

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Maryland



**PART C DUE
February 1, 2023**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services (DEI/SES) 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 DEI/SES is to provide leadership, support, and accountability for results to Local Education Agencies (LEAs), 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 Division is organized by five branches with early childhood integrated throughout:

- Policy and Accountability;
- Performance Support and Technical Assistance (TA);
- Family Support and Dispute Resolution;
- Interagency Collaboration; and
- Resource Management and Monitoring.

The Division's matrix organizational design integrates knowledge to improve compliance and results and ensures consistent communication within the DEI/SES, throughout the MSDE, and with external stakeholders and partners.

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

Transparency: Maintaining an open door to stakeholders and regularly communicating through formal and informal outreach

Stakeholder Engagement: Engaging our stakeholders in timely and meaningful consultation on priority topics, including policies that affect children with disabilities

Effectiveness: Serving stakeholders in a timely and effective manner and ensure the availability of the best "real-time" data for decision-making and dissemination of evidence-based models throughout the State

Alignment: Arranging our priorities to be synchronous with those of MSDE and federal requirements while also including the concerns of our LEAs, PAs, and advocates

Accountability: Striving to improve compliance and performance results for all local school systems and public agencies. The DEI/SES has developed a tiered system of general supervision and performance support to identify systems and agencies in need of differentiated support and TA (Differentiated Framework)

The Differentiated Framework includes tiers of general supervision and engagement to improve birth through 21 special education/early intervention results. Essential components of Maryland's comprehensive system of general supervision include (see General Supervision section for detailed information):

- Effective policies and procedures
- State Performance Plan (SPP) goals and targets
- Accountability to Improve Performance (AIP)
- Fiscal management
- Dispute resolution
- Targeted TA and support

The DEI/SES has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for performance support and TA 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 with disabilities. The Division is committed to maintaining compliance and providing supports to improve the quality of early intervention 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 receives is differentiated based on that agency's assigned tier and a comprehensive analysis of the LITP's needs.

The Differentiated Framework involves directing the DEI/SES' attention to LITPs in need of more comprehensive engagement, TA, and support in order to enable those programs to meet indicator targets, improve results, narrow the achievement gap, correct identified noncompliance, and maintain compliance.

A majority of the LITPs are in the Universal Tier of General Supervision/Engagement. This Tier 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." In the Universal Tier, the focus is on professional learning and follow-up coaching and support to address statewide needs based on overall State trend data. This includes general information related to early intervention policies, procedures and practices, as well as the general work of the MSDE. Examples of statewide TA include State and regional professional development, online tools, resources through MSDE websites, Q&A Documents, and TA Bulletins. Comprehensive monitoring for the Universal Tier occurs once every four years.

An LITP receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for two consecutive years or one year of "Needs Intervention" is assigned to the Targeted Tier. An LITP in this tier may have an active Corrective Action Plan(s) (CAPs) for identified noncompliance or, if compliance is not sustained despite correction within the required one-year time period. The corresponding Targeted Tier focuses on professional learning and support (training,

coaching, and TA) 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 DEI/SES to review State and local data and information in order to implement an IP that is approved by the DEI/SES to build capacity to effectively address the identified needs. LITPs in the Targeted Tier receive comprehensive monitoring every other year.

An LITP receiving a determination status of "Needs Assistance" for three consecutive years, "Needs Intervention" for two consecutive years, or "Needs Substantial Intervention" for one year is assigned to the Focused Tier. At this level, the goal of the Focused Tier 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 meet regularly to develop and implement an action plan designed to effect systems change in policy, program, instructional practices, and professional learning at multiple systems levels. The State Superintendent and the DEI/SES Assistant State Superintendent work closely with the local School Superintendent or local lead agency (LLA) 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 regular submission of data. Comprehensive monitoring for LITPs in the Focused Tier occurs annually.

At the highest tier, the Intensive Tier, an LITP fails to progress and correct previously identified noncompliance despite receiving TA and support. The failure to comply has affected core requirements, such as the delivery of services to 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 MSDE may direct, recover or withhold State or federal funds.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Data collection or reporting issues related to the COVID-19 Pandemic will be discussed within individual Indicators, if applicable.

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.

Data Collection

As part of the State's general supervision system, data are collected from several sources, including the Maryland Online IFSP (MOIFSP), the DEI/SES Complaint Database, and a State-funded vendor (for the family survey). The MOIFSP database is a secure, web-based application that serves as the primary case management tool for service coordinators and 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 Maryland 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 Maryland Online IFSP to generate both predefined and dynamic reports to assist with programmatic data-informed decision-making. Data collected for every eligible child and family are entered into the MOIFSP by local staff. MSDE and the LITPs generate reports to monitor statewide and local compliance/results and audit for data validity and reliability.

IDEA Requirements

The DEI/SES conducts comprehensive monitoring at least once every four years to ensure the requirements of the IDEA and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) are met.

Effective Policies, Procedures, and Practices

Maryland has policies and procedures aligned with IDEA. State law and COMAR support 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. The DEI/SES has embedded the review of LITP policies, procedures, and practices within existing components of general supervision.

State Performance Plan (SPP)

The SPP is the State's plan to improve results and compliance indicators established by the OSEP and 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 facilitated through stakeholder engagement.

Accountability to Improve Performance (AIP)

Comprehensive monitoring occurs at least every four years in each LITP 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 children with developmental delays and disabilities, and their families. The DEI/SES places strong emphasis on requirements related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. The DEI/SES works collaboratively with LITPs to identify root causes and focus on areas in need of improvement. The AIP process verifies data, documents compliance with both IDEA and COMAR regulatory requirements, and provides TA 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 consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. 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 DEI/SES to determine the level of compliance. If both reviews result in 100% compliance, then correction has been achieved and the corrective action is closed.

While some monitoring activities are universal for all, other monitoring activities are customized to examine areas of need based upon monitoring findings, LITP self assessment, MSDE priorities, etc:

Indicator data verification

Other data reviews

Grant/Fiscal reviews

Medicaid monitoring

Family support data

State complaints

Advocacy organization concerns

The DEI/SES has developed comprehensive monitoring activities geared towards these efforts to ensure improved results, including:

Desk Audits - review of data, IFSPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by the DEI/SES at the DEI/SES.

On-Site Monitoring - review of data, IFSPs, or other sources of information used in monitoring conducted by DEI/SES 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 DEI/SES staff.

Case Study Reviews - reviews of an individual child's early intervention record to determine 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.

Interviews - conducted with administrators, service providers, and parents to measure consistency and understanding of practices across the LITP. DEI/SES staff are able to ascertain the knowledge of local program staff pertaining to the implementation of IFSPs, utilization of evidence-based practices, and the responsibilities of staff.

Directed Onsite Visits - Onsite visits at any time based on data indicating potential 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 scope of each directed onsite visit may vary.

Fiscal Management

The primary responsibility of the Resource Management Branch is to ensure effective procurement, use, and oversight of DEI/SES resources. This branch also provides for fiscal subrecipient monitoring of all recipients of the IDEA grant funds throughout Maryland. The branch ensures fiscal accountability in accordance with IDEA and COMAR for federal and State funds administered by the MSDE for the benefit of children with disabilities. The branch assists LITPs, and other subrecipients through the application, reporting, and fiscal management process associated with the grant award.

Dispute Resolution

The IDEA provides safeguards that 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 to ensure effective implementation of the dispute resolution system. Dispute resolution trends may often lead to targeted monitoring in a specific jurisdiction or across the entire state.

Targeted TA and Support

Through the SSIP and data from the examination of the LITP performance, ongoing state activities are used for program improvement and progress measurement. The DEI/SES also aligns improvement activities with existing MSDE initiatives, such as Maryland's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and Preschool Development Grant. TA activities, designed to address the needs of each individual LITP, are based on data that are collected and correction of any noncompliance, consistent with OSEP's 09-02 Memo.

Enforcement

There is a direct relationship between determination status and enforcement. After assigning each LITP a determination status, the DEI/SES applies appropriate enforcement actions. The DEI/SES mandates activities and actions that are designed to ensure that LITPs meet the requirements of IDEA. Each LITP is assigned to one of four tiers of general supervision. This comprehensive information is used to provide differentiated engagement that focuses on building capacity to improve results and direct State resources to those LITPs that are the lowest-performing.

Technical Assistance System:

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

Through the DEI/SES's strategic plan, Moving Maryland Forward: Sharpen the Focus for 2020, the DEI/SES focuses on building the capacity of LITPs, LEAs, PAs, and IHE, to narrow the performance gap and enable all children to be kindergarten ready. The DEI/SES works collaboratively with other Divisions within the MSDE to improve performance on statewide accountability measures and achievement of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards. As described under the General Supervision Section, 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 supports data-informed systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation of evidence-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 from those LITPs which are achieving success. The State engages with LITPs using an Implementation Science-based approach called Team, Analyze, Plan, Implement, Track.

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

The TAP-IT process is the universal delivery system for improved results through the DEI/SES 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 DEI/SES 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 DEI/SES 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 DEI/SES representatives who operate in a clearly defined partnership. The team collects all current, relevant data sources [for example: 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: <https://ncsi.wested.org/resources/state-spotlights/>

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, DEI/SES 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 DEI/SES 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 documents their findings for subsequent steps.

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: <https://nim.fpg.unc.edu/resources/hexagon-exploration-tool>). Based on the data analysis, plans are created and resources are aligned to narrow the achievement gap. SMART (Strategic, Measurable, Attainable, Results-based and Time-bound) goals - and ideas for sharing success and replication are included in developed plans.

