth to one year olds served increased from 1.24 in FFY 05 to 1.34% in FFY 2006. Fifteen of the 24 LITPs demonstrated increases in the percentage of birth to one year olds served. Efforts were made throughout the state to increase public awareness of the program, especially with primary health care providers, in an attempt to increase the number of referrals from both parents and providers.

In fact, the number of referrals of birth to one year olds increased from 3,847 in FFY 2005 to 3,946 in FFY 2006. In addition, LITPs were able to track the age of children at referral by referral source on a regular basis. The resulting report provided LITPs with information regarding the specifics of referrals, not previously available. For example, LITPs can now determine if a given referral source is only providing referrals for children of certain ages and, when this occurs, are able to focus efforts to stress the importance of development from birth to one year of age.

Despite these strategies, the State did not meet its FFY 06 target for this indicator. One factor may be the basis on which the State targets were set in the SPP. Prior to the submission of the FFY 05 APR, MSDE used the number of live-births in the state to determine the percentage of children served, rather than the current OSEP requirement to use the U.S. Census residence figures.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

New/Revised Improvement Activities

In FFY 2007 - FFY 2010, LITPs will be required to develop improvement plans as part of the local application if they do not meet the State target for the percentage of the birth-one population served and to report on the status of the Improvement Plan in semiannual and final program reports.

In FFY 2007 – FFY 2010, MSDE will disseminate the **revised** “Physician’s Guide to Early Intervention” to primary care and other providers and other stakeholders.

In FFY 2005 – FFY 2010, MSDE and the SICCC will **review and analyze** research on the demographic factors that influence child identification in the early intervention system and the recommended practices for states to improve child find outcomes and revise State targets based on research.

Beginning in FFY 06, MSDE will collaborate with the State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene on initiatives, such as the ABCD Screening Academy and Autism Screening Pilot Project, to standardize developmental screening by pediatric primary health care providers and improve communication, referral, and feedback between physicians, families and LITPs.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Part C database, verified by LITPs, validated by MSDE, and will be reviewed by the SICC.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	The percent of infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be equal to or greater than 2.88% of the infants and toddlers of the same age in the general population.

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: 3.03%

Based on data provided by OSEP on www.ideadata.org, Maryland met its target of 2.88% of its 2006 resident birth to three population in the reporting period.

- A. Of the 23 States and 1 territory classified by OSEP as having a broad eligibility definition in 2006, Maryland ranks 9th. When the number of at-risk infants and toddlers are excluded, Maryland ranks 8th.
- B. Compared to the national data, Maryland served .60% more children birth to three than the national baseline and ranked 15th among the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and reporting territories. When the number of at-risk infants and toddlers at are excluded, Maryland ranks 14th.

Birth-Three Population Served	2006 Resident Population	Percent Served
6,717 (10/27/06)	221,978	3.03%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:**State monitoring and technical assistance activities:**

MSDE continued to monitor the local implementation of child find requirements through the data system and technical assistance was provided to LITPs as needed. LITPs were required to develop improvement plans in their local applications if the previous year data for the 0-1 child find indicator was below the State target. All LITPs were required to include Public Awareness Plans in their local applications, which included trend and referral source data, and data disaggregated by race/ethnicity groups. Strategies to improve participation of any underserved groups were also included. MSDE staff reviewed these plans and provided technical assistance as necessary. LITPs were required to report child find data in their semiannual and final program reports, which included explanations of increases or decreases in percentages served.

MSDE reviewed research on the demographic factors that included child identification in the early intervention system and the recommended practices for states to improve child find outcomes and revise State targets.

Interagency Child Find Activities:

MSDE and DHMH continued to implement mechanisms to exchange data from the Part C and Universal Newborn Hearing Screening databases to ensure that infants diagnosed with hearing loss are referred to LITPs.

MSDE ensured that LITPs and local Departments of Social Services continued to jointly implement local policies and procedures to ensure that infants and toddlers who are victims of child abuse and neglect or drug involvement are screened and, when appropriate, referred to LITPs.

MSDE and the SICC developed a first draft of the "Physician's Guide to Early Intervention". Also, the SICC, at the request of DHMH, considered new research on the link between low levels of lead exposure and development and discussed lowering the lead level for eligibility under the high probability condition criteria.

