

MD Part C

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary:

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

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

Overview

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) has the responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to have a comprehensive system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the IDEA, State laws, and applicable federal and State regulations. The mission of the DSE/EIS is to provide leadership, support, and accountability for results to Local School Systems (LSSs), 24 Local Infants and Toddlers Programs (LITPs), Public Agencies (PAs), and stakeholders through the provision of a seamless, comprehensive system of coordinated services to infants, toddlers, young children, and youth with disabilities, birth through age 21, and their families. The MSDE continues to implement the Extended IFSP Option that allows families to choose the continuation of early intervention services after the child turns three until the beginning of the school year following the child's fourth birthday if the child is determined eligible for Part B special education services.

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

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

- **Transparency:** We maintain an open door to stakeholders and regularly communicate through formal and informal outreach. This includes birth-21 special education and early intervention leadership updates, Professional Learning Institutes, State and local co-led Steering Committees, meetings of the Assistant State Superintendent's Advisory Council, and regularly scheduled convening of advisory groups including Institutions of Higher Education, State Interagency Coordinating Council, Special Education State Advisory Committee, Educational Advocacy Coalition, Early Childhood Advisory Council, and the Autism Waiver Advisory Council.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** We engage our stakeholders in timely and meaningful consultation on significant topics, including policies that affect children with disabilities. Our stakeholders include our governor, local school system and public agency personnel, parents, students, and advocates. We seek input through participatory processes, including regional listening forums that promote innovation, the sharing of best practices, and dissemination of evidence-based strategies. We are committed to strengthening partnerships and planning with other MSDE divisions, other public agencies, and stakeholders.
- **Effectiveness:** We serve stakeholders in a timely and effectively manner and ensure the availability of the best "real-time" data for decision making and dissemination of evidence-based models throughout the State.
- **Alignment:** The work of the DSE/EIS requires that we arrange our priorities to be synchronous with those of MSDE and federal requirements while also including the concerns of our local school systems, public agencies, and advocates. We must align our work to be most effective and efficient while keeping a focus on important student outcomes.
- **Accountability:** We strive to improve compliance and performance results for all local school systems and public agencies. The DSE/EIS has developed a tiered system of general supervision and performance support to identify systems and agencies in need of differentiated support and technical assistance.

Differentiated Framework

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

- Effective policies and procedures;
- State Performance Plan (SPP) goals and targets;
- Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR);
- Fiscal management;
- Dispute resolution; and
- Targeted technical assistance and support.

The DSE/EIS has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for performance support and technical assistance to provide a tiered system of monitoring and supports to address the needs of each LITP. The *Differentiated Framework* illustrates the shared responsibility and shared accountability to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. The Division is committed to maintaining compliance and providing supports to improve the quality of special education services. An LITP is assigned to a tier based upon performance on federal compliance and results indicators, correction of noncompliance, analysis of data, fiscal management, and monitoring findings. The corresponding support an LITP can expect to receive is differentiated and based on that agency's assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of the public agency's needs. **Please see Attachment B for a graphic representation of the *Differentiated Framework*.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Continuing up the *Differentiated Framework* tiers, an LITP with a determination status of "Needs Substantial Intervention" is assigned to the **Focused**

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Tier of General Supervision. These LITPs continue to have findings of noncompliance, have active CAPs for two or more years, and demonstrate little progress despite general and targeted technical assistance.

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

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

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

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

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

Data Collection

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

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

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

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

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

IDEA Requirements

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

Effective Policies, Procedures, and Practices

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

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

Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and Results (MCIR)

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

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

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

Comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every 3 years in each LITP. The purpose of comprehensive monitoring is to ensure the LITPs:

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

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

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

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

Desk Audit

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

On-Site Monitoring

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

Case Study Reviews

The MSDE, DSE/EIS staff conducts case study reviews of an individual child’s early intervention record. This allows the reviewer to gauge/conclude whether the child is being provided with appropriate services, which is evidenced by continued growth and progress towards child and family outcomes. Case studies include observations of service delivery and interviews with families and providers (not just document reviews).