Implement: The plan is implemented with the supports and resources identified from the LITP, the DEI/SES, 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. Assigned monitors provide updates on each data set, financial reports are discussed, and plans are modified as needed (e.g., based on intervention implementation fidelity, child performance, etc.). The team completes an annual review and report of the work through the SMART Process. Success is shared, and the work is scaled up as appropriate.

Professional Development System:

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

The DEI/SES 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.

Annually, each 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 has been revised to include an Early Intervention Program Plan (EIPP) which addresses both infrastructure and personnel development within the following sections (as required):

- Local IPs/CAPs
- Public Awareness Plans
- Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process
- Effective IFSP Development

The EIPP culminates with the CSPD which specifically addresses the personnel development strategies across all sections of the EIPP.

CSPD Plan

The purpose of the CSPD Plan is to describe how the local early intervention system will ensure a consistent knowledge base that builds capacity, for public and private providers, primary referral sources, community partners, Family personnel, parents, paraprofessionals and service coordinators to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities, including children in the Extended IFSP Option, and their families. In addition to including personnel development strategies to promote continuous improvement to support local IPs/CAPs, public awareness plans, the COS process, and effective IFSP development, implementation and evaluation, the CSPD Plan developed by a local jurisdiction must include, where appropriate, training on the basic components of the early intervention system; the coordination of transition services from the LITP to Preschool Special Education services, or another appropriate early childhood program; and the development, implementation, and incorporation of educational outcomes in the IFSP that promote school readiness, including pre-literacy, language, and numeracy skills.

The MSDE supports 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, self-monitoring, local data profiles, IPs, CAPs, complaints, parent calls, and investigations requiring corrective actions, and other data related to program improvement. Gathered information from all the data sources discussed above are clearly summarized in the data analysis section of the CSPD Plan. A list of anticipated in-service topics reflecting the results of the Personnel Development Strategies within the EIPP, the required Suitable Qualifications - Early Intervention Personnel Standards, other needs identified through local needs assessment data is included, 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 LITP Final Program Report.

Required local CSPD Plan components in FFY 2021, included:

- A summary of the specific personnel development Strategies within the EIPP, data on the required Suitable Qualifications - Early Intervention Personnel Standards and data on the results of the local training needs assessment of public and private providers, primary referral sources, Family Support personnel, parents, paraprofessionals, and service coordinators, in addition to other data analysis results;
- A description of each professional learning activity, including anticipated dates, training level, topic, presenters, and audience;
- The specific type of coaching support being provided (internal/external) coaching frequency, duration, and context (individual, team, communities of practice); and
- Evaluation levels, instruments, and program/early intervention provider fidelity checks to assess fidelity of implementation, continuous improvement, and level of impact on the local early intervention system.

After CLIG submissions are received by the DEI/SES, each CSPD Plan is reviewed by DEI/SES staff 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.

Jurisdictions can access technical assistance from the DEI/SES to support local/regional planning and implementation efforts for customized COS and IFSP professional development. The DEI/SES continues to promote their professional development website - 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 COS rating

process 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.

Personnel Standards

The DEI/SES 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. Maryland's Early Intervention & Preschool Special Education System Personnel Standards became effective on July 1, 2019. The standards are part of the State's revised CSPD to ensure a consistent base of knowledge by establishing a universal onboarding/orientation process along with an ongoing training plan for all personnel. The associated Guide outlines the requirements for early intervention providers and recommendations for preschool special educators and related service providers. All early intervention providers are required to complete the Personnel Standards, regardless of full-time or part-time status. Completing the Personnel Standards will provide the foundation for all early intervention and preschool special education providers to implement the natural and inclusive evidence-based practices throughout the development, implementation, and evaluation of the IFSP and preschool IEP processes, as well as the teaming and coaching practices essential to supporting the process.

Ongoing Professional Learning Activities and Resources

In order to improve program quality and services to positively impact child and family outcome results, the MSDE DEI/SES, in collaboration with numerous partners, provides resources, training, consultation, and technical assistance to local LITP directors, service providers, community partners, stakeholders and parents through various 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 DEI/SES website marylandlearninglinks.org in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education (CTE).

An additional website, Making Access Happen, (<http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms2/makingaccesshappen>) provides specific support around authentic assessment (<https://medium.com/mah-authentic-assessment-support>) including the Routines-Based Interview, and reflective coaching.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

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

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Apply stakeholder input from introduction to all Part C results indicators. (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

79

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Committees/Councils, including the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC), and Education Advisory Council (EAC), support Maryland's comprehensive birth through twenty-one (21) system of services. Parents and advisory/advocacy committees are engaged in target settings, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress in numerous ways. Parents, including representatives from the Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC) in Maryland, Parents Place of Maryland, are actively involved in the SICC, SESAC, and EAC. Parents Place of Maryland employs eleven (11) parents of children and students with identified delays and disabilities. The SICC currently has three (3) parent members, all from different local jurisdictions systems, who attend regularly. Maryland's SESAC has eighteen (18) parent members who attend regularly. Nonmember parents attend both the SICC and SESAC since the meetings are open to the public. The EAC is a diverse coalition of over 25 individuals and organizations, including individual advocates, advocacy law centers, disability societies/councils, educational consultants, and other agencies with a focus on empowering and supporting children with disabilities and their families. As mentioned before, Parents Place of Maryland, Maryland's PTIC, is a valuable stakeholder with membership on each committee.

Parents, parent support staff, and advocacy groups are also included in State Professional Learning Institutes (PLIs) and statewide webinars intended to provide stakeholders with up-to-date information on legislation, program strategies, evidence-based practice updates, and progress on program results and APR indicators. Thirty-one (31) of 43 Family Support providers in Maryland's LEAs are parents of students with disabilities.

Several ongoing committees have regular participation by parents, including:

The State Implementation Teams (Part B and Part C);

These teams are responsible for moving SSIP work forward.

One (1) parent that serves on each Team.

The Inclusion State Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);

This team advances technical assistance activities which are focused on advancing effective evidence-based inclusion policies and practices within the State's comprehensive birth through age 21 education system.

Two (2) parents that serve on this Team.

The State Inclusion Leadership Team (Part B and Part C);

This team develops state-level guidance and support for the local school systems that were awarded the PS Inclusion grants.

Two (2) parents that serve on this Team.

The Pyramid Model Leadership Committee, which is not led by DEI/SES, but the DEI/SES serves as partners (Part C and Part B); and

This committee focuses development, evaluation, and sustainability of a statewide collaborative effort, guided by national models, that supports the local implementation of the Pyramid Model framework.

Two (2) parents that serve on this Committee.

The Maryland Certificate of Program Completion (MCoPC) Endorsement Task Force

The task force's charge is to review the requirements for the Maryland Certificate of Program Completion requirements and develop standards for endorsements that can be added to the MCoPC that address employment, postsecondary education, and community/citizenship.

Six (6) parents serve on this Task Force.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

To increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to aid in the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, the State provides details on methods and measurement tools used in the collection and analysis of data, and provides interpreters for all meetings, as needed. The State has also developed numerous parent guides facilitate knowledge of the state early intervention and special education system, as well as to build capacity of parents to be engaged in their children's development. Publications are translated into at least 17 different languages, Parent guides can be found here: <https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/info.aspx>

The MSDE DEI/SES develops state leadership teams for new initiatives, including a diverse membership. Parent members fully participate in the processes and discussions and are encouraged to take on leadership roles at times. The expectation is that State leadership teams will then be modeled at the local level for each jurisdiction participating in the initiative. The MSDE DEI/SES provides grant funding to several family organizations, including Parents Place of Maryland (PPMD) and Maryland Coalition of Families (MCF), to enhance parent leadership and encourage diverse parent participation at all levels of decision-making.

The Parents Place of Maryland has two current grants from the DEI/SES:

Baby LEADers – goals of the grant include but are not limited to increasing parent participation in planning for IFSP, Extended IFSP, and IEP services and decision-making; increasing parent knowledge to support young children from the transition from an IFSP to an IEP; increasing parent knowledge of the Division of Early Childhood's Recommended Practices and Family Guides supporting state's rollout of evidence-based practices and strategies; empowering families to use the resources they need to participate in their own family community activities; and improving parent/provider communication and family partnerships regarding early intervention and preschool services for children to improve service delivery and substantially contribute to improving child outcomes.

Guiding the Journey: A Transition Program for Parents – goals of the grant include, but are not limited to, conducting secondary transition trainings for parents of students 14-years and older; and increasing parental involvement and expertise in the transition planning process.

Through a DEI/SES grant, the MCF's provides training programs aim to promote family/school partnerships and empower families to advocate for their children, as well as other children, in education and other child-serving care systems. The MCF's annual Family Leadership Institute (FLI) provides an intensive training program in order to promote the development of local partnerships and community ties. Through the MCF's Family Leadership Program, MCF seeks increase parent/caregiver capacity, engagement, and partnership with LITPs and LEAs. Equipping parents/caregivers who care for children with mental health disorders with knowledge, skills, and resources will promote a positive partnership with the school and positive educational outcomes for their child.

The SICC facilitates an annual joint meeting with LICCs across Maryland encouraging state-level representation and engagement from parents various stakeholders. This diverse group of parents and stakeholders advise the state's development of activities that support children and students with special needs. In addition, the collaborative meeting has resulted in the recruitment of additional parents to the SICC, ultimately broadening the diversity and representativeness of the SICC.