MSDE collaborated with the Maryland Academy of Pediatrics and DHMH to plan the implementation of the new American Academy of Pediatrics guidelines for developmental screening as part of primary care. Several LITP directors also participated in this collaboration to improve the referral process to LITPs, and the ongoing communication with pediatric primary care physicians.

MSDE and DHMH collaborated on an Autism Screening Pilot Project to improve early identification of autism by pediatricians and appropriate referrals to early intervention.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage:

In FFY 06, MSDE/MITP served 3.03% of children birth-three living in the State, which exceeds the target of 2.88%. Over half of Maryland's 24 LITPs demonstrated an increase in the percentage of the birth-three population served. This increase in percentage served is attributed to State/local targeted public awareness activities, including collaboration with local child care providers, physicians, hospitals, audiologists, and local departments of social services. Another contributing factor is increased knowledge of many parents, as a result of the popular media of the importance of the early childhood years in preparing a child for school. The result of increased public awareness was seen in the number of birth-three referrals made statewide to LITPs. Specifically, the State received 492 more referrals in FFY 2006 compared to FFY 2005 (a 4.4% increase).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

New/Revised Improvement Activities

In FFY 2007 - FFY 2010, LITPs will be required to develop improvement plans as part of the local application if they do not meet the State target for the percentage of the birth-there population served and to report on the status of the Improvement Plan in semiannual and final program reports.

In FFY 2007-FFY 2010, MSDE will disseminate the **revised** "Physician's Guide to Early Intervention" to primary care and other providers and other stakeholders.

In FFY 2005 – 2010, MSDE and the SICC will **review and analyze** research on the demographic factors that influence child identification in the early intervention system and the recommended practices for states to improve child find outcomes and revise State targets based on research.

Beginning in FFY 06, MSDE will collaborate with the State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene on initiatives, such as the ABCD Screening Academy and Autism Screening Pilot Project, to standardize developmental screening by pediatric primary health care providers and improve communication, referral, and feedback between physicians, families and LITPs.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Part C database, verified by LITPs, validated by MSDE, and reviewed by the SICC.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and 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)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	Evaluation and assessment and the initial IFSP meeting are conducted within 45 days of the referral for 100% of eligible children.

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: 93%

To report the target data for this indicator, 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 is validated by State and LITP staff.

Referral Range	Number/Percent within 45 days	Number/Percent delayed due to family-related reasons	Total Number/Percent in compliance with timeline
7/1/06-12/31/06 n=2,991	2,385 80%	356 12%	2,741 92%
1/1/07-6/30/07 n=3,287	2,583 79%	461 14%	3,044 93%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:**State monitoring and technical assistance:**

MSDE continued to monitor the implementation of the 45-day timeline requirement by LITPs through the data system. Data profiles were provided by MSDE to all 24 LITPs semiannually. Based on data results, LITPs were required to correct noncompliance through corrective action or improvement plans when substantial compliance was achieved. All LITPs were required to report progress or slippage in the semiannual and final program reports.

MSDE required all LITPs to track and monitor their compliance with the 45-day timeline and to implement improvement strategies, as necessary. MSDE and LITPs continued to analyze data on missed initial IFSP timelines to distinguish family-related reasons from program, individual child, or systemic reasons.

Technical assistance on achieving compliance in this indicator and related IFSP decision making issues was provided to LITPs using several different methods, including phone conversations, site-visits, and service coordination resource group meetings. This technical assistance was often specific to the jurisdiction requiring guidance. An example of the technical assistance provided was when LITPs were not using all available information in the evaluation and assessment and IFSP process. In particular, several LITPs were not using pediatrician or hospital discharge summary reports as a secondary evaluator. Instead, LITPs delayed evaluation and assessment until a second evaluator became available. The TA provided resulted in the consistent use of all available information when evaluation and assessment was completed

Data collection, reporting and analysis:

MSDE identified the need to revise the current 45-day timeline report so that the State and LITPs can determine the status of cases when the initial IFSP meeting is not held within the 45-day timeline, but has not exceeded 60 days. With this report LITPs to MSDE is in the process of developing a monitoring report for LITPs to target those cases where the initial meeting has not been held from 45 days to 60 days after the referral.