Interviews

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

Directed Onsite Visits

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

Fiscal Management

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

Dispute Resolution

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

Program Improvement and Correction

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

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

Technical Assistance and Support

Through the Division’s strategic plan, *Moving Maryland Forward: Sharpen the Focus for 2020*, the DSE/EIS focuses on building the capacity of local Infants and Toddlers Programs, local school systems, public agencies, and institutions of higher education, to narrow the performance gap and enable all children to be kindergarten ready. The Division works collaboratively with other Divisions within the MSDE to improve performance on statewide

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

accountability measures and achievement of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards. **Please refer to Attachment B, Differentiated Framework, Tiers of Engagement and Attachment C, DSE/IES Strategic Plan Moving Maryland Forward: Sharpen the Focus for 2020.**

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

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

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

The TAP-IT process begins with the formation of an implementation team comprised of LITP and DSE/EIS representatives who operate in a clearly defined partnership. The team collects all current, relevant data sources [for example: *State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Review (SPP/APR)*, *Maryland Report Card, Ready at Five - School Readiness Data, Maryland Online IFSP Database, and Family Survey Data*]. An August 2017 WestEd/NCSI Spotlight highlighted this process with a focus on mathematics in Maryland: http://marylandlearninglinks.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/17-2271_State_Knowledge_Utiliz_Spotlight_Aug2017_final.pdf. **Please refer to Attachment D for a graphic representation of TAP-IT.**

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

Analyze: The team studies the processes currently in place to analyze data at the state and LITP levels. The team reviews the available data that include formative, summative, longitudinal summary reports and early warning alert systems that may be in place. The purpose of each data source is reviewed, and the strength and limitations are identified. The team describes/defines the sources and processes to analyze data and identifies opportunities for programmatic support and/or technical assistance. The team analyzes the data using an agreed upon protocol and reports their finding.

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

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

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

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Professional Development System:

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

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

Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plans

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

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

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

- Specific data-informed decision-making based on child outcomes, family outcomes, child find practices, and/or natural environments practices;
- Evidence-based and recommended practices;
- Family and child issues currently challenging the program;
- Local, state, and national issues, trends, focuses; and/or
- Training evaluations.

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

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

Required local CSPD Plan components in FFY 2016, included:

1. A summary of the specific data on which the plan is based that supports the need for the proposed training activities. Data include the results of the local training needs assessment of public and private providers, primary referral sources, Family Support Network and Preschool Partners coordinators, parents, paraprofessionals, and service coordinators, in addition to other data analysis results;
2. The specific purpose for which the identified training is being sponsored (e.g., areas of non-compliance and performance, program improvement/results, required corrective actions, suitable qualifications, etc.);
3. A description of each training activity, including anticipated dates, training level, topic, presenters, audience, supportive resources, and planned follow-up to evaluate and support transfer of training to practice (e.g., coaching, communities of practice, etc.); and
4. Evaluation levels, instruments, methods or procedures, and the anticipated degree of training impact on the local early intervention system.

An additional requirement of each local CSPD Plan is the inclusion of local/regional training(s) and/or technical assistance on the utilization of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process for all new and experienced staff responsible for completion of the COS integrated into the IFSP process. Jurisdictions can access technical assistance from the Performance Support and Technical Assistance Branch in the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services to support local/regional planning and implementation efforts for customized COS professional development. Additionally, Maryland’s online Birth to Kindergarten COS Process Training was revised for FFY 2016 and rolled out to the four SSIP jurisdictions. All other LITPs will receive the updated training in FFY 2017.

A new professional development website has been created called the MD Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes Gateway at <http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/mdcos-gateway>. In addition to providing the rationale, training, and supports to implement the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) rating process

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

with fidelity across jurisdictions and programs, this online resource provides birth to kindergarten providers with the foundations of early intervention/preschool special education, including the Mission and Key Principles, DEC Recommended Practices, and the integration of child outcomes into the IFSP and preschool IEP process.