The DEI/SES provides the EAC an opportunity to review all technical assistance bulletins and parent guides before they are finalized and disseminated. Since the start of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the DEI/SES has developed over 45 guidance documents. Ultimately, these documents are published on the MSDE's website to ensure wide dissemination to both providers and families. The DEI/SES technical assistance bulletins and family guides can be

found here: <https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/TAB.aspx>. Of note, the DEI/SES developed two (2) new parent guides to increase the capacity of parents to support their children, including A Parents' Guide: Navigating Special Education during COVID-19 Pandemic and A Parents' Guide to Navigating Compensatory Education/Recovery Services during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Throughout the year, stakeholders are made aware of data analysis, improvement strategies, and program data/progress evaluation in a variety of ways, including through statewide meetings/webinars, SICC/SESAC/EAC meetings, and family support conferences. Statewide webinars occur frequently, but not necessarily with specific regularity as they are often dependent on hot topics or immediate concerns or initiatives. SICC, SESAC, and EAC meetings occur frequently and regularly with the schedule set at the beginning of each fiscal year. For both types of meetings, stakeholders can provide feedback on data analysis, improvement strategies, evaluation, and target setting. In addition to statewide meetings and regular stakeholder workgroups, the state has regular family support conferences and webinars. These meetings are regularly attended by parents and family support professionals. Below are examples of topics discussed at Family Support Conferences/webinars in FFY 2020 and FFY 2021:

Routines-Based Interview;
Authentic Assessment;
Data highlights;
Parent/Family Survey;
Improving Family Engagement;
Early Intervention Personnel Standards;
Components of IEP Goals;
Tips to Support Mask-Wearing for Students with Disabilities;
Helping Prepare Parents Prepare for a Return to In-Person Instruction/Services;
Review of MSDE Technical Assistance Bulletins;
Decision-Making for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities;
Improving Outcomes through Family Support;
Understanding the IFSP/IEP Process;
Helping Families Create a Vision for Their Child;
A review of Parental Rights Maryland's Procedural Safeguards Notice Document; and
Compensatory Education/Recovery Services Topics.

In addition to the meetings above, the State Implementation Team (SIT) meets monthly to develop, analyze, and evaluate evidence-based practices utilized in Maryland's SSIP jurisdiction and expand the use of the State's evidence-based practices beyond jurisdictions participating in the SSIP. The PPMD, SICC, and SESAC have representatives on SIT, thus ensuring parent and advisory group participation.

Below is a timeline of the mechanisms used to set targets, baselines, analyze data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate progress for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 APR Cycle.

Timeline:

July 2021 – October 2021

Reviewed how each indicator was measured in the past cycle what changes, if any, are required for data collection and reporting
Consulted with internal data collection teams at MSDE (inter-departmental) to ensure data availability and a plan for data analysis and reporting

October 2021 - December 2021

Presented to stakeholders changes to how the indicator will be measured in the new cycle
Identified and developed proposed baseline year, proposed target options, and improvement strategies to meet the targets
Solicited input from stakeholders on priorities for APR indicators
Developed APR Surveys (Part B and Part C) for obtaining feedback from stakeholders

December 2021 - January 2022

Disseminated Part C and Part B Surveys to stakeholders throughout Maryland for feedback on APR Indicators (baselines, targets, and improvement strategies). Solicited additional input from advisory groups, councils, and committees (SESAC, SICC, EAC, etc.)
Reviewed stakeholder survey responses
Made final adjustments and finalized proposed baselines, targets, and improvement strategies

February 1, 2022

Submitted SPP-APR FFY2020

February 1, 2022 - December 2022

Consulted with internal data collection teams at MSDE (inter-departmental) to ensure data availability and a plan for data analysis and reporting
Analyzed data and evaluated the effectiveness of improvement strategies
Solicited input from stakeholders on priorities for APR indicators and new/revised improvement strategies
Finalized improvement strategies for FFY 2022

February 1, 2023

Submitted SPP-APR FFY2021

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

After receiving input from the Part B and Part C target surveys, the State revised and finalized the proposed FFY 2020 targets for submission to the USDE. The revised targets were included in Maryland's FFY 2020 APR submission as Maryland's final targets. To make the set targets available to the public, the State disseminated the final targets included in both APRs to the stakeholders (including parents, advocacy groups, Maryland's PTI Center, SICC, SESAC, EAC, and Program Directors/Coordinators, etc.). The final FFY 2021 APR, including APR targets, Improvement Strategies, evaluation of

indicator data, and local system-specific data, will be posted on mdideareport.org no later than 120 days from submission consistent with submission in previous years.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

As required in the IDEA of 2004, the MSDE reported to the public on its FFY 2020 (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021) 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 2021 (July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022). Performance data in numbers and percentages will be reported for each LITP, along with the State target, State performance data, and a narrative description of the indicator. In addition, 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, the 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 2020 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. In addition, this site also includes OSEP's annual State determination and MSDE's annual local Infants and Toddlers Program determinations. The FFY 2021 APR will be included on this website shortly after the State's submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2023. Copies of the APR and SPP will be provided to LITPs, the SICC, and other stakeholders simultaneously immediately following the submission of the report.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

The State attached its 2022 Annual Report Certification of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Form. The State must submit its 2023 SICC form to confirm that the SICC is supporting the State's submission of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	96.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.24%	97.86%	98.07%	98.35%	99.05%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
12,635	14,987	99.05%	100%	98.49%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

2,125

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

IFSP services that were provided untimely were either due to exceptional family circumstances (e.g., family-related reasons, child unavailability, child illness/hospitalization, or IFSP team decision making) (2,125) or noncompliance (227). Staff unavailability was the primary reason cited for noncompliance. Other reasons for noncompliance included administrative errors and staff illnesses.

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

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

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

State database

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

Data were collected from the full reporting period of July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022.

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 7/1/2021 and 6/30/2022, 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 2,125 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 the finalization of SPP/APR data, local programs were reminded of the requirement to ensure the submission of timely and accurate data.

On September 23, 2022, the MSDE re-ran the child-level and summary actual service initiation reports and validated data. These data are used for local determinations and are reported in the State's Annual Performance Report. The data validation for this indicator included contacting jurisdictions about justifications for late services that were unclear. Also, the predefined report includes all services that are untimely, and the MSDE staff must distinguish between those services that are untimely due to family-related reasons and those that are late due to system reasons. Untimely services are summed and are reported above.

To monitor timely service data, the MSDE uses multiple predefined reports that (1) summarize the percentage of timely services, and (2) list all of the children who have untimely services or who are missing actual service initiation dates. During the FFY 2008 reporting year, the MSDE made changes to the Part C database in order to capture the services that had not been initiated and would never be initiated due to family-related reasons. In particular, some services are added to the IFSP but never actually start, such as when parents change their mind about approving a specific service, when families move out of the local jurisdiction, or when providers are unable to make contact with families despite repeated efforts to do so. These circumstances are now documented in both the early intervention record and the Online IFSP through a "Reason No Actual Service Initiation Date Entered" data field. This data field also reduces the amount of data validation required by the MSDE since the MSDE no longer has to request information about why these service entry dates were not entered. The MSDE also created a report to capture those services that will never start due to family-related reasons.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

At the systemic level, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified ten (10) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. To verify the correction of FFY 2020 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state’s data system, from a date subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to determine if those newer records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP identified with noncompliance in FFY 2020 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected regarding infants and toddlers whose services were provided in a timely manner. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2020, there were 121 individual level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that did not have IFSP services provided in a timely manner. Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that services were initiated for all 121 children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each individual child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	89.70%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target>=	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%	94.50%	94.50%
Data	97.83%	97.44%	98.14%	98.53%	99.67%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	96.00%	96.50%	97.00%	97.50%	97.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Please see the Introduction Attachment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/06/2022	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	8,470
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/06/2022	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	8,539

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
8,470	8,539	99.67%	96.00%	99.19%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

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

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Please see the Introduction Attachment.

In FFY 2017, a revised Birth to Kindergarten COS training of trainers was held in five regions with the expectation that all staff is trained or retrained in the COS process. The Maryland Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes Gateway website was created to support COS training and implementation with fidelity. The revised COS training was designed to help participants understand implementation fidelity, ensuring consistent use of Maryland's four core COS Process components (authentic assessment, age-anchoring, COS Rating Prep Tool, and Decision Tree) and assessing competency in the COS rating process. The expectation for trainers who attended was to conduct local training of all birth to kindergarten staff and culminate the training with completing the Maryland COS Competency Check. The Maryland COS Competency Check is now required for all early intervention staff with the ultimate goal being that every provider passes both the knowledge check and the case study competency. The DEI/SES provides annual COS Competency Check reports to ensure that providers are meeting the competency requirements. In FFY 2018, the DEI/SES developed the Maryland COS Process Fidelity Checklist in response to local leaders requesting a tool to monitor fidelity. Additionally, COS data reports, including COS Entry and data visualizations, continue to be updated and revised to support the State and local programs with using COS data for program improvement.

Given this focus, the State's data for this indicator has become less subjective and more reliable over time. As such, the state has seen a gradual decrease in some sub-indicators over time as the State gets closer to what it believes is a more valid baseline using COS data with age anchoring. Because the previous baseline and targets were set prior to the State's increased focus and training requirements, stakeholders believe and suggested the prior targets are not reasonably attainable at this time and that a new baseline with attainable, yet rigorous, targets be set. The State agrees with its stakeholders on this point and believes the data are sufficiently different from previously collected data as to no longer be comparable. As such, the State worked with the national TA Center, DaSy, and proposed a new baseline for FFY 2020 for Indicator 3 with targets based on this new baseline, aligned with stakeholder input.

Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2020	Target>=	61.55%	62.05%	62.55%	62.55%	62.48%

A1	62.48%	Data	61.27%	61.11%	56.58%	60.89%	62.48%
A2	2020	Target>=	59.50%	60.00%	60.50%	60.50%	43.58%
A2	43.58%	Data	58.21%	53.19%	46.44%	45.81%	43.58%
B1	2020	Target>=	65.61%	66.11%	66.61%	66.61%	64.94%
B1	64.94%	Data	66.54%	66.13%	60.33%	64.43%	64.94%
B2	2020	Target>=	54.15%	54.65%	55.15%	55.15%	40.38%
B2	40.38%	Data	53.51%	49.16%	43.50%	42.76%	40.38%
C1	2020	Target>=	72.30%	72.80%	73.30%	73.30%	65.56%
C1	65.56%	Data	71.41%	68.42%	62.69%	65.95%	65.56%
C2	2020	Target>=	49.44%	49.94%	50.44%	50.44%	40.40%
C2	40.40%	Data	49.74%	45.84%	43.32%	43.20%	40.40%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1>=	62.98%	63.48%	63.98%	64.48%	64.98%
Target A2>=	44.08%	44.58%	45.08%	45.58%	46.08%
Target B1>=	65.44%	65.94%	66.44%	66.94%	67.44%
Target B2>=	40.88%	41.38%	41.88%	42.38%	42.88%
Target C1>=	66.06%	66.56%	67.06%	67.56%	68.06%
Target C2>=	40.90%	41.40%	41.90%	42.40%	42.90%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

5,107

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21	0.41%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,751	34.29%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,152	22.56%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,520	29.76%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	663	12.98%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
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	2,672	4,444	62.48%	62.98%	60.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they	2,183	5,107	43.58%	44.08%	42.75%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
turned 3 years of age or exited the program							

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

The State experienced slippage in summary statement 1 for each Indicator 3 subindicators (3A, 3B, and 3C). This decrease is related to the overall percentage increase in children identified in category B (Percent of infants and toddlers who improvised functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) for each subindicator. For example, from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021 the percentage of category B children increased from 31.55% to 34.29%, from 30.92% to 34.03%, and from 31.83% to 34.05% for subindicators 3A, 3B, and 3C, respectively.

The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools, the COS Rating Prep Tool, and the decision tree for every COS rating. This intense focus is contributing to gradual decreases in the child outcomes data, in each of the three childhood outcomes (3A, 3B and 3C) for Summary Statement #1 as data quality improves and the State gets closer to what it believes is a more valid baseline for COS data. With a more comprehensive understanding of a child's functioning within daily routines and activities and the consistent use of age anchoring tools prior to the COS rating discussion with the family, local early intervention providers and leaders recognize that COS ratings have been elevated at entry. A new COS Entry report supports data analysis at the program and provider levels. Program-level data analysis has found that elevated COS entry scores directly contribute to decreases in COS data. For Summary Statement #1, children with relatively higher entry ratings are exiting without showing significant gains in their developmental trajectory compared to same-age peers.

Specific activities over the past several years to address fidelity of the COS process and to continue improving data quality include: Maryland Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes Gateway website for initial and ongoing professional learning, along with the Guide to Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes and COS Process Training and Support. The Maryland COS Competency Check is now required for all early intervention staff. In addition, the Maryland COS Process Fidelity Checklist was created in response to local leaders requesting a tool to monitor the fidelity of the COS process.

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	22	0.43%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,738	34.03%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,329	26.02%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,604	31.41%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	414	8.11%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,933	4,693	64.94%	65.44%	62.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,018	5,107	40.38%	40.88%	39.51%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

The State experienced slippage in summary statement 1 for each Indicator 3 subindicators (3A, 3B, and 3C). This decrease is related to the overall percentage increase in children identified in category B (Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) for each subindicator. For example, from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021 the percentage of category B children increased from 31.55% to 34.29%, from 30.92% to 34.03%, and from 31.83% to 34.05% for subindicators 3A, 3B, and 3C, respectively.

The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools, the COS Rating Prep Tool, and the decision tree for every COS rating. This intense focus is contributing to gradual decreases in the child outcomes data, in each of the three childhood outcomes (3A, 3B and 3C) for Summary Statement #1 as data quality improves and the State gets closer to what it believes is a more valid baseline for COS data. With a more comprehensive understanding of a child's functioning within daily routines and activities and the consistent use of age anchoring tools prior to the COS rating discussion with the family, local early intervention providers and leaders recognize that COS ratings have been elevated at entry. A new COS Entry report supports data analysis at the

program and provider levels. Program-level data analysis has found that elevated COS entry scores directly contribute to decreases in COS data. For Summary Statement #1, children with high entry ratings are exiting without showing significant gains in their developmental trajectory compared to same-age peers.

Specific activities over the past several years to address fidelity of the COS process and to continue improving data quality include: Maryland Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes Gateway website for initial and ongoing professional learning, along with the Guide to Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes and COS Process Training and Support. The Maryland COS Competency Check is now required for all early intervention staff. In addition, the Maryland COS Process Fidelity Checklist was created in response to local leaders requesting a tool to monitor the fidelity of the COS process.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	24	0.47%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,739	34.05%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,329	26.02%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,763	34.52%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	252	4.93%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,092	4,855	65.56%	66.06%	63.69%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,015	5,107	40.40%	40.90%	39.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

The State experienced slippage in summary statement 1 for each Indicator 3 subindicators (3A, 3B, and 3C). This decrease is related to the overall percentage increase in children identified in category B (Percent of infants and toddlers who improvised functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) for each subindicator. For example, from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021 the percentage of category B children increased from 31.55% to 34.29%, from 30.92% to 34.03%, and from 31.83% to 34.05% for subindicators 3A, 3B, and 3C, respectively.

The DEI/SES continues to focus on fidelity of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process with a strong emphasis on authentic assessment practices along with the use of age anchoring tools, the COS Rating Prep Tool, and the decision tree for every COS rating. This intense focus is contributing to gradual decreases in the child outcomes data, in each of the three childhood outcomes (3A, 3B and 3C) for Summary Statement #1 as data quality improves and the State gets closer to what it believes is a more valid baseline for COS data. With a more comprehensive understanding of a child's functioning within daily routines and activities and the consistent use of age anchoring tools prior to the COS rating discussion with the family, local early intervention providers and leaders recognize that COS ratings have been elevated at entry. A new COS Entry report supports data analysis at the program and provider levels. Program-level data analysis has found that elevated COS entry scores directly contribute to decreases in COS data. For Summary Statement #1, children with high entry ratings are exiting without showing significant gains in their developmental trajectory compared to same-age peers.

Specific activities over the past several years to address fidelity of the COS process and to continue improving data quality include: Maryland Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes Gateway website for initial and ongoing professional learning, along with the Guide to Birth to Kindergarten Child Outcomes and COS Process Training and Support. The Maryland COS Competency Check is now required for all early intervention staff. In addition, the Maryland COS Process Fidelity Checklist was created in response to local leaders requesting a tool to monitor the fidelity of the COS process.

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

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting 618 data	9,483
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	2,860

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

On October 1, 2018 the Maryland IFSP process, document, and online tool was revised to require more robust child and family assessment activities as well as a more integrated COS process. My Child and Family's Story now includes three (3) Assessment sections: Natural Routines/Activities and Environments, Our Family's Resources, Priorities, and Concerns, and the Assessment Summary: Present Levels of Functional Development. The first assessment section on natural routines and activities is completed through a Routines-Based Interview (RBI), the completion of the Scale for the Assessment of Family Enjoyment within Routines (SAFER), or the completion of the Everyday Routines and Activities section on the IFSP. The Family Resources, Priorities and Concerns section includes the ability to upload an Ecomap and utilizes prompts to assess the family's resources, priorities, and concerns, and includes service linkages. Finally, the Assessment Summary: Present Levels of Functional Development summarizes various sources of information, including conversations with the family, observations of the child in daily routines, the eligibility evaluation across the five developmental domains, child and family assessment activities, and outside reports, in order create a plan that fits well with the child's developmental strengths and interests.

The Assessment Summary: Present Levels of Functional Development documents all of the information gathered within each of the three early childhood outcomes areas: developing positive social skills and relationships, acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and using appropriate behaviors to meet needs. Using the COS Rating Prep Tool for each of the three early childhood outcome areas, teams document the discussion and identification of the child's skills and behaviors compared to other children the same age as either Foundational, Immediate Foundational, or Age-Expected. Together with the family, teams review the Assessment Summary, share information about typical development and age-anchoring while reviewing the COS Rating Prep Tool, elicit additional thoughts or information from the family and then use the Decision Tree for COS Summary Rating Discussions. The required online Decision Tree Procedural Facilitator guides teams to reach consensus about the appropriate COS descriptor statement. The COS Rating Descriptors use family-friendly language to assist families in understanding their child's development in relation to same-age peers and are matched to the COS 1 through 7 scale. Only the COS Rating Descriptors are written on the IFSP, not the 1 to 7 numbers. The 1 to 7 numbers are assigned in the database to calculate child progress data. For each of the three early childhood outcome areas, the appropriate COS Rating Descriptor is checked on the IFSP. In addition to the COS Rating Descriptor the following question is also required: "Has my child shown any new skills or behaviors related to this area since the last summary?" "Yes, No or Not Applicable?" When developing an initial IFSP and completing the COS entry, the answer to the question is "not applicable" since the child has not yet received early intervention services. At annual reviews and at exit this yes/no question must be answered.