Addressing system capacity issues:

MSDE provided technical assistance to LITPs which helped them to analyze service delivery models as a possible systemic barrier to meeting timelines. This was helpful when local resources were limited or LITPs were having difficulty filling vacant speech language pathology, teacher, physical therapy and occupational therapy positions.

Staffing shortages, and federal and State funding which does not keep pace with the increasing number of infants and toddlers identified as being in need of early intervention services, have a direct effect on the capacity of LITPs to achieve full compliance and meet State targets. For FFY 2006, MSDE requested an additional \$6.7 million in State funding for LITPs in its Department budget. In fact, the State budget for the MITP was increased in the Governor's budget by only \$600,000, despite advocacy efforts by stakeholders at every level.

Without increases in federal and State funding, LITPs continue to seek additional local funds and to piece together budgets which in many cases, do not adequately support the staffing capacity needed to serve eligible children and families. In FFY 2007, neither federal nor State funding for the program was increased, and it appears likely that funding will not increase in FFY 2008. This is expected to have a negative effect on the performance at the State and local levels in the future despite the local commitment to using limited resources effectively to serve eligible children and families

Explanation of Progress or Slippage:

Slight progress was noted from FFY 2005 (92%) to FFY 2006 (93%) in the percentage of eligible infants and toddlers for whom an evaluation, assessment, and initial IFSP were completed within 45

days of the referral. Fifteen of 24 LITPs either made progress or maintained their current level of compliance with this indicator.

Several major reasons for untimely meetings were noted. In particular, 33% of untimely meetings were due to staffing issues (staff shortages, staff illnesses, etc), 21% were due to scheduling issues or errors, and 18% were due to weather-related issues. Problems with surrogacy (6%) was also noted as a significant reason for not meeting timelines and about 12% of the delays either had no reason listed or were described as “system” issues. One LITP had difficulty meeting timelines because they were in the process of changing their lead agency during the reporting period.

Progress on this indicator was accomplished through several means, including utilization of a predefined report to monitor 45-day timelines. In addition, generating a dynamic report from the database allowed LITPs to link the number of days that an IFSP meeting is late to the reason for the lateness. Both database reports allowed LITPs to more closely monitor compliance for the 45-day timeline.

Noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. See Indicator #9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

New /Revised Improvement Activities:

In FFY 2007-FFY2010, MSDE will require Corrective Action Plans (CAP) as part of enforcement actions when an LITP does not attain substantial compliance. A LITP that does not meet the State target of 100% but has attained substantial compliance will be required to implement an improvement plan.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Part C database, verified by LITPs, validated by MSDE, and reviewed by the SICC.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children exiting Part C receive timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. IFSPs with transition steps and services; B. Notification to LEA; and C. Transition planning meetings within timelines

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: To report the target data for this indicator 8B and 8C, MSDE generated State and local reports throughout the reporting period from the statewide Part C database, and validated data in conjunction with LITPs. Data reported for Indicator 8A is based on a review of 729 Early Intervention Records, which is approximately 42.4% of all children who transitioned at age 3 between 1/1/07 and 6/30/07 (n=1,720). This sample size represents a 2.8% margin of error with a 95% confidence level. Data was collected from all 24 jurisdictions.

State

The reports for 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. The number/percent of meetings held within the timelines and the reasons why meetings are not held within timelines are provided. When the date of an untimely transition planning meeting (date later than 90 days before the child's third birthday) is entered into the database, a prompt appears requesting that the reason for the late meeting be entered.

- A.** During the reporting period, 722, or **99.0%**, of the records reviewed by MSDE and LITPs had transition steps and services (n= 729).
- B.** Between 7/1/06 and 6/30/07 local school systems were notified of **99.7%** (3,438) of children who transitioned during the time period (n=3,446).
- C.** Between 7/1/06 and 6/30/07, **94.7%** of children who transitioned had a transition planning meeting within the timelines or there was a documented family-related reason for the delay.

A.

Transition Date Range	Number/Percent of Children Reviewed	Number/Percent with Transition Outcomes
1/1/07 – 6/30/07 n=1,720	729 42.4%	722 99.0%

B.