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

Suitable Qualifications

The MSDE/MITP has established policies relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards pursuant to COMAR 13A.13.02.08(I) and 34 CFR §303.119. There are two components to Maryland's Personnel Standards for Early Intervention Service Providers. Personnel providing early intervention services under this part to eligible children and their families in excess of 15 percent of employment hours shall meet:

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

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

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

Ongoing Professional Learning Activities and Resources

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

The MSDE targets specific universal professional learning activities to local early intervention leaders. These include the annual DSE/EIS Professional Learning Institute with an early childhood strand, quarterly face-to-face Birth through 21 Leadership professional learning, and monthly Birth through 21 Leadership teleconferences. For FFY 2016 the focus of the professional learning activities for early intervention leaders was on high-quality, functional, routines-based IFSPs with the rollout of a reflection tool and training modules. In FFY 2017, the focus will be on evidence-based teaming practices, natural and inclusive learning opportunities, and effective coaching.

As described under Maryland's Technical Assistance System, the *Tiers of Engagement* provide differentiated program support and technical assistance based on State and local needs related to implementing a high quality, seamless, evidence-based early childhood intervention system of services. A specific state birth to kindergarten liaison is designated for each LITP and may support data informed systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation of evidenced-based professional learning to enhance the quality of recommended early childhood practices including assessment, environment, family partnerships, instruction, intervention, teaming and collaboration, and transition. The differentiated engagement model focuses on building capacity to improve results and direct State resources to those LITPs that are the lowest performing, while recognizing and providing the support needed to publish and disseminate successful best practices to those LITPs which are achieving success.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

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

For the FFY 2015 reporting year, the MSDE proposed changes to its baseline for Indicator 3 Child Outcomes, resulting from a change to the state's methodology. This change also resulted in changes to targets for FFY 2016 - FFY 2018. To set these targets, the MSDE engaged in discussions about resetting the baseline and establishing new targets with stakeholders via webinar on October 6, 2016, at the November 2, 2016 Professional Learning Institute Meeting, and at the November 10, 2016 SICC meeting.

Then, to obtain stakeholder additional input about baselines and targets, the MSDE created a Stakeholder Survey and distributed it to internal and external stakeholders, including families, LITP Directors, Preschool Coordinators, Directors of Special Education, Institutes of Higher Education, service providers, state agencies, and private agencies. In the survey, results data were shared, proposed target scenarios were provided, and stakeholders were given the opportunity to suggest specific targets for each child outcomes subindicators. The responses from this survey guided baseline and target setting and the proposed baselines and targets were presented to the SICC for final feedback on January 12, 2017, as part of the State's annual draft APR and data presentation. The OSEP accepted the MSDE's proposed changes with the FFY 2015 APR submission.

No changes to baselines or targets are being proposed for FFY 2016.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Throughout FFY 2016, 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; the presentation for FFY 2016 occurred on January 11, 2018.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

As required in the IDEA of 2004, the MSDE reported to the public on its FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016) performance and will report to the public on the performance of LITPs on Part C Indicators # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 for FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017). Performance data in numbers and percentages will be reported for each LITP, along with the State target, State performance data, and a narrative description of the indicator. State performance data on Part C Indicators # 9, 10, and 11 will also be reported to the public.

In partnership with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE), MSDE has developed an accessible, state-of-the art SPP/APR website for local and State performance data. The website currently includes APRs from FFY 2005 to FFY 2015 and can be accessed at <http://www.mdideareport.org>. In addition to the complete SPP/APR, the website includes State and LITP results for all applicable indicators and tools for comparing local performance in relation to the State targets. The public may see progress and slippage through a combination of tables and graphs populated on the website. This site also includes OSEP's annual State determination and MSDE's annual local Infants and Toddlers Program determinations. The FFY 2016 APR will be included on this website shortly after the State's submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2018. Copies of the APR and SPP will be provided to LITPs, the SICC, and other stakeholders simultaneously.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

--

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		96.00%	99.00%	95.80%	96.70%	97.30%	96.70%	97.70%	96.90%	97.88%	98.28%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.37%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
		98.37%	100%	

<p>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i></p>	2,251
--	-------

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 the date of the IFSP.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

Data were collected from the full reporting period of July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017.

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 7/1/2016 and 6/30/2017, 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 2,251 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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2016, local data reports will be distributed in February, 2018.