Prior to FFY 2015, the COS was only required at entry into and exit from the program, with best practice guidance 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 be completed at every annual IFSP review. The revised IFSP process and online tool now require the entire Assessment Section of the IFSP to be updated and completed at every annual evaluation, along with completing a COS interim and/or exit rating. Additional guidance has been provided in the MITP IFSP Process and Document Guide and an updated version of the COS Technical Assistance Bulletin. These resources are posted on the MSDE website.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

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

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year's response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group)

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

Beginning with the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2024, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, States must include race and ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2006	Target>=	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	93.00%
A	76.00%	Data	98.18%	97.91%	97.52%	96.65%	96.74%
B	2006	Target>=	85.60%	87.80%	90.00%	92.50%	92.50%
B	74.00%	Data	97.74%	98.05%	97.88%	95.93%	96.41%
C	2006	Target>=	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.00%

C	81.00 %	Data	97.88%	98.31%	98.15%	96.25%	97.06%
---	---------	------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A>=	94.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.50%	97.00%
Target B>=	94.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.50%	97.00%
Target C>=	94.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.50%	97.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	11,021
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	3,632
Survey Response Rate	32.96%
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	3,453
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	3,579
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	3,403

B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	3,527
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	3,392
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	3,490

Measure	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	96.74%	94.00%	96.48%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	96.41%	94.00%	96.48%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	97.06%	94.00%	97.19%	Met target	No Slippage

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

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

Survey Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Survey Response Rate	19.47%	32.96%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

For FFY 2021, families had the opportunity to complete the survey in English or Spanish online to provide families additional methods of completing the survey. 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 so that the state could examine representativeness of survey respondents.

The State has also implemented a bilingual telephone and email help desk for parents for the duration of the survey.

These strategies will continue for FFY 2022.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Between FFY 2005-08, an average 6,699 surveys were distributed annually. During the subsequent four years, the average number of surveys increased to 8,598. From FFY 2013-15, the average number of surveys distributed increased to 9,457. One reason for the observed growth in survey distribution is Maryland's implementation of the Extended IFSP Option in FFY 2009, a programmatic change that increased the overall population of eligible children in the state. From FFY 2016-2018, the average number of surveys distributed increased again to 10,703. In FFY 2019, there was a slight dip again back to 9,769 and in FFY 2020 rose back up to 10,881. The reason for the decrease in 2019 and could have been due to COVID protocols and parents making different educational decisions for their children during that time, as we see this correcting to previous levels for FFY 2020 and 2021.

From 2005-08, the average response rate was 23.6%. In the following four years, 2009-12, the response rate grew to 43.3%. From 2013 to the present, the average response rate increased more gradually to 46.0% in 2016-17. In 2017-18 we had a decline of 9.8% in responses from the previous year, but in 2018-19 we had an increase of 3.9 percentage points. The 2019-20 response rate of 17.3% (a sharp decrease of 22.8 percentage points) was most

likely due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the difference in the process for distribution and collection of surveys and how counties have had to adjust when offering services. The 2020-21 year saw a 2.4 percentage point increase and the 2021-22 year saw a more substantial 13.5 percentage point increase which is most likely due to relaxing COVID restrictions and parents receiving more services in the ways they were used to prior to the pandemic.

The State continues to focus on increasing response rates to minimize nonresponse bias, overrepresentation, and underrepresentation by analyzing response rates over time. For example, the State analyzed the response rate by demographic variables, jurisdictional response rates (LITPs), and response rates depending on method of completion (paper vs. online survey).

The State has identified several strategies to increase response rates and to minimize nonresponse bias, overrepresentation, and underrepresentation. This include:

- Providing the survey in English and in Spanish;
- Providing multiple methods to complete the survey (paper and online);
- Providing multiple options to deliver the survey (mail, hand delivery, email);
- Providing Family Survey Dashboards to each LITP with response rate information and data;
- Implementing a bilingual telephone and email help desk for parents; and
- Requiring Improvement Plans for LITPs with response rates lower than the state mean.

Improvement Plans require a Root Cause Analysis to determine which groups are underrepresented, why they are underrepresented, and strategies to increase the responsiveness amongst underrepresented groups. Improvement Plans for FFY 2021 Family Survey data will be due in early Spring 2023 so that additional strategies will be in place for the FFY 2022 Family Survey data collection.

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

A demographic group is classified as being overrepresented in the respondent sample if the percentage of that group in the sample is greater than its percentage in the population by at least 3 percentage points. Similarly, a demographic group is classified as being underrepresented in the sample if the difference between the percentage of that group in the sample is less than its percentage in the population by 3 percentage points or more.

The two racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (43.4%) and Black or African American children (24.6%). With regard to race/ethnicity, parents of White children were overrepresented by 4.8 percentage points. Black or African Americans and Hispanic or Latina survey respondents were underrepresented by 5.5 and 4.1 percentage points, respectively.

17 jurisdictions (71% of all local jurisdictions) achieved an adjusted response rate of at least 33.3%, and 23 jurisdictions (96% of all local jurisdictions) achieved a response rate of at least 20%. While in most jurisdictions the percentage of survey respondents were representative of the number of active and eligible students, five (5) jurisdictions were underrepresented, three of which had an underrepresentation of 3 percentage points or more, which is similar to previous years. On the other hand, nine (9) jurisdictions were over represented in survey responsiveness, two of which had an overrepresentation of 3 percentage points or more.

The most common disability eligibility category evident in the MITP population is a developmental delay of at least 25%, with 73.6% of the population reporting this disability. The second most common disability eligibility category statewide is a physical or mental condition with a high-probability of developmental delay (19.9% of the population). The third category, atypical development or behavior, constitutes 6.5% of the population. Overall, the sample was under-representative (by 5.8 percentage points) of the population with regard to exceptionalities/disabilities for children at least 25% delays.

The survey was fairly representative across all key respondent demographic variables, although not fully representative (as indicated above). The State continues to make efforts to ensure a representative sample. LITPs with low response rates are required to complete and submit an Improvement Plan detailing the efforts, root causes of the discrepancy and strategies, based on each school system's unique needs, to raise the response rates.

Overall, 2,258 paper surveys were completed (62.2% of all surveys), while 1,374 surveys were completed online (37.8%). Comparatively, in FFY 2018, 92.2% of all surveys were completed on paper, whereas 7.8% of surveys were completed online. The increase from 7.8% to 37.8% of families using the online option helps demonstrate the usefulness of this strategy towards ensuring representativeness across the state. Without the online option, the state's overall response rate may have been considerably smaller.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

For the purpose of determining representativeness, a demographic group is classified as being overrepresented in the respondent sample if the percentage of that group in the sample is greater than its percentage in the population by at least 3 percentage points. Similarly, a demographic group is classified as being underrepresented in the sample if the difference between the percentage of that group in the sample is less than its percentage in the population by 3 percentage points or more. Differences of 3 percentage points or more, indicates areas in which the characteristics of children of parents or guardians who responded to the survey are different from the statewide population. If the difference between the sample and the statewide estimate is less than 3 percentage points in either direction, the respondent sample is not significantly different from the statewide population.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

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

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

4 - OSEP Response

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.24%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	1.53%	1.54%	1.55%	1.56%	1.56%
Data	1.59%	1.53%	1.68%	1.60%	1.14%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	1.58%	1.59%	1.60%	1.61%	1.62%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/06/2022	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	871
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021	06/28/2022	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	66,594

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
871	66,594	1.14%	1.58%	1.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 Pandemic resulted in a significant decrease in the number of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program. To remediate this trend, the State has increased its child find efforts, including the development of new public awareness announcements and has since seen the number of infants and toddlers enrolled to increase from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021.

The COVID-19 Pandemic has not impacted the State's ability to analyze or report on this Indicator.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	2.88%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	3.15%	3.20%	3.25%	3.30%	3.30%
Data	3.68%	3.86%	3.99%	4.24%	3.40%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	3.50%	3.75%	4.00%	4.25%	4.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special

education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/06/2022	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	8,539
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021	06/28/2022	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	208,241

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
8,539	208,241	3.40%	3.50%	4.10%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The COVID-19 Pandemic has not impacted the State's ability to analyze or report on this Indicator.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	92.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.53%	97.16%	95.94%	97.60%	98.46%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
7,637	11,400	98.46%	100%	96.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

One LITP is responsible a large percentage of the slippage from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021. This LITP, who achieved 100% compliance in FFY 2020, only achieved 62% compliance in FFY 2021. The major reason for noncompliance in this jurisdiction was cited as staff availability and vacancies. If, however, this jurisdiction had achieved 100% compliance like in FFY 2020, the state's data would have been 97.86%.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

3,413

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Reasons for delay included exceptional family circumstances, including parent/child unavailability and parent request (3,413), and noncompliance, including staff unavailability, staff illnesses, and administrative errors, (350).

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

State database

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

Data for Indicator 7 include all eligible children that were referred between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022.

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

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

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

In FFY 2009, the MSDE redesigned Maryland's IFSP and Online IFSP Database. The major focus of the redesign was to create a more family-focused document. The revised Online IFSP Database gives users the ability to complete the IFSP online with IFSP data being entered directly into the database. This process helped to decrease data entry errors by data entry staff. In FFY 2018, the Maryland IFSP and Maryland Online IFSP Data System underwent major revisions, including usability of the online tool to support compliance and results. The revised data system includes a dashboard display of important information needed by service coordinators, service providers, and data managers to manage their workload and achieve program objectives.

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

Information that is found on the dashboard includes:

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

At the systemic level, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified nine (9) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance (achieved 100%). To verify the correction of FFY 2020 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state's data system, from data subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP identified with noncompliance in FFY 2020 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of new data subsequently reviewed regarding additional infants and toddlers who had an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2020, there were 135 individual-level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that did not have an initial evaluation, initial assessment, and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that initial evaluations, assessments and IFSP meetings were provided for all 135 children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records of additional children were compliant. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each individual child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the 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)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	97.60%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	99.82%	99.93%	99.77%	99.14%	97.26%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

NO

If no, please explain.