Transition Date Range	Number of Children Turning 3	Number of Children with LEA Notification	Percentage of Children with LEA Notification
7/1/06-6/30/07	3,446	3,438	99.7%

C.

Transition Date Range	Number/Percent Within Timelines	Number/Percent Delayed Due to Family-Related Reasons	Total Number/Percent in Compliance with Timelines
7/1/06 – 6/30/07 n=3,253	2,739 84.1%	342 10.5%	3,081 94.7%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:**State monitoring and technical assistance activities:**

MSDE continued to monitor the transition planning requirement through the data system. Data profiles were provided by MSDE to all 24 LITPs semiannually. Based on data results, LITPs were required to correct noncompliance for this indicator when substantial compliance was not achieved. All LITPs were required to report progress or slippage in the semiannual and final program reports.

MSDE required all LITPs to track and monitor their compliance with the transition requirements and to implement improvement strategies, as necessary. MSDE and LITPs continued to analyze data on missed transition timelines to distinguish family-related reasons from program, individual child, or systemic reasons. Reasons for untimely meetings were reviewed to make sure that there was not a systemic cause for untimely meetings.

During the reporting period, planning for regional IFSP training on transition outcomes was initiated. This training, provided in November 2007, included development of child and family-oriented transition outcomes. In FFY 2006 MSDE updated the MSDE web-based Early Childhood Gateway tutorial on transition.

Technical assistance was provided to LITPs to assist in analyzing transition models to determine possible systemic issues or child specific issues making transition compliance difficult. An example is unnecessary testing being done by Part B staff to determine Part B eligibility when Part C provides updated information to the Part B program.

Data collection, reporting, and analysis:

MSDE and LITPs conducted record reviews to determine the percentage children exiting Part C with transition steps and services.

Transition compliance data was tracked by 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 were tracked in the database. Children referred after 31.5 months of age were not included in the denominator for 8C because the timeline for eligibility determination and IFSP development would occur beyond the 90 day period before the children's third birthday.

Collaboration with Part B was initiated to create a unique identifier that would allow for more accurate tracking of children transferring from Part C to Part B or other community programs. This is intended to ensure the data are accurate and reliable across systems and is also part of a longitudinal study being planned for the birth through 21 population.

Addressing system capacity issues:

Staffing shortages, and federal and State funding which does not keep pace with the increasing number of infants and toddlers identified as being in need of early intervention services, have a direct effect on the capacity of LITPs to achieve full compliance and meet State targets. For FFY 2006, MSDE requested an additional \$6.7 million in State funding for LITPs in its Department budget. In fact, the State budget for the MITP was increased in the Governor's budget by only \$600,000, despite advocacy efforts by stakeholders at every level.

Without increases in federal and State funding, LITPs continue to seek additional local funds and to piece together budgets which in many cases, do not adequately support the staffing capacity needed to serve eligible children and families. In FFY 2007, neither federal nor State funding for the program was increased, and it appears likely that funding will not increase in FFY 2008. This is expected to have a negative effect on the performance at the State and local levels in the future despite the local commitment to using limited resources effectively to serve eligible children and families.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage:

State data indicates substantial compliance in Subindicators 8A, 8B, and 8C. Progress in the area of transition was assisted by changes within the database that allowed for better transition monitoring, including reports that provide reasons why transition planning meetings were not held (e.g., late referrals or family request). The database also allowed for the categorization of children referred after 31.5 months of age. Another factor contributing to the progress was the closer collaboration of the LITPs and the Part B local early childhood special education programs. Local jurisdictions have refined the process of transitioning children from Part C to Part B or other community programs. This was accomplished by local training, in part utilizing the web-based Early Childhood Gateway transition tutorial.

Noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for indicators 8A, 8B and 8C were corrected in a timely manner. See Indicator #9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:**New/Revised Improvement Activities**

In FFY 2007-FFY2010, MSDE will require Corrective Action Plans (CAP) as part of enforcement actions when an LITP does not attain substantial compliance. A LITP that does not meet the State target of 100%, but has attained substantial compliance, will be required to implement an improvement plan.

In FFY 2007-FFY 2010, MSDE will implement Regional IFSP trainings with a particular focus on the creation of child and family focused IFSP outcomes, including transition outcomes.

