

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

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

For reporting on
FFY 2022

Maryland



PART C DUE
February 1, 2024

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), twenty-four (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. 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 into 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 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 ensuring 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 infants and toddlers programs. The DEI/SES has developed a tiered system of general supervision and performance support, the Differentiated Framework, to identify systems and agencies in need of differentiated support and TA.

The Differentiated Framework includes tiers of general supervision and engagement (Universal, Targeted, Focused, and Intensive) 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
Data on Processes and Results
Improvement, Correction, Incentives, & Sanctions

The DEI/SES has aligned its general supervisory responsibilities with engagement for performance support and TA to provide a tiered system of monitoring and support 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 DEI/SES is committed to maintaining compliance and providing support 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, monitoring findings 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.

The 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 are 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 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.

A 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 Improvement Plan (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 three years.

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 meets 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. 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 bi-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 the provision of effective general supervision and oversight. The LITP enters into a formal agreement with MSDE to guide improvement and may have additional sanctions. MSDE may direct, recover, or withhold State or federal funds. Comprehensive monitoring for LITPs in the Intensive Tier occurs annually.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part C requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

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, Elevate Maryland's Performance System utilized for comprehensive monitoring, 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/monitoring of Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs). Because IFSPs are entered into the Maryland Online IFSP database by 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 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. LITPs are 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 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 that 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 a 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 and guidance provided through OSEP QA 23-01. 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). 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 – a 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 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 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 often lead to targeted monitoring in a specific jurisdiction or across the entire state.

Targeted TA and Support

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (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 and guidance provided through OSEP QA 23-01.

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, 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 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 the TAP-IT 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 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 including 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://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/imce/documents/NIRN%20Hexagon%20Discussion%20Analysis%20Tool%20v2.2.pdf>). Based on the data analysis, plans are created, and resources are aligned to narrow the achievement gap. Strategic, Measurable, Attainable, Results-based and Time-bound (SMART) goals - and ideas for sharing success and replication are included in developed plans.

Implement: The plan is implemented with the support 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, Maryland's Early Intervention & Preschool Special Education System Personnel Standards, 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 Support 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.

MSDE supports TAP-IT to assist jurisdictions in aligning local CSPD Plans with conclusions drawn from the review and analysis of the Early Intervention and Preschool Personnel Standards 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 professional learning topics reflecting the results of the Personnel Development Strategies within the EIPP, the required Early Intervention and Preschool Personnel Standards report, 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 2022 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 TA 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 its 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 for Providing Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments, 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(l) 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, 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.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

80

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. Non-member 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 forty-three (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 serves on each Team.

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

This team advances technical assistance activities that 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 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 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);

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 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.

In addition, MSDE has convened an ongoing Special Education Workgroup to discuss and make recommendations on instruction and services for students with disabilities. Workgroup meetings are held approximately once per month, and each meeting includes a dedicated time for public comment during which parents of students with disabilities in Maryland have the opportunity to provide their input. Parents are also engaged as members of the workgroup, with four (4) parents of students with disabilities currently serving as members.

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 to facilitate knowledge of the State's early intervention and special education system, as well as to build the 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>

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. 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 the 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.

Through a DEI/SES grant, the MCF provides training programs aimed at promoting family/school partnerships and empowering 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 FLI program, MCF seeks to 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 and various stakeholders. This diverse group of parents and stakeholders advises 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 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>. In 2023 the DEI/SES developed a Parent Information Series: <https://marylandpublicschools.org/programs/Pages/Special-Education/FSDR/ParentInformationSeries-2.aspx>. Each Series document has been translated into twenty-four (24) languages to help ensure parent access to information.

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, as they are utilized to address hot topics or immediate concerns or initiatives. SICC, SESAC, and EAC meetings occur 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 hosts family support conferences and webinars. These meetings are attended by parents and family support professionals. Below are examples of topics discussed at Family Support Conferences/webinars during the FFY 2022 and FFY 2023:

Tri-annual reviews with all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Local Family Support Coordinators

Data highlight review with each LEA;

Parent/Family Survey report and discussions;

Family Engagement strategies;

Early Intervention support and resources;

Components of IEP Goals;

Parent Information Guides;

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;

Grant reviews and technical assistance;

Resources for: Autism Waiver; Community Mediation Maryland; Developmental Disabilities Administration; and Pathfinders information through local agencies;

Review of Parental Rights Maryland's Procedural Safeguards Notice Document;

Compensatory Education/Recovery Services Topics;

Restraint and Seclusion;

Family Engagement Core Competencies;

Dispute resolution;

Autism Waiver;

Facilitated IEP Meetings;

Community Organizations that Support Families in Special Education and the community

Agencies that support families – DDA;

K- grade 2 suspensions;

Threat Assessments; and

Student Removals from the school setting.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the setting targets, 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 stakeholders (including parents, advocacy groups, Maryland's PTI Center, SICC, SESAC, EAC, and Program Directors/Coordinators, etc.). The final FFY 2022 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 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

As required in the IDEA of 2004, MSDE reported to the public on its FFY 2021 (July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022) 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 2022 (July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023). 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, 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 2021 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 2022 APR will be included on this website shortly after the State's submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2024. 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 Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. § 303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency's submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State's SPP/APR documents.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.86%	98.07%	98.35%	99.05%	98.49%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
12,830	15,668	98.49%	100%	96.70%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The total number of individual incidences of noncompliance increased from 227 in FFY 2021 to 517 in FFY 2022. Eleven (11) of twenty-four (24) LITPs experienced a decrease in compliance. 330 (64%) of the 517 incidences of noncompliance were from one (1) of Maryland's largest LITPs. The vast majority of reasons for missed timelines was due to staffing shortages across the state.