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 wh 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.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
189	189	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

At the systemic level, fourteen (14) instances of noncompliance, less than 100% compliance, were identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator and all were corrected within 12 months or less or prior to written notification. The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through a review of updated local data and the MSDE data analyses, subsequent to the closing of the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or Improvement Plan (IP) to verify 100% compliance. Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C.1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442) consistent with timely provision of services (Prong 2). The MSDE found that all systemic incidences of noncompliance were corrected with 100% compliance achieved. This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes included by local programs in IPs or CAPs.

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

Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

For FFY 2015, there were 175 individual level incidences of noncompliance. The State reviewed the records of all 175 children whose services were not initiated within Maryland's 30-day timeline in FFY 2015 and verified through the Online IFSP Database that all of the services were eventually provided, although late, as documented on the IFSP (Prong 1).

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			89.00%	89.50%	90.00%	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.00%	92.50%
Data		89.70%	89.60%	91.20%	92.30%	94.10%	96.30%	97.10%	97.60%	97.81%	97.53%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	93.00%
Data	97.37%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	7,918	
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	8,094	

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
7,918	8,094	97.37%	93.50%	97.83%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To report on the percentage of infants and toddlers (birth to age 3) who received early intervention services primarily in natural environments, the MSDE generated a report from the statewide database, which calculated the frequency and intensity of services delivered in all settings for all eligible children with IFSPs on 10/1/16. Infants and toddlers were considered to receive service(s) primarily in the natural environment if more than half of their early intervention service hours were provided in a home or community-based setting. Out of 8,094 active eligible children, 7,918 children received services primarily in the natural environment. There were 176 children who received the majority of their services in settings other than natural environments with appropriate justifications on the IFSP. In FFY 2016, the State met its target of 93.50%.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

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)

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)? No

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2015	Target ≥						62.80%	80.60%	80.60%	81.10%	66.04%	67.04%
		Data					62.80%	80.60%	76.00%	70.10%	68.80%	66.04%	67.11%
A2	2015	Target ≥						83.60%	73.80%	73.80%	74.30%	64.90%	65.40%
		Data					83.60%	73.80%	68.80%	65.30%	65.60%	64.90%	65.91%
B1	2015	Target ≥						71.30%	85.80%	85.80%	86.30%	71.17%	72.17%
		Data					71.30%	85.80%	80.80%	74.10%	73.20%	71.17%	72.47%
B2	2015	Target ≥						57.30%	69.90%	69.90%	70.40%	61.34%	61.84%
		Data					57.30%	69.90%	64.10%	60.50%	60.90%	61.34%	62.95%
C1	2015	Target ≥						55.40%	87.00%	87.00%	87.50%	75.03%	76.03%
		Data					55.40%	87.00%	81.60%	72.90%	74.30%	75.03%	76.28%
C2	2015	Target ≥						78.40%	75.40%	75.40%	75.90%	56.16%	56.66%
		Data					78.40%	75.40%	70.90%	63.50%	59.00%	56.16%	56.69%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	61.05%
	Data	61.05%
A2	Target ≥	59.00%
	Data	59.00%
B1	Target ≥	65.11%
	Data	65.11%
B2	Target ≥	53.65%
	Data	53.65%
C1	Target ≥	71.80%
	Data	71.80%
C2	Target ≥	48.94%
	Data	48.94%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	61.55%	62.05%	62.55%
Target A2 ≥	59.50%	60.00%	60.50%
Target B1 ≥	65.61%	66.11%	66.61%
Target B2 ≥	54.15%	54.65%	55.15%
Target C1 ≥	72.30%	72.80%	73.30%
Target C2 ≥	49.44%	49.94%	50.44%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	5039.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	17.00	0.33%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1368.00	26.33%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	786.00	15.13%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1405.00	27.05%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1619.00	31.16%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	2191.00	3576.00	61.05%	61.55%	61.27%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	3024.00	5195.00	59.00%	59.50%	58.21%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	20.00	0.38%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1350.00	25.99%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1045.00	20.12%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1680.00	32.34%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1100.00	21.17%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	2725.00	4095.00	65.11%	65.61%	66.54%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	2780.00	5195.00	53.65%	54.15%	53.51%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	14.00	0.27%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1328.00	25.56%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1269.00	24.43%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2083.00	40.10%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	501.00	9.64%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	3352.00	4694.00	71.80%	72.30%	71.41%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	2584.00	5195.00	48.94%	49.44%	49.74%