In FFY 2007-FFY 2010, MSDE will implement a unique identifier so that children can be more easily followed when transitioning from Part C to Part B or other community resources.

In FFY 2007-FFY 2010, MSDE will monitor local Infants and Toddlers Programs and local school systems jointly to ensure that compliance with Part C requirements for timely transition planning and Part B requirements for timely IEP development result in smooth transition from Part C to Part B preschool special education.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 06

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Part C database, onsite visits, record reviews, and complaint investigations. Data was verified by LITPs, validated by MSDE, and reviewed by the SICC.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement: Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	Maryland's general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) will identify and correct 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: 100% of FFY 05 Findings Were Corrected in FFY 06

MSDE identified October 2006 - October 2007 as the time frame for identification and correction of noncompliance. MSDE issued local data profiles to LITPs in October 2006, which served as notice of identification of noncompliance. MSDE required LITPs notified of noncompliance to implement improvement or corrective action plans to correct the noncompliance no later than September 30, 2007, and to submit periodic reports, including analysis of data and impact of corrective actions on progress toward compliance. Through the online Part C database, MSDE tracked the progress of LITPs with corrective action plans and was able to document the correction of noncompliance by looking at data throughout the time frame, rather than just at the end of the designated period.

FFY 05 findings of noncompliance corrected in FFY 06 include findings identified through State-level monitoring and complaint investigation. The total number of findings reported includes one finding that was reported as uncorrected in the FFY 05 APR, as well as those identified during that reporting period. The number of corrected findings reported includes two findings that were corrected beyond the reporting period, but within the twelve-month period following identification.

Percent of Noncompliance Corrected within One Year of Identification

Total # of Findings of Noncompliance	Total # of Findings Corrected*	% of Findings Corrected
44	44	100%

Findings and Corrections by Monitoring Priorities/Other Requirements

Priority indicator/Other Areas	# of Findings	# of Corrections	% Corrected
Indicator #1 - Timely Service Delivery	7	7	100%
Indicator #2 – Natural Environments (No justification for services not provided in NE)	2	2	100%
Indicator #7 - 45-day Timeline*	7	7	100%
Indicator #8a- Transition Steps/Services	3	3	100%
Indicator #8b - Notification to the LEA	3	3	100%
Indicator #8c - Timely Transition Planning Meetings	12	12	100%
Continuous Service Delivery	7	7	100%
Consideration of Evaluation and Assessment Results in IFSP Review	1	1	100%
Annual IFSP Evaluation	1	1	100%
Written Prior Notice	1	1	100%

*Two of seven findings of noncompliance for the 45-day Timeline were corrected outside the reporting period, but within one year of identification.

Summary of Correction of Findings:

Indicator #1 - Timely Service Delivery

Since database reports were not yet available to LITPS to track timely service delivery, identification and correction of non-compliance was documented by comparing the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 reports generated by MSDE's database developer, which were then verified by LITPs, and validated by MSDE.

Five of the 7 findings were identified through the State data system; 2 of the findings were identified through State-level complaint investigations. All findings were corrected by 6/30/07.

Indicator #2 – Provision of Services in Natural Environments

In FFY 2005, there were two findings identified through State-level complaint investigations related to the absence of a justification on the IFSP when an early intervention service was not provided in a natural environment. Both findings were corrected by 6/30/07.

Indicator #7 – 45-Day Timeline

Of the 7 findings of noncompliance for Indicator #7 in FFY 2005:

- 1 was corrected by 9/30/06
- 2 were corrected by 4/30/07
- 1 was corrected by 5/31/07
- 1 was corrected by 6/30/07
- 1 was corrected by 7/31/07
- 1 was corrected by 9/30/07

Indicator #8a – Transition Steps and Services

Of the 3 findings of noncompliance for Indicator #8a in FFY 2005:

- 3 were corrected by 6/30/07

Indicator #8b – Notification to the LEA

Of the 3 findings of noncompliance for Indicator #8b in FFY 2005:

- 2 were corrected by 7/31/06
- 1 was corrected by 9/30/06

Indicator #8c – Timely Transition Planning Meetings

Of the 12 findings of noncompliance for Indicator #8c in FFY 2005:

- 2 were corrected by 7/31/06
- 1 was corrected by 8/31/06
- 1 was corrected by 9/30/06
- 6 were corrected by 12/31/06
- 2 were corrected by 6/30/07

Other Areas of Noncompliance: Continuous Service Delivery, IFSP Review, Annual IFSP Evaluation, and Written Prior Notice

In FFY 2005, 10 findings were identified in areas other than the monitoring indicators. All 10 were corrected by 6/30/07.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:**State Monitoring and TA**

During the reporting period, MSDE monitored all 24 LITPs through data extracted from the statewide Part C database for the federal/State priority indicators, verified the accuracy and completeness of the data collaboratively with LITPs, and issued State/local data profiles displaying trend data, current percentages of performance/compliance for each indicator, and number of State-level complaints received. Through the local data profiles, MSDE notified LITPs of the level of State monitoring for the monitoring time period and the requirement for corrective action plans for each priority indicator in which LITPs were not in substantial compliance and were not showing significant improvement.

Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) were integrated into local improvement plans that are required for all LITPs as part of the local grant award for federal and State funding. LITPs with CAPs were required to submit an initial quarterly report analyzing progress and updating improvement strategies as needed. If the quarterly report did not document correction, LITPs were required to submit monthly reports until correction was documented. In addition, all LITPs were required to report on their performance in the compliance and performance indicators in semi-annual and final program reports for each reporting period.

MSDE reviewed the local CAP reports submitted by LITPs and ran independent data reports to verify local data on the percentage of compliance for the periods following the implementation of the CAPs. Timely data entry and reporting are critical factors when using an online database to identify and correct noncompliance. If timely data entry was identified as an issue for an LITP with a CAP, MSDE notified the LITP that available data was not sufficient to track progress and LITPs implemented strategies to improve the timeliness of data entry. When MSDE verified that the LITP with a CAP reached substantial compliance, MSDE notified the LITP in writing that the CAP was closed.

For findings of non-compliance identified through State-level complaint investigations, MSDE required LITPs to implement child-specific and systemic corrective action plans, and to integrate the corrective and improvement activities related to the complaint into existing local improvement plans and CAPs, when appropriate.

MSDE provided technical assistance through statewide meetings, individual on-site meetings, and phone consultation on request or when indicated through review of current data or other sources of information.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

In FFY 2006, the percentage of correction increased to 100%, primarily because of State and local efforts focusing on data tracking, analysis, targeted improvement activities, and CAPs. LITPs used local indicator data to identify the reasons for noncompliance, implemented activities related to the reasons, tracked the data regularly to determine progress, and reported the results to MSDE in required corrective action and improvement plan reports.

In FFY 2006, MSDE filled one vacant State-level position to assist with monitoring/TA responsibilities and filled a second position for Lead Monitoring Specialist in the Fall of 2007. The additional positions will increase MSDE's capacity to work more closely with LITPs to validate and track data, and provide technical assistance as needed.

As they focus on correcting noncompliance and assuring high-quality services for children and families, LITPs are increasingly concerned about sustaining the current level of effectiveness without increased federal Part C and targeted State funding support.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

New/Revised Improvement Activities:

In FFY 2007, MSDE will review and revise its cycle of identification to ensure that data obtained through an online database is used effectively in identification of noncompliance and in documenting progress and correction.

In FFY 2007-FFY 2010MSDE will identify and provide multiple sources of direct technical assistance to local staff, such as LITPs with successful practices, individual consultants with expertise in targeted areas, and national TA Centers to assist LITPs to maintain or achieve compliance and meet State targets. Opportunities for technical assistance will include regional and on-site meetings, conference calls, and online discussions planned through an Electronic Learning Community, which is a component of MSDE's Early Childhood Gateway (mdecgateway.org), developed and supported in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE).

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was collected through the Complaint Investigations Branch database, and verified by Part C staff.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of all complaint investigations are completed within the required timelines

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: 100%

Number of Complaints Received	Number of Complaints Investigated within Timelines	% of Complaints Investigated within Timelines
1	1	100%

One signed written Part C complaint was received during the reporting period, 7/1/06-6/30/07, and was investigated with a report issued within 60 days. No complaints were dismissed or withdrawn. No complaints are pending.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:

As described in the Part C SPP, the Complaint Investigation Branch within MSDE’s Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services has the responsibility for investigating Part C complaints with the consultation and assistance of State Part C staff. Systemic findings of noncompliance identified through complaint investigations are incorporated into the Part C monitoring process. Complaint findings are taken into consideration when decisions are made about the level of monitoring and degree of State technical assistance and intervention for individual LITPs.