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.

2,321

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) (2,321) or noncompliance (517). Staff unavailability (staffing shortages) 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, 2022 to June 30, 2023.

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 with IFSPs (including 3 and 4-year-olds in the Extended IFSP Option) who received early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner between 7/1/2022 and 6/30/2023, 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 newly added service 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. 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. 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 2,321 children whose service initiation date exceeded 30 days from the parental consent 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 the 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 October 24, 2023, MSDE re-ran the child-level and summary of 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 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 summarized and reported above.

To monitor timely service data, 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, 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 minds 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 MSDE since MSDE no longer has to request information about why these service entry dates were not entered. 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021 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 2021 for this indicator. All findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance. To verify the correction of FFY 2021 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 all LITPs identified with noncompliance in FFY 2021 were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (100% compliance). 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 all LITPs corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

For FFY 2021, there were 227 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 ultimately initiated for all 227 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 and QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state has reported on the correction of noncompliance from FFY 2021 and described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	94.00%	94.00%	94.50%	94.50%	96.00%
Data	97.44%	98.14%	98.53%	99.67%	99.19%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	9,466
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	9,567

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
9,466	9,567	99.19%	96.50%	98.94%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2020	Target>=	62.05%	62.55%	62.55%	62.48%	62.98%
A1	62.48%	Data	61.11%	56.58%	60.89%	62.48%	60.13%
A2	2020	Target>=	60.00%	60.50%	60.50%	43.58%	44.08%
A2	43.58%	Data	53.19%	46.44%	45.81%	43.58%	42.75%
B1	2020	Target>=	66.11%	66.61%	66.61%	64.94%	65.44%
B1	64.94%	Data	66.13%	60.33%	64.43%	64.94%	62.50%
B2	2020	Target>=	54.65%	55.15%	55.15%	40.38%	40.88%
B2	40.38%	Data	49.16%	43.50%	42.76%	40.38%	39.51%
C1	2020	Target>=	72.80%	73.30%	73.30%	65.56%	66.06%
C1	65.56%	Data	68.42%	62.69%	65.95%	65.56%	63.69%
C2	2020	Target>=	49.94%	50.44%	50.44%	40.40%	40.90%
C2	40.40%	Data	45.84%	43.32%	43.20%	40.40%	39.46%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------

Target A1>=	63.48%	63.98%	64.48%	64.98%
Target A2>=	44.58%	45.08%	45.58%	46.08%
Target B1>=	65.94%	66.44%	66.94%	67.44%
Target B2>=	41.38%	41.88%	42.38%	42.88%
Target C1>=	66.56%	67.06%	67.56%	68.06%
Target C2>=	41.40%	41.90%	42.40%	42.90%

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	22	0.38%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,948	34.06%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,430	25.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,683	29.42%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	637	11.14%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	3,113	5,083	60.13%	63.48%	61.24%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,320	5,720	42.75%	44.58%	40.56%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

The State experienced slippage in summary statement 2 for each Indicator 3 subindicators (A2, B2, and C2). This decrease is related to the overall percentage increase in children identified in summary statement 2 (the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in the outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program) for each subindicator. The State believes that the societal impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic may be, at least in part, responsible for the decrease in the percentage of children who exited at age level. National research has indicated that children exposed to isolation and additional layers of stress caused by the pandemic were behind their peers developmentally. This impact is evident in that the largest decrease in summary statement 2 was seen in Outcome A – Social-Emotional Development.

The DEI/SES continues to focus on the 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. 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	24	0.42%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,858	32.48%

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,660	29.02%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,791	31.31%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	387	6.77%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	3,451	5,333	62.50%	65.94%	64.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,178	5,720	39.51%	41.38%	38.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

The State experienced slippage in summary statement 2 for each Indicator 3 subindicators (A2, B2, and C2). This decrease is related to the overall percentage increase in children identified in summary statement 2 (the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in the outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program) for each subindicator. The State believes that the societal impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic may be, at least in part, responsible for the decrease in the percentage of children who exited at age level. National research has indicated that children exposed to isolation and additional layers of stress caused by the pandemic were behind their peers developmentally. This impact is evident in that the largest decrease in summary statement 2 was seen in Outcome A – Social-Emotional Development.

The DEI/SES continues to focus on the 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. 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	21	0.37%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,931	33.76%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,528	26.71%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,992	34.83%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	248	4.34%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	3,520	5,472	63.69%	66.56%	64.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in	2,240	5,720	39.46%	41.40%	39.16%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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	11,172
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.	3,018
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	5,720

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (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 were 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 a 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 scales. 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 to 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).

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed 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/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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2006	Target>=	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%
A	76.00%	Data	97.91%	97.52%	96.65%	96.74%	96.48%
B	2006	Target>=	87.80%	90.00%	92.50%	92.50%	94.00%
B	74.00%	Data	98.05%	97.88%	95.93%	96.41%	96.48%
C	2006	Target>=	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.00%	94.00%
C	81.00%	Data	98.31%	98.15%	96.25%	97.06%	97.19%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A>=	95.00%	96.00%	96.50%	97.00%
Target B>=	95.00%	96.00%	96.50%	97.00%
Target C>=	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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	12,100
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	3,636
Survey Response Rate	30.05%
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	3,465
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	3,564
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	3,424
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	3,549
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	3,401
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	3,509

Measure	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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)	96.48%	95.00%	97.22%	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)	96.48%	95.00%	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)	97.19%	95.00%	96.92%	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

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Survey Response Rate	32.96%	30.05%

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.