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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	
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.	2410

Please note that this data about the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program is optional in this FFY16 submission. It will be required in the FFY17 submission.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? 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 is 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. The Strengths and Needs Summary captures multiple sources of information including: the child's present levels of development (gained through the evaluation/assessment process including naturalistic observation, parent interview, and team involvement), the family's concerns, priorities and resources, and the family's daily routines in natural environments. This information is utilized to summarize the child's strengths and needs in the three early childhood outcome areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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 (see <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Documents/Special-Ed/TAB/16-02-ChildOutcomeSummary.pdf>)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Table 1 and Table 2 below provide a detailed data review indicating the completeness of the FFY 2016 COS data (93.0%). Table 1 shows the total number of children exiting Maryland's Part C Birth - 3 program from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. The remaining columns indicate the number of children with COS progress at exit data, the number of children with specific reasons for no COS progress at exit data including children not in the program for 6 months, the number of children with missing COS progress at exit data, the number of children with impossible COS progress data, and finally, the percentage of children with complete COS data including specific reasons.

Table 2 goes into further detail around the five specific reasons for children not having COS progress at exit data. **The primary reason for not having COS progress at exit data is that the child was not in the program for at least 6 months.** While states are able to include those data above, other reasons beyond the state's control include: children who are in the program for at least six months but attempts to contact the family were unsuccessful, the child passed away, the family moved out of state, or the family withdrew from the program. To minimize missing data for children who leave the MITP suddenly and without an IFSP Meeting (e.g., family withdrawal), the MITP included the guidance in a Technical Assistance Bulletin to complete an exit COS if enough information is available.

Table 1: Number of Children with COS Data, with Specific Reasons for No Progress at Exit Data, with Missing COS Data, and Percentage of Children with Complete COS Data (Birth to 3)

Total number of children exiting Part C Birth - 3 from 7/1/16 - 6/30/17	Number of children with specific reasons for no COS progress at exit data	Number of children with missing COS progress at exit data	Number of children with impossible COS progress data	Percentage of children with complete COS data in FFY 2016 including specific reasons	Percentage of children with complete COS data in FFY 2016 with valid reasons removed
8774	2969*	610	0	93.0%	89.6%

Table 2: *Specific Reasons for No COS Progress at Exit Data (Birth to 3)

Length of time in program	Count 2016 - 2017	Inactive Reason
Not in 0-3 program for at least 6 months	2410	
In Birth-3 Program for at least 6 months	300	Attempts to Contact Unsuccessful
In Birth-3 Program for at least 6 months	4	Deceased

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In Birth-3 Program for at least 6 months	59	Moved out of state
--	----	--------------------

In Birth-3 Program for at least 6 months	196	Parent Withdrawal
--	-----	-------------------

Total: Specific reasons for no COS progress at exit data	2969	
--	------	--

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2006	Target ≥				74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	78.00%	79.50%	81.00%	81.00%	83.00%
		Data			76.00%	78.00%	83.00%	87.00%	93.00%	94.90%	94.92%	94.70%	95.86%
B	2006	Target ≥				72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	76.00%	77.50%	79.00%	79.00%	81.20%
		Data			74.00%	75.00%	81.00%	83.00%	93.00%	94.70%	94.79%	94.71%	95.37%
C	2006	Target ≥				82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	86.00%	87.50%	89.00%	89.00%	89.50%
		Data			81.00%	86.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	95.20%	95.15%	94.92%	95.50%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	85.00%
	Data	98.10%
B	Target ≥	83.40%
	Data	97.31%
C	Target ≥	90.00%
	Data	98.21%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%
Target B ≥	85.60%	87.80%	90.00%
Target C ≥	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed		10202.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	46.05%	4698.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		4524.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		4608.00
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		4456.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs		4559.00
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		4429.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn		4525.00

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their	98.10%	87.00%	98.18%

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
rights			
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	97.31%	85.60%	97.74%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	98.21%	90.50%	97.88%

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

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, the vendor (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 2016-17. The Survey was launched in mid-September and closed in mid-November.

As in prior years, the 2016-17 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).

The MSDE provided the external evaluation team with a data file of all active eligible children as of June 30, 2017 receiving early intervention services across 24 local Infants and Toddlers Programs (ITPs), including children and families receiving services through an Extended IFSP. 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. These directors were responsible for distributing the surveys to families. Directors also received a Frequently Asked Questions document that contained answers to common questions about the purpose of the survey.

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 was maintained for parents for the duration of the survey. Response rate reports were submitted to MSDE at three points during the survey window: October 20, November 2, and November 22, 2017. The last surveys to be included in this report arrived at ICF's office on November 17, 2017.

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.

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 10,202 surveys were distributed to families, and 4,698 completed surveys were returned – resulting in an adjusted response rate^[1] of 46.0% (same response rate as last year). Five jurisdictions achieved an adjusted response rate of at least 70%, and 18 jurisdictions (75% of all local jurisdictions) achieved a response rate of at least 40%.

Statewide, 4,291 surveys were completed in English (91.3%) and 407 surveys were completed in Spanish (8.7%). In 5 of the 24 jurisdictions, there were no surveys completed in Spanish. Paper surveys were much more common than online surveys. Overall, 4,542 paper surveys were completed (96.7% of all surveys), while 156 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.

The survey respondents reported that the majority of children in the sample that were receiving services were male (65.3%, n=2,981), while 1,586 of the respondent's children receiving services were female (34.7%). This is representative of the gender breakdown of children receiving early intervention services in the State. Respondents were asked to classify their relationship to the child receiving early intervention services (n=4,656). Overwhelmingly, mothers completed the survey (85.7%), followed by fathers (10.0%). Foster parents, grandparents and others accounted for the remaining 4.3% of respondents.

The three racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (43.3%), Black or African-American (27.9%), and Hispanic (17.7%) children. Parents of Black or African-American children were underrepresented by 2.6 percentage points (down from 4.1 points last year) and parents of Hispanic or Lation children were underestimated by 1.2 percentage points (up slightly from 1.1 points last year) in the survey when compared to the state population. In addition, parents of White children are overrepresented in the survey by 1.9 percentage points (down

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

from 4.4 points last year). The State continues to make efforts to ensure a representative sample. Much of the underrepresentation of African American families in the State's family survey data can be attributed to the relatively low response rate in Baltimore City, which negatively impacts the percentage of African Americans who complete the survey, since over 60% of the birth to 3 year old population in Baltimore City is African American. Jurisdictions, like Baltimore City, with low response rates are required to complete and submit an Improvement Plan. As response rates increase, so does the State's representativeness.

According to statewide estimates, the most common exceptionality evident in the MITP population is a developmental delay of at least 25%, with 65.2% of the population reporting this disability. The second most common exceptionality or disability statewide is a physical or mental condition with likely developmental delay (25.3% of the population). The third category of exceptionalities, atypical development or behavior, constitutes 9.5% of the population. Parents of children with a 25% delay and parents of children with atypical development were underrepresented by 4.4 percentage points and 0.6 percentage points, respectively, whereas parents of children with a diagnosed condition were overrepresented by 2.6 percentage points. Again, the State continues to make efforts to ensure a representative sample.

In general, the survey was fairly representative across all key respondent demographic variables (see Survey Representativeness Attachment). And, it should be noted that 134 surveys (2.9%) were completed online and the respondent did not put in the survey's unique identifier, limiting the State's ability to determine demographic variables for those families. It's possible that with demographic information on those families, the State's data would have been more representative.

One final look at representativeness was completed by jurisdiction. Please see the chart below for a look at which jurisdictions were overrepresented and which were underrepresented in this year's survey.

2016-17 Survey Representativeness by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Active and Eligible Children		Survey Responses		Over or Under-Representation
	n	% of Total	n	% of Total	% pts
Prince George's	1,457	13.9%	819	18.4%	+4.5
Baltimore County	1,412	13.5%	713	16.0%	+2.5
Montgomery	2,041	19.5%	944	21.2%	+1.7
Wicomico	103	1.0%	101	2.3%	+1.3
Allegany	103	1.0%	82	1.8%	+0.9
Saint Mary's	204	2.0%	122	2.7%	+0.8
Dorchester	52	0.5%	51	1.12%	+0.7
Washington	241	2.3%	122	2.7%	+0.4
Frederick	371	3.6%	177	4.0%	+0.4
Garrett	32	0.3%	32	0.7%	+0.4
Calvert	189	1.8%	98	2.2%	+0.4
Caroline	40	0.5%	32	0.7%	+0.3
Unknown*	0	0.0%	11	0.3%	+0.3
Kent	31	0.3%	21	0.5%	+0.2
Worcester	74	0.7%	33	0.7%	0.0
Queen Anne's	73	0.7%	32	0.7%	0.0
Cecil	157	1.5%	67	1.5%	0.0
Harford	448	4.3%	190	4.3%	0.0
Somerset	27	0.3%	9	0.2%	0.0
Talbot	69	0.7%	19	0.4%	-0.2
Carroll	278	2.7%	75	1.7%	-1.0
Charles	235	2.3%	55	1.2%	-1.0
Anne Arundel	1,247	11.9%	482	10.8%	-1.1
Howard	503	4.8%	129	2.9%	-1.9

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Baltimore	1,068	10.2%	282	6.3%	-3.9
City					

Note: Counties have been sorted in descending order based on representativeness.

[\[1\]](#) Adjusted Response Rate = Number of Surveys Completed/(Number of Surveys Mailed – Number of Surveys returned Undeliverable)

The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Both Black/African American and Hispanic families were slightly underrepresented in the survey. The State continues to focus on achieving representativeness through improvement plans for local programs with lower response rates (e.g., Baltimore City). As mentioned earlier, as response rates in jurisdictions increases, so does the State's overall representativeness. Its important to note that the survey responses were more representative this year compared to FFY 2015.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2016 response data represent the demographics of the State, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

The State has reported its FFY 2016 response data and described the actions used to address the issue of representativeness.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.34%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.51%
Data		1.24%	1.34%	1.25%	1.33%	1.47%	1.59%	1.48%	1.55%	1.68%	1.53%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	1.52%
Data	1.61%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.53%	1.54%	1.55%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	1,155	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	72,580	null
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,155	72,580	1.61%	1.53%	1.59%

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 (1.24%), Maryland served 1.59% of the resident population of children birth to 1 year of age. Maryland exceeds the national average by .35 percentage points and the percentage served is ranked 13th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			2.88%	2.88%	2.88%	2.88%	2.88%	2.95%	3.00%	3.00%	3.05%
Data		2.88%	3.03%	3.05%	3.26%	3.11%	3.54%	3.39%	3.43%	3.51%	3.50%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	3.10%
Data	3.55%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	3.15%	3.20%	3.25%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	8,094	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	220,056	
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
8,094	220,056	3.55%	3.15%	3.68%

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 (3.12%), Maryland served 3.68% of the resident population of children birth to 3 years of age. Maryland exceeds the national average by .56 percentage points and the percentage served is ranked 15th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		92.00%	93.00%	94.80%	98.70%	99.10%	98.20%	98.70%	98.10%	99.74%	98.87%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.06%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
7,677	9,580	98.06%	100%	98.53%
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i>				1,762

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

Data for Indicator 7 include all eligible children that were referred between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017.

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

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

Data collection, reporting and analysis

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

In FFY 2009, the MSDE redesigned Maryland's IFSP and Online IFSP Database. The major focus of the redesign was to create a more family-focused document. The revised Online IFSP Database gives users the ability to complete the IFSP online with IFSP data being entered directly into the database.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This process helped to decrease data entry errors by data entry staff. In FFY 2011, the MSDE implemented an “off-line solution” to the database, allowing for the completion of an IFSP in the Online IFSP Database without Internet access. With this implementation, providers can complete the IFSP with the family and have the data from the IFSP sync with the database at a later time. In FFY 2016, the MSDE continued the development and maintenance of the online IFSP database. Suggestions for online IFSP database updates were obtained through an IFSP Users Group that meets quarterly and includes data managers, local directors, JHU/CTE staff, and State staff.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
182	182	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

At the systemic level, ten (10) instances of noncompliance, less than 100% compliance, were identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator, and all were corrected within 12 months or less or prior to written notification. The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through LITP and the MSDE data analyses of data periods subsequent to the identified noncompliance. Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442) consistent with timely evaluation, assessment, and IFSP development. The MSDE found that all systemic incidences of noncompliance were corrected with 100% compliance achieved (Prong 2). This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes described by local programs in Improvement Plans or Corrective Action Plans.

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

Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

For FFY 2015, there were 172 individual incidences of noncompliance identified. The State reviewed the records of all 172 children whose evaluation, assessments, and IFSPs were not provided within the 45-day timeline in FFY 2015 and verified that all of the evaluation and assessments were eventually provided and initial IFSPs completed (Prong 1).

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		97.60%	99.00%	99.10%	99.10%	99.60%	99.80%	100%	99.90%	99.94%	99.95%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.97%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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

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.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,352	3,959	99.97%	100%	99.82%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i>	600
--	-----

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

State monitoring

State database

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

Data reported for Indicator 8A were based on a database review of Early Intervention records of all children who transitioned between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017.

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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In FFY 2016, 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.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

At the systemic level, one (1) instance of noncompliance, less than 100% compliance, was identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator and was corrected within 12 months or less or prior to written notification. The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through subsequent local and the MSDE data analyses of data periods subsequent to the identified noncompliance. Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442) consistent with timely transition planning. The MSDE found that the systemic incidence of noncompliance was corrected with 100% compliance achieved (Prong 2). This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes described by the local program through an Improvement Plan.

Describe how the

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

Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

In FFY 2015, there was one (1) individual incidence of noncompliance identified. Although late, Transition Steps and Services were added to the IFSP for the identified child (Prong 1).

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		98.90%	99.70%	99.90%	99.40%	99.80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,959	3,959	100%	100%	100%

Number of parents who opted out <i>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.</i>	0
--	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 DSE/EIS structure is birth through five in nature.

Between 7/1/16 and 6/30/17, local school systems and the SEA were notified of all 3,959 of the children, potentially eligible for Part B, who transitioned during the time period (3,959/3,959). Notification for 3,563 children occurred at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday. Another 344 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 3,959 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? No

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

Data include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017.

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.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year’s response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State’s only actions required in last year’s response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		92.00%	94.70%	95.00%	96.40%	99.60%	99.40%	99.10%	98.40%	99.53%	99.06%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.35%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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

Please explain

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

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,241	3,959	99.35%	100%	99.62%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>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.</i>	11
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	692

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Data include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017.

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 2016, eleven (11) 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 .

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
34	34	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Systemic Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

At the systemic level, ten (10) instances of noncompliance, less than 100% compliance, were identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator, and all were corrected within 12 months or less or prior to written notification. The correction of noncompliance was confirmed through LITP and the MSDE data analyses of data periods subsequent to the identified noncompliance. Following each incidence of noncompliance, data analyses were conducted to confirm that jurisdictions were correctly implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442) consistent with the provision of timely transition planning meetings. The MSDE found that all systemic incidences of noncompliance were corrected with 100% compliance achieved (Prong 2). This was accomplished through the local implementation of changed practices and processes described by local programs in Improvement Plans or Corrective Action Plans.

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

Individual Level Noncompliance from FFY 2015

For FFY 2015, there were twenty-four (24) individual level incidences of noncompliance. The State reviewed the records of all twenty-four (24) children whose transition planning meetings were not held within timelines in FFY 2015 and verified through the Online IFSP Database that the transition planning meetings were eventually provided, although late, for all twenty-four (24) children (Prong 1).

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

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 under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted).

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	100%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016		2017		2018	
Target	-		-		-	

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	100%	% - %	0%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data						0%			100%	100%	

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	100%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0	100%		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none