MSDE has met its compliance target of 100% for FFY 2006 and will continue its collaborative approach to ensure that complaint investigations are thorough and timely.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was provided by the Office of Administrative Hearings, and verified by Part C staff.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the timeline.

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: No fully adjudicated due process requests

No requests for due process hearings were received in FFY 2006

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:

MSDE will continue to work with the Office of Administrative Hearings to ensure that Part C policies, procedures, and timelines are followed when parents file a request for due process under Part C of IDEA.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Data for this indicator was provided by the Office of Administrative Hearings and verified by Part C staff.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	No target required because fewer than 10 mediation sessions were requested.

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: No mediation sessions were held.

During the reporting period, no requests for mediation were submitted.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 06:

No improvement activities required because fewer than 10 mediation sessions were requested.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07:

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of State reported data (618, SPP, and APR) is timely and accurate.

Actual Target Data for FFY 06: 100%

To calculate the percentage of State-reported data that is timely and accurate for FFY06, MSDE used the rubric recommended by OSEP for Indicator 14, which combines the timeliness of 618 and APR submission with the accuracy of data reported in the SPP/APR. The completed rubric has been inserted on the following page. With electronic edits built into the Part C database and systematic procedures for data verification and validation, MSDE has met its target for this indicator.

- a. For the reporting period, all Part C 618 data tables and the Part C SPP were submitted on the due dates.
- b. All State-reported data is accurate, including data reported through 618 tables, the State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Report.

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 14					
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Followed Instructions	Total	
1	1	1	1	3	
2	1	1	1	3	
3	1	1	1	3	
4	1	1	1	3	
5	1	1	1	3	
6	1	1	1	3	
7	1	1	1	3	
8a	1	1	1	3	
8b	1	1	1	3	
8c	1	1	1	3	
9	1	1	1	3	
10	1	1	1	3	
11	1	1	1	3	
12	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	
13	1	1	1	3	
			Subtotal	42	
APR Score Calculation		Timely Submission Points - If the FFY2006 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5	
		Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		47	
618 Data - Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Program Settings Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4

					State
Table 3 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
				Subtotal	16
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 3) =		48
Indicator #14 Calculation					
A. APR Grand Total			47		
B. 618 Grand Total			48		
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =			95		
Total NA or N/A in APR			3		
Total NA or N/A in 618			0		
Base			95		
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =			1.000		
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =			100.0		
*Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 3 for 618					

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 05:

618 Data Accuracy

Part C 618 data for Tables 1, 2, and 3 is collected through the statewide web-based Part C data system. LITPs enter data into individual child records in the database from referral and intake forms and the statewide IFSP document. Predefined reports with child-level and summary data for each of the 618 tables have been programmed into the database.

During FFY 06, the following procedures were in place to ensure the accuracy of 618 data collection and reporting:

- MSDE provides an online data dictionary with definitions of data fields. The Data Specialist provides regular updates to LITP Program and Data managers when new data fields and reports are added to the database.
- MSDE and LITPs generate individual child and aggregate data reports throughout the reporting period to track changes and verify data accuracy. Electronic data edits have been programmed into the database to prohibit the entry of out-of-range data or inconsistent cross-field relationships.
- Prior to data collection for the annual 618 data reports, MSDE’s Data Specialist requests that all LITPs run local audit reports developed to identify inconsistent or incomplete data, correct data errors, and enter missing data.
- Following the local auditing and verification, MSDE runs statewide audit reports and notifies LITPs of inconsistent or missing data and provides a final timeline for the data entry and correction before generating the final 618 data tables.