The State's data also include children with transition steps and services added to the IFSP outside of the specified timeline as a result of documented delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances. Data also include 20 children, who had transition steps and services added to their IFSP, but late due to noncompliance. The primary reason indicated for incidences of noncompliance was administrative error. The data also includes two (2) children who did not have transition steps and services added to their IFSP as a result of parent refusal to participate in an IFSP meeting to develop outcomes and one (1) child who did not have transition steps and services added to his/her IFSP as a result of administrative error. The child left the Infants and Toddlers Program prior to noncompliance being identified so correction for that child could not occur.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3,853	4,598	97.26%	100%	99.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

724

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

IFSP transition services that were provided untimely were either due to exceptional family circumstances, including parent request or late referrals, or noncompliance, including staff errors and administrative delays, as described in detail above. Administrative error was the primary reason cited for noncompliance.

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

State database

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

Data reported for Indicator 8A were based on a database review of Early Intervention records of all children who transitioned between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022.

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 continue to present.

In FFY 2021, the MSDE generated state and local reports throughout the reporting period from the statewide Part C database, and validated data in conjunction with LITPs. The statewide database comprises every IFSP, including the Transition Outcomes (Steps and Services) information for all eligible children in Maryland. Once the reports are generated, local programs are asked to validate missing or unclear data before the reports are rerun and finalized.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

At the systemic level, the MSDE, DEI/SES identified eleven (11) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance (achieved 100%). To verify the correction of FFY 2020 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state's data system, from data subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to determine if those records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP

identified with noncompliance in FFY 2020 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected whether additional infants and toddlers had an IFSP developed with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2020, there were 101 individual-level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that did not have an IFSP developed with transition steps and services at least 90 days and not more than nine (9) months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that transition steps and services were added to the IFSP for 100 children.

As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records on new children were compliant. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each individual child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

One (1) child left the Infants and Toddlers Program prior to noncompliance being identified so correction for that child could not occur.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the 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)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	98.90%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4,598	4,598	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of parents who opted out

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

0

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

The state achieved 100% compliance for this indicator. The only delays were due to exceptional family circumstances related to children referred to Part C later. In FFY 2021, 487 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. However, notification still occurred for these children.

Describe the method used to collect these data.

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

Between 7/1/21 and 6/30/22, local school systems and the SEA were notified of all 4,598 children, potentially eligible for Part B, who transitioned during the time period (4,598/4,598). Notification for 4,111 children occurred at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. Another 487 children were found eligible for Part C less than 90 days prior to their third birthday due to later referrals to the program. Notification still occurred for all 4,598 children. Therefore, timely notification to the SEA and LEA (or late notification with a valid reason) occurred for all children potentially eligible for Part B services.

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

NO

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

State database

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

Data include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022.

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 the assignment of Improvement Plans for untimely and/or inaccurate data. Since the MSDE provides these data to the LEA and SEA on a monthly basis, the MSDE ensures notification is provided for every child found eligible for early intervention services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the 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)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}}{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}}{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}}{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B}} \right] \times 100$.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	92.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	99.62%	99.75%	99.38%	99.11%	96.85%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, please explain.

Data include children with documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances, including parent request for delay and child/family unavailable. Data also include 22 children whose transition conferences were held untimely as a result of noncompliance (staff/administrative errors and staff illnesses) and one (1) children who did not have a transition conference as a result of noncompliance. Of the 22 children with untimely transition conferences due to noncompliance, the vast majority of reasons for delay were cited as administrative errors. The child who did not have a transition conference (due to staff/administrative errors) was no longer within the jurisdiction once noncompliance was identified, so a transition conference could not be held.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3,845	4,598	96.85%	100%	99.50%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

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

17

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

713

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Transition Planning Meetings that were provided untimely were either due to exceptional family circumstances (713) or noncompliance (22). Administrative error was the primary reason cited for noncompliance. In addition, there was one (1) child who did not have Transition Planning Meetings due to noncompliance.

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

State database

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

Data include all children who transitioned in the reporting year, from July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022.

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 2021, seventeen (17) families declined or did not make themselves available to participate in a transition planning meeting.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSDE, DEI/SES identified fourteen (14) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance (achieved 100%). To verify the correction of FFY 2020 noncompliance, an updated random sample of early intervention records, using the state's data system, from data subsequent to the issuance of the written finding of noncompliance was reviewed to determine if those new records were compliant. Through this review process, the MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITP identified with noncompliance in FFY 2020 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected regarding additional infants and toddlers who had a transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. These data demonstrated that the LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For FFY 2020, there were 116 individual-level incidences of noncompliance. The MSDE, DEI/SES reviewed the records of each individual child that did not have a transition conference held at least 90 days, and not more than nine (9) months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. Although late, the MSDE, DEI/SES verified that transition conferences were held for 114 children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those additional records were compliant. The two (2) children who did not have a TPM was no longer within the jurisdiction once noncompliance was identified, so transition conferences could not be held. Through the review process, the MSDE verified through its online database that each child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

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

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets

were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Please see attachment

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=					

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were no resolution sessions in FFY 2021.

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=					

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were no mediations held in FFY 2021.

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the five years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

11 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The MITP will substantially increase the rate of growth of positive social-emotional skills in infants, toddlers, and preschool age children (Indicator 3A, Summary Statement #1).

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Four Maryland counties (Cecil, Howard, Montgomery, and Frederick) participate in the SSIP. All children ages birth through age three are included in these analyses from these four counties.

Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/SSIP_Part_C_MITP_Theory_of_Action_MD_2-28-19.pdf

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	47.23%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	59.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Weighted Numerator from 4 SSIP LITPs	Child Count from 4 SSIP LITPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
999	1,799	60.07%	59.00%	55.53%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There are several potential reasons why the State saw slippage in the most recent SSIP year, including:

1. The SiMR data went from 49.7% in 2018/2019 to 54.1% in 2019/2020 and then up to 60.08% in the previous SSIP year (2020/2021). This was almost a 10% increase in the SiMR in two years, and there was an expectation that it may be too large an increase to sustain, and that there would be some regression toward a number more in line with consistent growth. The State will continue to monitor the data to see the direction and trends for the next year to see if the data stabilize.

2. Although there was a drop this year in the SiMR, there was no noticeable drop for any of the intermediate outcome indicators, and in fact a major intermediate outcome of the inclusion of social-emotional outcomes on IFSPs improved for the third year in a row.
3. There were a larger number of children included in the child-counts in the four SSIP counties this year compared to the previous two-years. This may be an effect of COVID, where participation has returned to pre-COVID levels. The State will continue to monitor this over the next year to see if child count is steady going forward and what effect that has on the SiMR.
4. MD also experienced a statewide dip in Indicator 3a Summary Statement #1 in the current year (from 62.48% to 60.13%), showing that in general scores were lower in the State, not just the SSIP counties.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

SiMR data are taken from a subset of the data reported for SPP/APR Indicator 3a Summary Statement 1, which comes from Maryland's IFSP and Online IFSP Database. The weighted numerator is calculated by multiplying the Indicator 3a Summary Statement 1 percentage of each LITP by the LITP's child count and adding the totals together. The weighted numerator is then divided by the total child count of the four (4) SSIP LITPs to obtain the State's SSIP data.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The SiMR data are the weighted mean (by number of children served) of the four SSIP counties Indicator 3a Summary Statement 1 data.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The State continued to see significant progress in an intermediate SSIP outcome related to social emotional development: Data from 1212 IFSPs developed in 2022 were reviewed for social-emotional outcomes related to low COS entry ratings. The State saw an increase from 86% in 2020 to 90% in 2021, and again an increase this year in 2022 to 92%, demonstrating the increased use of outcomes targeting SE outcomes.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

http://mdideareport.org/SupportingDocuments/Part_C_SSSIP_Evaluation_Plan.pdf

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period.

The MSDE Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services (DEI/SES) Strategic Plan, Moving Maryland Forward: Sharpen the Focus (2020), continues to provide a strong foundation and vision supporting the implementation of the SSIP evidence-based practices. The combination of the theory of action and the Strategic Plan together provides for implementation of a seamless and comprehensive statewide system of coordinated services for children with disabilities from birth through kindergarten and their families. The strategic plan includes:

- Strategic collaboration
- Family partnerships
- Data informed decisions
- EBPs
- Professional learning

Professional Learning

-Ongoing professional learning opportunities through State developed resources and technical assistance continue to be implemented with the four SSIP LITPs as well as with Maryland Birth through Kindergarten early intervention and preschool special education leaders and providers, and early childhood stakeholders. The DEI/SES continues to maintain contracts with the University of Maryland School of Social Work (UM-SSW) and the Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE) to support State-level content experts in Reflective Coaching, RbI, and the Pyramid Model. The four SSIP LITPs continue to participate in both ongoing as well as differentiated in-person and virtual professional learning and coaching activities based on identified local program implementation needs.

-The Maryland EI/PSE Personnel Standards continues to require continued ongoing training of all early intervention staff on IFSP development, implementation and evaluation along with documentation in the State-supported database. This year, the State has begun the development of a professional learning module for EI providers targeting social emotional development of infants and toddlers with disabilities. The module will focus on building the capacity of EI providers to coach families in the importance of social emotional learning and readiness for school and community settings beyond the age of 3.

Systems Coaching

-During this year the State continued implementation of Systems Coaching through regional Birth to Kindergarten Liaisons/State Systems coaches. This strategy provides a high level of engagement with all four of the Part C SSIP programs which are identified as being in the Focused Tier of Performance Support within the DEI/SES Differentiated Framework (refer to MD Part C SSIP, Phase III, Year 2 Report pgs. 6-7).

-The DEI/SES also continued to support State-level content experts/coaches, contracted with UM-SSW and JHU/CTE, to provide regular coaching

cycles with local content coaches around the implementation of the Team, Analyze, Plan-Implement, Track (TAP-IT) model, RBI and Pyramid Model.

Evidence-Based Practices

-The SIT and the four LITs continue to work towards full implementation of the targeted evidence-based practices (reflective coaching, RBI, and the Pyramid Model). This year the State contracted with national content experts to provide a cohort of professionals trained in the EBP of reflective coaching. The cohort will receive six months of follow up to achieve fidelity to provide mentor coaching to their local jurisdictions.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Improvement Strategy #1 & #2: Professional Learning/Coaching: Develop a system for PL which includes training, coaching, technical assistance, resource development and information dissemination for implementing evidence-based practices

System Framework: Professional Development and Technical Assistance

The state partners with an external evaluation team to evaluate a number of activities related to PL/Coaching, including tracking of the number and types of professional learning and coaching opportunities provided to SSIP sites, technical assistance activities, the quality, usefulness, and relevancy of those trainings, the number and types of SSIP-related resources developed, access to web-based trainings and resources, and change in knowledge. The State has seen continuous growth in almost all areas evaluated, with data reflecting a sustainable system of PL and coaching at the State and district level.

Improvement Strategy #3: Evidence-Based Practices: Implement SSIP evidence-based practices with fidelity: Reflective coaching, Routines-Based Interview, Pyramid Model, Data-informed decision-making

System Framework: Quality Standards, Professional Development

With a concentration on sustainability of the practices within the four sites, MITP has focused on evaluating the number of staff in the SSIP jurisdictions who have received coaching and training on the SSIP EBPs. Staff in all four districts reached the highest levels of personnel who are trained to fidelity or are in training, with all practices being in the full implementation phase. Other evaluation indicators, such as Benchmarks of Quality and impact on IFSP social-emotional planned outcomes show that the improvements made through the EBPs are being reflected in long-term data. The successes shared by the four counties has helped others begin adopting all three evidence-based strategies, which are voluntarily being implemented in various phases by counties throughout the State, helping set the ground for future scale-up.

Improvement Strategy #4: Strategic Collaboration: Using Data-Informed Decisions with engaged stakeholders for continued improvement activities

System Framework: Governance, Data

Collaboration among the SSIP sites and within each site are managed by the State and Local Implementation Teams (SITs and LITs). Data are collected on team collaboration and data-based decision-making using the TAP-IT model, and results show consistently high scores for collaboration and implementation. The SIT used 2021/2022 to look at how the data collected during the previous six years could help inform bringing on board new SSIP jurisdictions, working with the external evaluators and State leadership to determine next steps for expansion of the practices.

Improvement Strategy #5: Family Partnerships integrated into all aspects of the systems change work

System Framework: Quality Standards

Family outcomes data show the states achieve high marks in all of the SSIP jurisdictions. As many of the EBPs focus on the integration of families in the assessment, evaluation, IFSP, and ongoing maintenance process, evaluation data show improved family partnerships and high satisfaction. As the EBPs (i.e., RBI) grow to new SSIP jurisdictions, family involvement will continue to increase, which will be reflected in the data. These successes can then be shared with new counties during scale-up to demonstrate the impact of the EBPs on both children and families.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The next steps for infrastructure improvement will be two-fold and continue to support improvement of social-emotional skills and the mental health of Maryland's infants and toddlers. The first will focus on improving Child Outcomes data through the improvement of data quality, understanding the meaning of the data, and its impact on child and family outcomes. The foundation will be built upon the importance of developing support and a sustainable infrastructure for a process that is implemented with fidelity. Anticipated outcomes include:

- Increasing understanding of what data quality means and its importance
 - Developing a process for improving quality data
 - Using data to develop a process for implementing COS rating with fidelity
 - Meeting State targets for COS and
- Improving the social-emotional and mental health of Infants and Toddlers

The second focus scales the current core of four SSIP LITP sites more broadly across the State. Currently, the technical assistance is provided in a regional model with support to five (5) different areas of the State. The existing SSIP sites represent three (3) of the five (5) areas. The plan for scaling up includes at a minimum the two (2) regions not represented and at least one additional site. The current SIT has started developing a plan for determining readiness and interest. The current SSIP LITPs will continue their current work with the EBPs, with diminishing support from the MSDE liaisons. In addition, they will serve in a mentor/leadership capacity to new LITPs. Anticipated outcomes include:

- Increasing participation in the State Implementation Team by four (4) LITPs
- Newly identified LITPs will have the capacity to provide ongoing support to implement identified Evidence-Based Practices and measure child outcomes with fidelity
- Current participating LITPs will continue to focus attention on improving the fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices while scaling their practices across the LITP as well as through preschool, strengthen their infrastructure support to function with diminishing support from the MSDE liaison, and utilize their experience and capacity to serve in a mentor/leadership role in support of the newly added LITPs
- Stronger awareness of the Evidence-Based Practices and the process for braiding and implementing them with fidelity

The 2021/2022 SSIP years was devoted to developing a plan to help select and onboard new jurisdictions. In particular, the State attended to:

- Reviewing the previous six-years of SSIP data to determine the following factors:
 1. Which of the three EBPs was easiest to implement? Most difficult? (Based on data on training and scale-up)
 2. How long did it take to implement the three practices in the current jurisdictions?
 3. What data helped to show success of implementation?
- Devoting focused time at SIT meetings to develop an application for new jurisdictions (see below)
- Reviewing data from non-SSIP counties to determine readiness for participation and implementation of the EBPs

List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period:

Reflective Coaching
Routines-Based Interview (RBI)
The Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence in Infants and Young Children

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

Reflective Coaching is an evidence-based practice that when used in early childhood programs fosters a provider's ability to set appropriate goals, process and integrate feedback. It also builds capacity of the family and caregivers providing them with the skill and knowledge to foster the child's growth and development.

Routines-Based Interview is a structured interview process that provides a rich depth of understanding of the child and family's functioning, leading to a positive relationship between provider, family, and child. Functional and realistic child and family outcomes result from this interview process.

The Pyramid Model is a research-based practice that has shown evidence for promoting young children's social and emotional skills and decreasing a child's challenging behavior.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practices and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child/outcomes.

The Part C State Implementation Team and the four Local Implementation Teams continue full implementation of the targeted evidence-based practices including Reflective Coaching, Routines-Based Interview, and the Pyramid Model to support the social-emotional and mental health of Maryland's Infants and Toddlers. Systemically, the use of Implementation Science and the TAP-IT model will continue to provide the foundation to support the adoption, integration, and sustainability of the identified evidence-based practices. As the four SSIP LITPs, in collaboration with the State, have worked to install, implement, and scale-up evidence-based practices, fidelity of implementation continues to grow. Maryland continues to engage in a "Regionalization for Results" model to support the implementation of the MSDE DEI/SES strategic plan. This model offers opportunities to share the journey and successes realized from the intentional planning and implementation of the evidence-based practices within the SSIP jurisdictions with the State Part C leaders. These professional learning opportunities have sparked interest and implementation of the practices across the State of Maryland. Individual locals have progressed to full implementation of the EBPs. The continuing improvement and model results of the four SSIP LITPs and the acknowledgement of the potential for program improvement to meet the needs of children and their families will continue to provide data regarding the overall impact and long-term results of the Part C SSIP work. This work has a direct impact on the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) which measures the overall impact and long-term results of the Part C SSIP work.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Every year, the MITP works with an external evaluator to collect and report on the progress of the implementation and outcomes. Below is a summary of the major evaluation activities and findings for the current SSIP year.

- Since 2017, MD has used a standardized tool to address performance related to implementation of Pyramid Model components at the program level, the Pyramid Model Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ). More than 85% of the indicators are partially or fully in place in all four jurisdictions.
- To determine if the evidence-based RBI assessment process was more likely to be used in the SSIP counties vs. other assessments, data from 3073 initial IFSPs were reviewed and an RBI was used in the assessment process 70% of the time, an improvement over last year (69%) and an increase from 51% in 2020.
- Since 2017, the MITP has distributed the Coaching Feedback Questionnaire to local level content coaches to evaluate the effectiveness of State coaching support. The 2017-2021 data reflect consistently high levels of support and satisfaction, with over 90% of respondents reporting that the support has helped improve implementing the various EBPs with fidelity. The survey was discontinued in this SSIP year but will be incorporated into the evaluation plan for new jurisdictions.
- The State tracks the number of EI providers in each of the counties who are in training or have been trained to fidelity in 2020. Three of the four counties have over 95% of their providers in training or trained to fidelity in RBI, with the fourth over 84%.
- In March of 2018, the MITP State Implementation Team conducted the initial TAP-IT Fidelity Assessment based on reflection of their team's progress-to-date and the extent to which the data-informed decision-making process (TAP-IT) is being implemented, and has been seeing progress as a highly-functioning team each year.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

As stated above, the SIT worked with the external evaluators to review the previous year's SSIP data, as well as historical SSIP data from the previous six years to determine how to expand the practices across the State. Additional data were collected on the non-SSIP sites to help determine potential readiness for participation. Some of the data reviewed by the SIT were the size of the non-SSIP jurisdictions, any existing efforts to implement the three EBPs (e.g., RBI), and current SiMR outcome data.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

State implementation Team partners, as well as the DEI/SES will continue to focus on moving toward full implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs) to support child and family success across Maryland. The State Implementation Team partners and national experts will continue to provide

professional learning opportunities during monthly SIT meetings. Topics will include family engagement, implementation of the Pyramid Model to support children with social/emotional, and behavioral challenges including training on; the Early Interventionist Pyramid Model Practices Fidelity Instrument (EIPPF) and Facilitating Attuned Interaction (FAN), Reflective Coaching, Routines-Based Interview, COS data analysis, age-anchoring, and virtual intervention. Based upon ongoing progress, next steps for the local level will include local growth with a focus on strengthening the current implementation practices as well as scaling up the integration of EBPs into preschool. At the State level, the DEI-SES liaisons will continue to provide individualized monthly technical assistance to each of the LITPs with a specific focus on their identified individual needs. In addition, the DEI/SES leadership will continue to offer monthly virtual meetings with national and State updates, providing universal resources in the form of Technical Assistance Bulletins, Q & As, and Hot Topics documents. Scaling the current evidence-based practices beyond the four SSIP jurisdictions will be the goal of the State leadership in collaboration with the current locals and State Implementation Team partners. The eligibility process will include determining the interest on the part of the LITP, evaluation of current EBP implementation, and a determination of readiness to move forward with integrating practices that will support the eligibility process.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The State is planning on expanding the reach of the SSIP EBPs in 2022/2023 to include 2-4 new sites so that all five regions of the State are represented, and the practices continue to grow as anticipated. The success of both implementation and outcomes for the original four LITPs has helped to make the rest of the State aware of the EBPs and many are eager to join the expansion. The SIT worked the previous year with the State leadership team to review data and develop a strategy for adding new sites and moving current sites to maintenance/sustainability and mentorship role. The SIT developed an application for new sites who are interested in participation in order to help the SIT determine who may be most ready to implement the EBPs, as well as to identify counties who are especially in need of the EBPs based on outcome data. The application contained:

- Description of the SSIP State Implementation Team
- Period of commitment and timeline for activities
- Responsibilities of jurisdictions for mentorship/leadership capacity
- Responsibilities of the MSDE Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services
- Description of use of funds
 - Required application components including District Implementation Team contact information, narrative responses, and letters of support
- Data required of applicant district: which EBPs the district implements, degree of implementation for each EBP, number of staff trained to fidelity on EBPs, familiarity with Implementation Science
- Overview of the review and selection process

The following activities will occur in 2022/2023:

1. One to four new SSIP sites will apply and be selected
2. New sites will begin to develop implementation and evaluation plans (with external evaluators)
3. New sites will develop infrastructure plans to implement EBPs (e.g. professional development, fiscal)
4. Updated evaluation plan submitted to OSEP for review
5. Updated SiMR submitted to OSEP for review

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The IDEA requires each State to establish a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The Maryland SICC is a Governor-appointed council that advises and assists the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program to ensure that a comprehensive delivery system of integrated Early Intervention services is available to all eligible infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families. Composition of the SICC made up of stakeholders from across the state and the demographic representation is aligned with state demographics. The SICC advises the State on unmet needs of students with disabilities, including the development of evaluations, reports, and/or corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring, and implementing policies and procedures to coordinate services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children with disabilities.

The Assistant State Superintendent of DEI/SES met with the SICC during all five meetings during FFY 2021. SICC members were informed of the Divisions' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2021, 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, LITP Directors, preschool coordinators/directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SESAC meetings. On January 5, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, the MSDE began discussions about new targets with stakeholders at numerous state-facilitated meetings. These meetings include, but are not limited to, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (MDAAP) Monthly Meeting (October 5, 2021), the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Meetings (October 7, 2021 and December 2, 2021), the State Implementation Team Meeting (October 8, 2021), the Local Directors Hot Topics Webinar (November 10, 2021), the Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) Meetings (November 17, 2021 and January 28, 2022), and the Early Childhood Hot Topics and Funding Webinar (December 1, 2021). The December 2, 2021 SICC and January 28, 2022 SESAC included full presentations of APR data as well as information on setting new targets for the FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 APRs.

In addition to meetings, the MSDE created two SPP/APR Stakeholder Surveys (one for Part B and one for Part C) to obtain stakeholder feedback regarding proposed SPP/APR targets. Target Surveys were provided broadly to stakeholders of the early intervention and special education system in Maryland, including the Local Infants and Toddlers Program Directors, Local Preschool Coordinators, Local Special Education Directors, Parents Place of Maryland, SICC, SESAC, and Education Advocacy Coalition (EAC). Each individual/agency was asked to disseminate the surveys to their stakeholders as well, thus ensuring the State obtained as much feedback from stakeholders as possible. Feedback from stakeholders was received through January 10, 2022. After surveys were collected and analyzed, revisions to MSDE-proposed targets were made and the final proposed targets were provided/presented to the SICC, SESAC, and other stakeholders. These targets were ultimately included in the FFY 2020 APR.

For FFY 2021, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2021, the MSDE provided information and preliminary data on the Part C APR indicators, including the State's SSIP, and multiple opportunities for questions, comments, and recommendations from a broad range of stakeholders including the SICC, LITP directors, and local special education directors. During the reporting period, updates on SPP/APR federal reporting requirements and State and local performance data were provided at SICC meetings. On January 6, 2023, the draft FFY 2021 APR and data were presented to the SICC. Current data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership Conversations for Solutions meetings on August 5, 2021 and August 9, 2022. A full presentation of FFY 2021 APR data occurred at the December 14, 2022 Conversations for Solutions meeting. These meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, service providers, advocates and parents.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The State continues to involve stakeholders at all levels to support the implementation of the SSIP and to guide efforts for scale-up of EBPs statewide. Internal MSDE and DEI/SES teams (refer to MD Part C SSIP, Phase III, Year 2 Report pgs. 29-30) continue to support the alignment of the Part C SSIP work with the MSDE DEI/SES strategic plan and with Part B SSIP efforts. As the DEI/SES has continued its work with various contractual partners and the Division of Early Childhood, the quarterly meetings, that began in Year 3, have strengthened the implementation of EBPs within the MSDE and across Institutes of Higher Education. The MSDE EBP Collaborative Partners include representatives from the UM-SSW, JHU/CTE, Frostburg College, Parents Place of Maryland, and the Division of Early Childhood at the MSDE. While the purpose of these meetings is to update the team on relevant work, it also serves as a vehicle for exploration and problem-solving around how to best integrate the work across EBPs, other Divisions within MSDE, and personnel preparation programs. This collaboration across contractual partners and grantees supports not only the Part C SSIP work but the overall work of early childhood special education in the State.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

This year, the MSDE DEI/SES experienced a shift in leadership infrastructure and added new team members to the Division to take over leadership of the SSIP. When new leadership conducted SIT meetings, stakeholders raised concerns around the length of commitment on the SSIP. Current sites have been involved in the SIT for seven years. Site leaders expressed concerns about the time commitment and felt that they have reached full implementation of the EBPs over this period of time. They now want to transition to a different role within the SSIP and feel the need for the SIT to expand to new sites. As a result, the group discussed the addition of new sites and the role of the current sites as mentor leaders to the current sites.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Although mentioned above, MSDE will be engaging in a process in the upcoming SSIP year to add additional sites to the Plan, in order to help expand the success of the implementation of the chosen Evidence-Based Practices listed above. In particular, MDSE plans to:

- Choose new sites through an application process developed by the current SSIP sites;
- Begin infrastructure and data assessment in the newly selected sites to determine the areas of greatest need;
- Help the new sites set-up Local Implementation Teams (LITs), and training structures to ensure a successful PD structure in each of the new sites;
- With the help of external evaluators, a new Evaluation Plan will be developed which will outline the data that are to be collected and the outcomes and impact anticipated;
- Review the current Theory of Action and Logic Model to ensure relevancy and update as needed;
- Engage stakeholders in a process to determine a new SiMR; and
- Create a mentorship program where current SSIP sites mentor new SSIP sites.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Based on the activities outlined above, MSDE is proposing the following timeline and outcomes:

January-March 2023 – New sites completed applications, which are reviewed by the SIT, and 1-4 new sites will be chosen.

April-June 2023 – New sites begin using self-assessments to determine readiness for PD and EBP implementation. Sites begin to set-up training structures and creating their Local Implementation Teams (LITs). The 1-4 new sites will have a plan in place to begin training in implementing the EBPs, including fidelity measures. The external evaluators will begin working with the new sites to develop an Evaluation Plan. The SIT will work with the 1-4 new sites to review the Theory of Action and Logic Model for potential revisions based on the addition of the new sites. Mentoring begins between the new sites and the existing SSIP sites.

June 2023-August 2023 – MSDE will engage SSIP stakeholders (including the SIT, LITs, ICC, and other state-wide boards) to help in determining an updated SiMR to reflect the addition of the new sites. One of the considerations proposed to stakeholders will be to use the Statewide data as the SiMR going forward since the practices have begun to saturate throughout the State, and impact at this point may be best seen through a Statewide SiMR.

September 2023-October 2023 (end of SSIP year) – The new sites will begin training staff in the EBPs and the new sites will be integrated in to the SIT meetings as existing sites move to the mentorship roll. It is expected that the 1-4 new sites will be operational by November 1st, 2023, collecting data on implementation and impact.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

The MSDE DEI/SES experienced several shifts in staffing and leadership infrastructure this year. As a result, we have sought to maintain consistency in the SSIP SIT and held meetings regularly throughout the year. When new leadership took over, a conversation was held to address the concerns of the group and develop a plan moving forward. Currently, the SIT is moving forward with the scale-up of the SSIP based on the input of the SIT so that new jurisdictions may implement EBPs and benefit from the mentorship of jurisdictions that have gone through the process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP's Required Actions to the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required the State to make available the attachment(s) not posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter. The State has not publicly posted the attachment(s).

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

Brian Morrison

Title:

Branch Chief, Policy and Accountability

Email:

brian.morrison@maryland.gov

Phone:

410-767-0863

Submitted on:

04/25/23 9:24:35 AM