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. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must 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 category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The two racial groups that account for the largest percentage of the respondent population are parents of White (42.2%) and Black or African American children (28.7%). Parents of White children were overrepresented by 6.3 percentage points, while Black or African American survey respondents were underrepresented by 3.5 percentage points.

The most common exceptionality evident in the MITP population is a developmental delay of at least 25%, with 68.3% of the respondent population reporting this disability. The second most common exceptionality or disability statewide is a physical or mental condition with likely developmental delay (21.9% of the population). The third category of exceptionalities, atypical development or behavior, constitutes 4.9% of the population. Parents of children who have at least 25% Development Delay (DD) were underrepresented by 6.3 percentage points. The second most common exceptionality or disability, physical or mental condition with likely developmental delay, was slightly overrepresented, and the less common atypical development or behavior was slightly underrepresented.

While in most jurisdictions the percentage of survey respondents was representative of the number of active and eligible students, there are two counties where respondents were underrepresented in the sample by more than 3%: Anne Arundel and Montgomery counties. This year, Wicomico County's responses were overrepresented by 3.2 percentage points.

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. (yes/no)

NO

If no, 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, including a root cause analysis and improvement strategies, 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.

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 2022, 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.

In order to improve the response rates of underrepresented groups, the state will continue to require improvement plans for LITPs who demonstrate underrepresentation in survey response rates. Strategies identified in improvement plans for the next reporting period include:

- Incentives to families who complete the survey (e.g., admission to LEA's Family Fun Fest event)
- Early Intervention Coordinators to send emails to service providers and service coordinators to remind them to communicate with families regarding the family survey
- Providing consistent, advanced, and clear communication about the family Survey. In addition to sending messages via Constant Contact and making phone call reminders, sending text messages and adding a session about the Family Survey to the Family Learning Series workshops occurring two months prior to survey distribution.
- Resuming hand-delivery of surveys; providers make an intentional effort to hand-deliver surveys to underrepresented groups.
- Bringing iPads to families' homes to enable families to complete the survey on the iPad. Providers would be available to answer questions without swaying the families in answering the questions.
- Developing a clear script available to providers delineating why it's important that families complete the survey and how completion of the survey will benefit their family and child.

Also, in an effort to increase the response rate of underrepresented populations, the State plans to translate the family survey into 22 non-English languages that are spoken by over 1% of the state.

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 2021 and 2022.

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. In FFY 2022, the State achieved a response rate of 30.05%, a slight decrease from the previous year.

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). In examining whether nonresponse bias was present for groups over- or under-represented in this year's survey, a series of chi square tests were conducted to detect whether these groups' level of agreement across indicators 4a, 4b, and 4c varied significantly from those of other racial groups; this analysis revealed no statistically significant differences supporting a lack of nonresponse bias in this year's results.

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 2022 Family Survey data will be due in early Spring 2024 so that additional strategies will be in place for the FFY 2023 Family Survey data collection in the fall of 2024.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2022 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 2021 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 *EDFacts* Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations. 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	1.54%	1.55%	1.56%	1.56%	1.58%
Data	1.53%	1.68%	1.60%	1.14%	1.31%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	998
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	06/20/2023	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	69,158

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
998	69,158	1.31%	1.59%	1.44%	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 and percentage of infants and toddlers enrolled to increase from FFY 2020 to FFY2022.

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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	3.20%	3.25%	3.30%	3.30%	3.50%
Data	3.86%	3.99%	4.24%	3.40%	4.10%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and

are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	9,567
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	06/20/2023	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	206,762

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
9,567	206,762	4.10%	3.75%	4.63%	Met 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 and percentage of infants and toddlers enrolled to increase from FFY 2020 to FFY2022.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.16%	95.94%	97.60%	98.46%	96.93%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6,929	11,188	96.93%	100%	89.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

The state experienced a significant decrease in compliance for the ability to meet the 45-day timeline in FFY 2022. Decreases in compliance occurred in thirteen (13) of Maryland's twenty-four (24) LITPs. Especially large decreases in compliance were noted in three (3) of Maryland's five (5) largest districts. Districts reported that staffing shortages have created difficulty in meeting timelines.

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.

3,130

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Reasons for delay included exceptional family circumstances, including parent/child unavailability and parent request (3,130), and noncompliance, including staff unavailability, staff illnesses, and administrative errors (1,129).

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, 2022 and June 30, 2023.

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

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 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, 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 Maryland 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 the 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 the ability to drill through to the child's record)
- List of children and their 30-day timelines (with the 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 the 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).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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	8	1	0

FFY 2021 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, MSDE, DEI/SES identified nine (9) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021 for this indicator. Eight (8) of nine (9) findings were corrected within one year of issuing the written finding of noncompliance (achieved 100%). One (1) finding, although late, was subsequently corrected (achieved 100%). To verify the correction of FFY 2021 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, MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that all LITPs identified with noncompliance in FFY 2021 were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. (i.e., achieved 100% compliance). 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 each LITP corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

For FFY 2021, there were 350 individual-level incidences of noncompliance. 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, MSDE, DEI/SES verified that initial evaluations, assessments and IFSP meetings were provided for all 350 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, 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 and QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state has reported on correction of noncompliance from FFY 2021 and described the specific actions that were taken to verify correction.

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.93%	99.77%	99.14%	97.26%	99.54%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 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 thirty (30) 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 include fifty-one (51) children who did not have transition steps and services added to their IFSP as a result of parents declining to make themselves available for an IFSP meeting. During the FFY 2022 clarification period in April 2024, the State was made aware that OSEP considers these incidences of noncompliance. As such, the State will notify each LITP and require correction of noncompliance as detailed in OSEP QA 23-01.

Finally, the data include twenty-five (25) children who did not have transition steps and services added to his/her IFSP as a result of administrative error. The twenty-five (25) children left the Infants and Toddlers Program prior to noncompliance being identified so correction for those children 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4,316	5,289	99.54%	100%	98.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

LITPs reported that increased incidences of noncompliance in FFY 2022, compared to FFY 2021, were primarily the result of staffing shortages.

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.

867

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

IFSP transition services that were provided untimely were either due to exceptional family circumstances, including parent requests 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, 2022 and June 30, 2023.

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

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, MSDE began requiring transition outcomes to be entered directly into the IFSP database. This enabled MSDE to obtain these data through electronic record review beginning in FFY 2011, whereas in prior years 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 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 2022, 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

FFY 2021 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, MSDE, DEI/SES identified six (6) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021 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 2021 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, MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that all LITPs identified with noncompliance in FFY 2021 were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (100% compliance achieved). This was based on a review of updated data subsequently collected on 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 all LITPs corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

For FFY 2021, there were twenty-one (21) individual-level incidences of noncompliance. 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, MSDE, DEI/SES verified that transition steps and services were added to the IFSP for twenty (20) children. One (1) child record was unable to be corrected because the child was no longer in the program when noncompliance was identified.

As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those records on new children were compliant. Through the review process, 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 and QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state has reported on correction of noncompliance from FFY 2021 and described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,289	5,289	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 with this indicator. The only delays were due to exceptional family circumstances related to children referred to Part C later. In FFY 2022, 549 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, MSDE generated monthly reports 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 MSDE is the lead agency and the DEI/SES structure is birth to kindergarten in nature.

Between 7/1/22 and 6/30/23, local school systems and the SEA were notified of all 5,289 children potentially eligible for Part B, who transitioned during the time period (5,289/5,289). Notification for 4,740 children occurred at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. Another 549 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 5,289 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, 2022 - June 30, 2023.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021 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 = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.75%	99.38%	99.11%	96.85%	99.50%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 863 children with documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances, including parent request for delay and child/family unavailable.

Data also include thirty-one (31) children whose transition conferences were held untimely as a result of noncompliance (staff/administrative errors and staff illnesses) and thirty (30) children who did not have a transition conference as a result of noncompliance.

Of the thirty-one (31) children with untimely transition conferences due to noncompliance, the vast majority of reasons for delay were cited as administrative errors. All thirty (30) children who did not have a transition conference due to staff/administrative errors were no longer within the jurisdiction once noncompliance was identified, so transition conferences 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4,314	5,289	99.50%	100%	98.84%	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.

51

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.

863

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Transition Planning Meetings that were provided untimely were either due to exceptional family circumstances (863) or noncompliance (31). Administrative error was the primary reason cited for noncompliance. In addition, there were thirty (30) children 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, 2022 - June 30, 2023.

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 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 2022, fifty-one (51) families declined or did not make themselves available to participate in a transition planning meeting.

To report on Indicator 8C, 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 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).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

MSDE, DEI/SES identified seven (7) findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021 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 2021 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, MSDE, DEI/SES staff verified that the LITPs identified with noncompliance in FFY 2021 were 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 LITPs corrected noncompliance for the system by achieving 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

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

For FFY 2021, there were twenty-three (23) individual-level incidences of noncompliance. 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, MSDE, DEI/SES verified that transition conferences were held for twenty-two (22) children. As mentioned above, a subsequent data set was also reviewed to determine if those additional records were compliant. The one (1) child 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, MSDE verified through its online database that each child identified with noncompliance was corrected consistent with the regulatory requirements and OSEP Memo 09-02 and QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state has reported on the correction of noncompliance from FFY 2021 and described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=				

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were no resolution sessions in FFY 2022.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. 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 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	4
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	1

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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=				

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3	1	4			100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide 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 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 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 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 2020 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 2020 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, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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 (4) Maryland counties (Cecil, Howard, Montgomery, and Frederick) participate in the SSIP. All children aged birth through 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	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Weighted Numerator from 4 SSIP LITPs	Child Count from 4 SSIP LITPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,086	2,006	55.53%	60.00%	54.14%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

1. The SiMR data went from 49.7% in 2018/2019 to 54.1% in 2019/2020 and then up to 60.08% in 2020/2021, which was an almost a 10 percentage point increase in the SiMR in two (2) years. MSDE suspected it might be due to the aftereffects of COVID-19 and its impact, and there was an

expectation that it may not be a true sustainable increase, but rather an artificial one. The 2022/2023 data (54.14%) are very similar to the 2021/2022 data and, therefore, maybe a more accurate reflection of the current State performance on the SiMR. The State will continue to monitor the data to see the direction and trends for the next year to see if the data continue to stabilize and if so if an adjustment in targets may be needed.

2. There has been a trend toward more children included in the child counts in the four SSIP counties, with an increase from 1,542 children included in 2018/2019 to 2,006 children included in 2022/2023, a 30.1% increase in just four years. Further data analysis will be needed to determine if perhaps there are more children with greater needs being identified through child find (which could potentially impact the SiMR), as well as other reasons for the jump in child count.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 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 progress in an intermediate SSIP outcome related to social emotional development:

Data from 1,235 IFSPs developed in calendar year 2023 were reviewed for social-emotional outcomes related to low COS entry ratings. The State saw an increase from 86% in 2020 to 92% in 2022, which stabilized this year at 92%, demonstrating the emphasis of targeting SE outcomes on IFSPs.

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_SSIIP_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.

MSDE Division of Early Intervention/Special Education Services (DEI/SES) Strategic Plan, Moving Maryland Forward: Sharpen the Focus, 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 the 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
- Evidence Based Practices (EBP)
- 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 continue 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 continued work on 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). However, a large part of the work this year of the SIT was to begin to identify and recruit new LITPs to join the SIT and adopt the proven EBPs of the SSIP. Therefore, a significant amount of work occurred in 2023 to begin this process of expansion of the SSIP EBPs to additional counties, which was always the goal of MDSE in this work. The current LITPs participated in the following activities this year related to EBP sustainability:

- Brought in external trainers for Reflective Coaching to help with a Train-the-Trainer model, allowing the sites to continue to train staff internally without having to contract with external trainers each time going forward.
- RBI continued to be supported by the State through training, technical assistance, and regular RBI coaching sessions and chats. These provide opportunities for RBI coaches to learn from one another and share best practices and lessons learned. There were a total of 16 RBI interviewers across the four sites that participated in six virtual coaching sessions with the State-contracted RBI expert/trainer, and four coaches chats (quarterly) that were also well-attended.
- Fidelity is being monitored to the Pyramid Model using a standardized evaluation process throughout the sites, which allows for sustainability of the practice and ensuring that staff are trained effectively and are implementing the practice as designed.
- Several of the LITPs used braided funds to bring on board additional staff to help with social emotional screening and delivery of services. The new staff include a family mental health clinician and child psychologist.

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 and continues to evaluate, where applicable, 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 training, the number and types of SSIP-related resources developed, access to web-based training 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. As MSDE begins to expand the SSIP to additional LITPs, it is working closely with the SIT to determine the most effective way to provide State assistance for training and technical assistance for both infrastructure improvement and EBP implementation to the new SSIP sites once selected. It is expected that the new sites will learn from the current sites through a mentoring process that is being developed by the current SIT.

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 the 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 have helped others begin adopting all three evidence-based strategies, which are voluntarily being implemented in various phases by counties throughout the State. This work has helped in creating the groundwork for additional sites to be selected in 2024 to join the SSIP SIT, and implementing the EBPs with fidelity in 1-2 years (with time allowed for onboarding).

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 historical SiMR and related data (e.g. RBI implementation) to look at how the data collected during the previous six years could help inform bringing on board new SSIP jurisdictions. This work led to the development of an application by the SIT and MSDE leadership, which was sent out to all LITPs in the most recent CLIG (October 2023).

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

System Framework: Quality Standards

Family outcomes data show the states achieved 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. The current SIT is compiling resources that the new SSIP jurisdictions can use 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 the improvement of social-emotional skills and the mental health of Maryland's infants and toddlers. The first will continue the 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 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 data quality
- 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 continues the work that began last year to scale the current core of four SSIP LITP sites more broadly across the State. Currently, 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 two new SSIP sites. The current SIT, in coordination with MSDE leadership, developed an application in 2023 which was sent out to all LITPs in the October 2023 CLIG, with the hope of having 2-4 LITPs show interest. The SIT began this work in early 2023 by creating workgroups to help with the onboarding of the new SSIP sites in 2024. The workgroups included:

- Application Sub-Group: Formed to develop the application parameters, including the types of data that interested LITPs would need to submit with the application.
- Resource Sub-Group: Formed to begin reviewing all of the resources that were used or developed by the four SSIP LITPs over the previous seven years to determine their utility for helping the new SSIP sites with onboarding, infrastructure development, and implementation of EBPs to fidelity.
- Data Collection/Measures Sub-Group: Formed to begin reviewing the data that have been collected since the start of the SSIP and determine what data would be most useful for the new SSIP sites to collect for evaluation and performance purposes.
- SIMR Sub-Group: Formed to begin reviewing data to help make recommendations to MSDE leadership and stakeholders about potential changes to the SIMR.

The next steps for the current SSIP LITPs will be to continue their current work and increase the fidelity of EBPs as they transition outside the SSIP framework, with diminishing support from MSDE liaisons. In addition, they will serve in a mentor/leadership capacity to new LITPs. Anticipated outcomes include:

- Decreasing participation in the State Implementation Team by four (4) LITPs as the new SSIP sites onboard.
- Newly identified LITPs will begin infrastructure development activities to help improve the capacity 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, strengthening their infrastructure support to function with diminishing support from MSDE liaison, and utilize their experience and capacity to serve in a mentor/leadership role in support of the newly added MITPs
- Stronger awareness of Evidence-Based Practices and the process for braiding and implementing them with fidelity

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 the capacity of the family and caregivers providing them 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 the 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 practice 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, the 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 acknowledgment 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 since the start and for the current SSIP year.

- Since 2017, MD has used a standardized tool to address performance related to the 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 3,599 initial IFSPs were reviewed, and an RBI was used in the assessment process 63% of the time, a drop from the last year (70%), however still much higher than when initially measured in 2020 (51%).
- 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 implementation of the various EBPs with fidelity. The survey was discontinued in 2021 after maximum usefulness was determined, but it 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 since 2018. Three of the four counties have over 95% of their providers in training or trained to fidelity in RBI, with the fourth over 80% (due to its larger size and staff turnover).
- In March of 2018, the MITP State Implementation Team conducted the initial TAP-IT Fidelity Assessment based on reflection of their team's progress

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 all EBPs are in place at all four SSIP LITPs, the counties have developed the data collection methods and systems to track the training provided on the EBPs in their jurisdictions. This will allow the LITPs to continue the training and fidelity monitoring for the EBPs once the SSIP support has ended and they have moved to a sustainability phase.

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.

The major focus of the next steps for the EBPs in the next reporting period will be to help the newly identified SSIP LITPs determine 1) which of the three SSIP EBPs they want to implement, and 2) in which order they would like to implement them. One of the lessons learned from the four current SSIP LITPs was that attempting to learn and scale three new practices county-wide was extremely challenging, and that new sites would be better served in selecting a single practice (or two) to concentrate on initially. This will allow for time to begin work with foundation-building, particularly around networks of Professional Development for Training and Technical Assistance for staff. Therefore, the work to scale 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.

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.

As described last year and above, the State is beginning the work to expand the SSIP EBPs to additional Maryland LITPs through an application process that occurred in October 2023. 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

Several applications were received and are currently under review with an anticipated timeline of calendar year 2024 to onboard the 2-4 new sites. Activities in the next reporting period, which began in the current reporting period, including:

1. Two to four new SSIP sites 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
6. Current SSIP sites begin to transition off SIT to mentorship role

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. The composition of the SICC is 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.

DEI/SES staff updated members of the SICC during all five meetings in FFY 2022. SICC members were informed of the DEI/SES' priorities, including but not limited to the State's APR and SSIP. Throughout FFY 2022, 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 LICC meetings. On January 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC.

Stakeholder engagement in Target Setting:

In preparation for submission of the FFY 2020 APR cycle, 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 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, 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 2022, the State is not proposing any revisions to baselines or targets.

Throughout FFY 2022, 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 4, 2024, the draft FFY 2022 APR and data were presented to the SICC. SICC meetings are held virtually and are open meetings to all stakeholders. Data on APR indicators was also presented during the State's leadership meeting on October 17, 2023. Leadership meetings included diverse stakeholders, including early intervention leaders, preschool special education leaders, directors of special education, general education leaders, secondary transition specialists, and service providers.

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 the scale-up of EBP 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 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 MSDE. While the purpose of these meetings is to update the team on relevant work, they also serve 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)

NO

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.

As mentioned above, MSDE will add additional sites to the SSIP in order to help expand the success of the implementation of the chosen Evidence-Based Practices listed above. In particular, MDSE plans to:

- Select 2-4 new SSIP LITPs;
- 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 established SSIP sites mentor new SSIP sites.

This work will be accomplished through the work of the SIT and the workgroups described above.

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 anticipated outcomes. Note that many of these activities are continuing from the previous reporting period due to the extended amount of time it took to develop and distribute the application for new sites.

January-March 2024 – 2-4 new sites selected.

April-June 2024 – New sites begin using self-assessments to determine readiness for PD and EBP implementation. Sites begin to set up training structures and create their Local Implementation Teams (LITs). The 2-4 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 2-4 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-August 2024 – 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-October 2024 (end of SSIP year) – The new sites will begin training staff in the EBP, and the new sites will be integrated into the SIT meetings as existing sites move to the mentorship roll. It is expected that the 2-4 new sites will be operational by November 1st, 2024, collecting data on implementation and impact.

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

MSDE DEI/SES continues to experience 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. It also took longer than expected to develop the application for new SSIP sites, which delayed some of the planned implementation steps for new sites. 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

None

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

Email:

brian.morrison@maryland.gov

Phone:

410-767-0863

Submitted on:

04/22/24 9:13:25 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Maryland

2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
81.25%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	8	5	62.50%
Compliance	16	16	100.00%

2024 Part C Results Matrix

I. Data Quality

(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State's 2021 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e., outcome data)	5,720
Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e., 618 exiting data)	10,403
Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%)	54.98
Data Completeness Score (please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation)	1

(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in your State's FFY 2021 Outcomes Data

Data Anomalies Score (please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation)	2
--	---

II. Child Performance

(a) Data Comparison: Comparing your State's 2022 Outcomes Data to other States' 2022 Outcomes Data

Data Comparison Score (please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation)	1
---	---

(b) Performance Change Over Time: Comparing your State's FFY 2022 data to your State's FFY 2021 data

Performance Change Score (please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation)	1
--	---

Summary Statement Performance	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1 (%)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS1 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS2 (%)
FFY 2022	61.24%	40.56%	64.71%	38.08%	64.33%	39.16%
FFY 2021	60.13%	42.75%	62.50%	39.51%	63.69%	39.46%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part C."

2024 Part C Compliance Matrix

Part C Compliance Indicator (2)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3)	Score
Indicator 1: Timely service provision	96.70%	YES	2
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline	89.91%	YES	2
Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan	98.00%	YES	2
Indicator 8B: Transition notification	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference	98.84%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-C_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for an indicator.

Appendix A

I. (a) Data Completeness:

The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2022 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 data. A percentage for your State was computed by dividing the number of children reported in your State's Indicator C3 data by the number of children your State reported exited during FFY 2022 in the State's FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 Exit Data.

Data Completeness Score	Percent of Part C Children included in Outcomes Data (C3) and 618 Data
0	Lower than 34%
1	34% through 64%
2	65% and above

Appendix B

I. (b) Data Quality:

Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes Data

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2022 Indicator 3 Outcomes Data reported by your State. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2018 – FFY 2021 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C. For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using the publicly available data and a lower and upper scoring percentage was set 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for category a, and 2 standard deviations above and below the mean for categories b through e (numbers are shown as rounded for display purposes, and values are based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). In any case where the low scoring percentage set from 1 or 2 standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2022 data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State's data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a 0 for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomaly score of 0, 1, or 2 is based on the total points awarded.

Outcome A	Positive Social Relationships
Outcome B	Knowledge and Skills
Outcome C	Actions to Meet Needs

Category a	Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning
Category b	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
Category c	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
Category d	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
Category e	Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

Expected Range of Responses for Each Outcome and Category, FFY 2022

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-1SD	+1SD
Outcome A\Category a	1.57	3.26	-1.69	4.83
Outcome B\Category a	1.39	3	-1.6	4.39
Outcome C\Category a	1.26	2.6	-1.33	3.86

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-2SD	+2SD
Outcome A\ Category b	24.07	9.01	6.05	42.08
Outcome A\ Category c	20.96	13.11	-5.27	47.19
Outcome A\ Category d	26.97	9.61	7.74	46.2
Outcome A\ Category e	26.43	15.4	-4.37	57.23
Outcome B\ Category b	25.63	9.71	6.21	45.04
Outcome B\ Category c	29.44	12.56	4.32	54.57
Outcome B\ Category d	31.02	8.11	14.8	47.25
Outcome B\ Category e	12.51	8.23	-3.96	28.98
Outcome C\ Category b	20.98	8.89	3.19	38.76
Outcome C\ Category c	23.49	13.59	-3.68	50.66
Outcome C\ Category d	33.36	8.28	16.8	49.93
Outcome C\ Category e	20.91	15.22	-9.53	51.35

Data Anomalies Score	Total Points Received in All Progress Areas
0	0 through 9 points
1	10 through 12 points
2	13 through 15 points

Anomalies in Your State's Outcomes Data FFY 2022

Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP's Assessed in your State	5,720
--	--------------

Outcome A — Positive Social Relationships	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	22	1,948	1,430	1,683	637
Performance (%)	0.38%	34.06%	25.00%	29.42%	11.14%
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome B — Knowledge and Skills	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	24	1,858	1,660	1,791	387
Performance (%)	0.42%	32.48%	29.02%	31.31%	6.77%
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome C — Actions to Meet Needs	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	21	1,931	1,528	1,992	248
Performance (%)	0.37%	33.76%	26.71%	34.83%	4.34%
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

	Total Score
Outcome A	5
Outcome B	5
Outcome C	5
Outcomes A-C	15

Data Anomalies Score	2
-----------------------------	---

Appendix C

II. (a) Data Comparison:

Comparing Your State's 2022 Outcomes Data to Other States' 2022 Outcome Data

This score represents how your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2022 Outcomes Data. Your State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements for your State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States. The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement (values are based on data for States with a summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned 0, 1, or 2 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned 0 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned 1 point, and if your State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile the Summary Statement was assigned 2 points. The points were added up across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive a total number of points between 0 and 12, with 0 points indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were at or below the 10th percentile and 12 points indicating all 6 Summary Statements were at or above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of 0, 1, or 2 was based on the total points awarded.

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited 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.

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.

Scoring Percentages for the 10th and 90th Percentile for Each Outcome and Summary Statement, FFY 2022

Percentiles	Outcome A SS1	Outcome A SS2	Outcome B SS1	Outcome B SS2	Outcome C SS1	Outcome C SS2
10	45.63%	35.29%	54.05%	27.07%	51.93%	33.56%
90	82.58%	69.37%	81.10%	56.55%	85.30%	71.29%

Data Comparison Score	Total Points Received Across SS1 and SS2
0	0 through 4 points
1	5 through 8 points
2	9 through 12 points

Your State's Summary Statement Performance FFY 2022

Summary Statement (SS)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS1	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS2
Performance (%)	61.24%	40.56%	64.71%	38.08%	64.33%	39.16%
Points	1	1	1	1	1	1

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2(*)	6
---	---

Your State's Data Comparison Score	1
---	---

Appendix D

II. (b) Performance Change Over Time:

Comparing your State's FFY 2022 data to your State's FFY 2021 data

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year's reporting (FFY 2021) is compared to the current year (FFY 2022) using the test of proportional difference to determine whether there is a statistically significant (or meaningful) growth or decline in child achievement based upon a significance level of $p \leq .05$. The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase across the years. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas are totaled, resulting in a score from 0 – 12. The Overall Performance Change Score for this results element of '0', '1', or '2' for each State is based on the total points awarded. Where OSEP has approved a State's reestablishment of its Indicator C3 Outcome Area baseline data the State received a score of 'N/A' for this element.

Test of Proportional Difference Calculation Overview

The summary statement percentages from the previous year's reporting were compared to the current year using an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon a significance level of $p \leq .05$. The statistical test has several steps. All values are shown as rounded for display purposes.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2022 and FFY 2021 summary statements.

e.g., $C3A \text{ FFY}2022\% - C3A \text{ FFY}2021\% = \text{Difference in proportions}$

Step 2: Compute the standard error of the difference in proportions using the following formula which takes into account the value of the summary statement from both years and the number of children that the summary statement is based on

$\text{Sqrt}[(\text{FFY}2021\% * (1-\text{FFY}2021\%)) / \text{FFY}2021N] + ((\text{FFY}2022\% * (1-\text{FFY}2022\%)) / \text{FFY}2022N)] = \text{Standard Error of Difference in Proportions}$

Step 3: The difference in proportions is then divided by the standard error of the difference to compute a z score.

$\text{Difference in proportions} / \text{standard error of the difference in proportions} = z \text{ score}$

Step 4: The statistical significance of the z score is located within a table and the p value is determined.

Step 5: The difference in proportions is coded as statistically significant if the p value is it is less than or equal to .05.

Step 6: Information about the statistical significance of the change and the direction of the change are combined to arrive at a score for the summary statement using the following criteria

0 = statistically significant decrease from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

1 = No statistically significant change

2= statistically significant increase from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

Step 7: The score for each summary statement and outcome is summed to create a total score with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 12. The score for the test of proportional difference is assigned a score for the Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score based on the following cut points:

Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score	Cut Points for Change Over Time in Summary Statements Total Score
0	Lowest score through 3
1	4 through 7
2	8 through highest

Summary Statement/ Child Outcome	FFY 2021 N	FFY 2021 Summary Statement (%)	FFY 2022 N	FFY 2022 Summary Statement (%)	Difference between Percentages (%)	Std Error	z value	p-value	p<=.05	Score: 0 = significant decrease; 1 = no significant change; 2 = significant increase
SS1/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	4,444	60.13%	5,083	61.24%	1.12	0.0100	1.1138	0.2654	NO	1
SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	4,693	62.50%	5,333	64.71%	2.21	0.0096	2.2977	0.0216	YES	2
SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	4,855	63.69%	5,472	64.33%	0.64	0.0095	0.6768	0.4985	NO	1
SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	5,107	42.75%	5,720	40.56%	-2.19	0.0095	-2.3032	0.0213	YES	0
SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	5,107	39.51%	5,720	38.08%	-1.44	0.0094	-1.5322	0.1255	NO	1
SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	5,107	39.46%	5,720	39.16%	-0.29	0.0094	-0.3135	0.7539	NO	1

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2	6
--	----------

Your State's Performance Change Score	1
--	----------

**Data Rubric
Maryland**

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part C Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8A	1	1
8B	1	1
8C	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	13
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	18

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/Settings Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	9
Grand Total (Subtotal X 2) =	18.00

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	18
B. 618 Grand Total	18.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	36.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	36.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 2 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 2.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part C 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits counts/ responses for an entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part C Child Count and Setting	Part C Child Count and Settings in EMAPS	8/30/2023
Part C Exiting	Part C Exiting Collection in EMAPS	2/21/2024
Part C Dispute Resolution	Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all data elements, subtotals, totals as well as responses to all questions associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection. See the EMAPS User Guide for each of the Part C 618 Data Collections for a list of edit checks (available at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html>).

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part C

Maryland

Year 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	2
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	1
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance.	1
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines.	1
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines.	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	1

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	4
(2.1) Mediations held.	4
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	3
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	3
(2.1) (b) Mediations held no related to due process complaints.	1
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	1
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations not held.	0

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	4
Has your state adopted Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(1) or Part B due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(2)?	PARTB
(3.1) Resolution meetings (applicable ONLY for states using Part B due process hearing procedures).	0
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline.	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Hearings pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	4

State Comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Maryland

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



United States Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Final Determination Letter

June 18, 2024

Honorable Carey Wright
Interim Superintendent
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Interim Superintendent Wright :

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Maryland meets the requirements and purposes of Part C of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Maryland's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Maryland's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in Maryland's "2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for Maryland and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix (including Components and Appendices) that include scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) Maryland's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Sections 616\(d\) and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part C](#)" (HTDMD-C).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making the Department's determinations in 2024, as it did for Part C determinations in 2015-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD-C document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Maryland.) For 2024, the Department's IDEA Part C determinations continue to include consideration of each State's Child Outcomes data, which measure how children who receive Part C services are improving functioning in three outcome areas that are critical to school readiness:

- positive social-emotional skills;
- acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Specifically, the Department considered the data quality and the child performance levels in each State's Child Outcomes FFY 2022 data.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Maryland's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your State-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Maryland's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in Indicators 1 through 11, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Maryland is required to take. The actions that Maryland is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for your State to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Maryland's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part C," which shows how OSEP calculated the State's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Maryland's 2024 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's 2024 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's last three IDEA Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



United States Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering two additional criteria related to IDEA Part C determinations. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State that would otherwise receive a score of meets requirements would not be able to receive a determination of meets requirements if the State had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is reviewing whether and how to consider IDEA Part C results data reported under three indicators in order to improve results for all infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities. This review would include considering alternative scoring options for child outcome Indicator C-3 and considering as potential additional factors the information and data that States report under child find Indicators C-5 and C-6.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part C Results Matrix and States will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data that States submit will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part C SPP/APR Indicators 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part C data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the appropriate EDFacts system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part C data.

As a reminder, Maryland must report annually to the public, by posting on the State lead agency's website, on the performance of each early intervention service (EIS) program located in Maryland on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Maryland's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Maryland must:

- (1) review EIS program performance against targets in Maryland's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each EIS program "meets the requirements" of Part C, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part C of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each EIS program of its determination.

Further, Maryland must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the State lead agency's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Maryland's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Maryland's efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and looks forward to working with Maryland over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Part C Coordinator

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.