State

- Prior to the submission of the 618 data tables, the Part C Program Manager and Data Specialist compare the current State and local data with the previous year's submission, identify significant increases or decreases, and contact the LITP Program and Data Managers for clarification, when necessary. This information is used to respond accurately to data that WESTAT flags for explanation after the data tables are submitted to OSEP.
- Year-to-year comparisons of 618 data are provided to LITPs and are used as part of State monitoring for relevant indicators.
- Data for 618 Table 4 is collected and reported through a Part C/Part B database which tracks compliance and corrective action data on all State-level complaint investigations and findings.

SPP/APR Data Accuracy

MSDE developed the web-based Part C data system to allow for comprehensive monitoring of State and local data in federal/State monitoring priorities as a major component of its Part C general supervision system. Through its online data system, MSDE and LITPs monitored data accuracy and performance against the priority indicators on a regular basis, and adjusted strategies for improvement and correction based on current data analysis. During FFY 06, MSDE modified the database by adding new fields and reports to increase State and local capacity to verify and validate data reported in the SPP/APR. MSDE generated and disseminated semi annual data profiles, which include trend and current data on federal/State compliance indicators.

In addition to the procedures described above, MSDE ensured the accuracy of the SPP/APR data through the following:

- MSDE provided the OSEP measurement criteria for all monitoring indicators to the database developer to ensure that child-level and summary reports provide accurate data for federal, State, and local reporting.
- MSDE generated reports from the Part C database to report actual target data for Indicators 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Throughout the reporting period, MSDE and LITPs generated child-level and summary data and analyzed the data for inconsistencies and trends. Prior to the submission of SPP and APR data, MSDE generated child-level data reports for the compliance indicators and requested that LITPs validate the accuracy of data through review of the database and paper early intervention records. MSDE integrated data collected from onsite monitoring and complaint investigations to further validate the electronic results. Based on the results of State and local validation, MSDE modified the electronic data reports to accurately and reliably report SPP/APR data.
- For indicator #1, MSDE added fields to the Part C database to collect reasons for delay in the projected service initiation date, actual service initiation date, and the reasons for delay in the actual service initiation date. The following reports were developed for state and local use in future reporting periods:
 - Summary by Projected Service Initiation Date,
 - Child Level by Projected Service Initiation Date,
 - Summary with Late Reason by Projected Service Initiation Date,
 - Summary by Actual Service Initiation Date,
 - Child Level by Actual Service Initiation Date, and
 - Summary with Late Reason by Actual Service Initiation Date.
- For indicator #3, MSDE developed formulas for each of the OSEP progress categories, using assessment data entered into the Part C database after each child enters and exits the local early intervention system. The formulas were tested multiple times using individual child data and were refined as needed to ensure that children met the criteria in each OSEP progress category.

State

- To report baseline data for Indicator #4, MSDE selected the NCSEAM Early Intervention Family Survey, which has been calibrated using a valid and reliable measurement scale and has been piloted with documented results that are accurate and consistent across States. To aggregate and analyze baseline data for Indicator #4, MSDE contracted with a vendor that was involved in the development and piloting of the NCSEAM Family survey, and worked closely with the vendor to understand and analyze the results and to plan targeted improvement activities.
- For Subindicator 8A, MSDE and LITPs confirmed the presence of transition outcomes in early intervention records of 42.4% of the children who turned 3 years of age during the reporting period.
- For Subindicator 8C, MSDE added fields to the Part C database to collect the reasons if transition planning meetings were held after 33 months of age. The reasons include (1) child referred at 31.5 months of age or later; (2) family request (family chose to reschedule or delay the meeting); and (3) other with text box to explain the reason. Also, a data field was modified to identify the reasons if a transition planning meeting was not held prior to a child's third birthday. The reasons include (1) child referred at 34.5 months of age or later, (2) family declined to participate in the transition planning meeting, and (3) other with the text box to explain the reason. The predefined transition summary report was modified to include the changes mentioned above.
- To report data on Indicators 10, MSDE maintains a database which tracks compliance and corrective action data on all State-level complaint investigations and findings. Data for indicators 11 and 13 comes directly from the Office of Administrative Hearings, which conducts Part C mediation and due process hearings. All data from these sources is verified before it is reported in the SPP or APR.
- MSDE provides ongoing technical assistance and clarification through statewide meetings, onsite visits, and phone consultations on all aspects of data entry and reporting, especially those related to the federal/State monitoring priorities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 07: