



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

June 29, 2017

Honorable Karen B. Salmon
Acting State Superintendent of Schools
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street, 7th floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Dear Superintendent Salmon:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2017 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 the State's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Your State's 2017 determination is based on the data reflected in the State's "2017 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) Results 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) the State'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 2017: Part C" (HTDMD).

OSEP is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2017, as it did for Part C determinations in 2015 and 2016. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD and reflected in the RDA Matrix for your State.) For 2017, the Department's *IDEA* Part C determinations continue to include consideration of each State's Child Outcomes data, which measures how children who receive *IDEA* Part C services are improving functioning in three outcome areas that are critical to school readiness:

- Positive social-emotional skills;

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.

- 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 2015 data.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of your State's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the SPP/APR module using your State-specific log-on information at osep.grads360.org. When you access your State's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in Indicators 1 through 10, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that the State is required to take. The actions that the State is required to take are in two places:

- (1) actions related to the correction of findings of noncompliance are in the "OSEP Response" section of the indicator; and
- (2) any other actions that the State is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

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

You will also find all of the following important documents saved as attachments to the Progress Page:

- (1) the State's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD document;
- (3) a spreadsheet entitled "2017 Data Rubric Part C," which shows how OSEP calculated the State's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix;
- (4) a document entitled "Dispute Resolution 2015-16," 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; and
- (5) a Data Display, which presents certain State-reported data in a transparent, user-friendly manner and is helpful for the public in getting a broader picture of State performance in key areas.

As noted above, the State's 2017 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's 2017 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three *IDEA* Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2014, 2015, and 2016), and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination.

States were required to submit Phase III of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 3, 2017. OSEP appreciates the State's ongoing work on its SSIP and its efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. We have carefully reviewed your submission and will provide feedback in the upcoming weeks. Additionally, OSEP will continue to work with your State as it implements the second year of Phase III of the SSIP, which is due on April 2, 2018.

As a reminder, your State 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 the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the State's submission of its FFY 2015 SPP/APR. In addition, your State must:

- (1) review EIS program performance against targets in the State'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, your State must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the State lead agency's website. Within the next several days, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) will be accessible to the public;
- (2) includes the State's determination letter and SPP/APR, and all related State and OSEP attachments; and
- (3) can be accessed via a URL unique to your State, which you can use to make your SPP/APR available to the public.

We will provide you with the unique URL when it is live.

OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and looks forward to working with your State 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ruth E. Ryder", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Ruth E. Ryder
Acting Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Part C Coordinator

Maryland

2017 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
83.33	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	6	4	66.67
Compliance	16	16	100

I. Results Component – Data Quality

Data Quality Total Score (completeness + anomalies)	3
---	---

(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State's 2015 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e. outcome data)	5037
Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e. 618 exiting data)	9343
Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%)	53.91
Data Completeness Score ²	1

(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes Data

Data Anomalies Score ³	2
-----------------------------------	---

II. Results Component – Child Performance

Child Performance Total Score (state comparison + year to year comparison)	1
--	---

(a) Comparing your State's 2015 Outcomes Data to other State's 2015 Outcomes Data

Data Comparison Score ⁴	1
------------------------------------	---

(b) Comparing your State's FFY 2015 data to your State's FFY 2014 data

Performance Change Score ⁵	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

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 2015	61.05	59	65.11	53.65	71.8	48.94
FFY 2014	67.11	65.91	72.47	62.95	76.28	56.69

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 2017: Part C."

² Please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation.

³ Please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation.

⁴ Please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation.

⁵ Please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation.

2017 Part C Compliance Matrix

Part C Compliance Indicator ¹	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014	Score
Indicator 1: Timely service provision	98.37	Yes	2
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline	98.06	Yes	2
Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan	99.97	Yes	2
Indicator 8B: Transition notification	100	N/A	2
Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference	99.35	Yes	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Special Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

¹ The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:
<https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/13202>

Appendix A

I. (a) Data Completeness:

The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2015 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2015 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 2015 in the State's FFY 2015 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 2015 Outcomes Data

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2015 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 2011 – FFY 2014 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 e¹². 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 2015 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 anomalies 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

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-1SD	+1SD
Outcome A\Category a	2.77%	6.33%	-3.56%	9.1%
Outcome B \Category a	2.39%	6.44%	-4.05%	8.83%
Outcome C\Category a	2.37%	6.57%	-4.2%	8.94%

¹ Numbers shown as rounded for display purposes.

² Values based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exits.

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-2SD	+2SD
Outcome A\Category b	20.62%	8.19%	4.25%	36.99%
Outcome A \Category c	18.89%	11.57%	-4.25%	42.02%
Outcome A\Category d	28.21%	8.73%	10.75%	45.66%
Outcome A\Category e	29.52%	15.15%	-0.79%	59.82%
Outcome B\Category b	22.05%	9.03%	3.99%	40.1%
Outcome B\Category c	26.58%	11.51%	3.56%	49.6%
Outcome B\Category d	33.96%	8.14%	17.68%	50.24%
Outcome B\Category e	15.02%	10%	-4.97%	35.02%
Outcome C\Category b	18.43%	7.46%	3.51%	33.34%
Outcome C\Category c	21.17%	11.54%	-1.92%	44.25%
Outcome C\Category d	35.61%	8.89%	17.83%	53.38%
Outcome C\Category e	22.43%	14.78%	-7.13%	52%

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

Data Quality: Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes Data

Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP's Assessed in your State	5037
--	-------------

Outcome A – Positive Social Relationships					
	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	28	1269	768	1265	1707
Performance (%)	0.56	25.19	15.25	25.11	33.89
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome B – Knowledge and Skills					
	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	27	1314	994	1509	1194
Performance (%)	0.54	26.09	19.73	29.96	23.7
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	1269	1282	2003	462
Performance (%)	0.42	25.19	25.45	39.77	9.17
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) Comparing Your State's 2015 Outcomes Data to Other States' 2015 Outcome Data

This score represents how your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2015 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 Statement¹. 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 2015

Percentiles	Outcome A SS1	Outcome A SS2	Outcome B SS1	Outcome B SS2	Outcome C SS1	Outcome C SS2
10	49.74%	42.9%	53.4%	36.51%	58.28%	45.27%
90	84.89%	69.82%	83.75%	63.24%	84.91%	71.78%

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 2015

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 (%)	61.05	59	65.11	53.65	71.8	48.94
Points	1	1	1	1	1	1

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

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

¹ Values based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters.

Appendix D

II. (b) Comparing your State's FFY 2015 data to your State's FFY 2014 data

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year's reporting (FFY 2014) is compared to the current year (FFY 2015) 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.

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.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2015 and FFY2014 summary statements.

e.g. C3A FFY2015% - C3A FFY2014% = 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 on¹

$$\sqrt{\left(\frac{\text{FFY2014}\% * (1 - \text{FFY2014}\%)}{\text{FFY2014}_N} + \frac{\text{FFY2015}\% * (1 - \text{FFY2015}\%)}{\text{FFY2015}_N}\right)} = \text{Standard Error of Difference in Proportions}$$

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

Difference in proportions / standard error of the difference in proportions = z 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 2014 to FFY 2015

1 = No statistically significant change

2 = statistically significant increase from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015

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 2 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

¹Numbers shown as rounded for display purposes.

Summary Statement/ Child Outcome	FFY 2014 N	FFY 2014 Summary Statement (%)	FFY 2015 N	FFY 2015 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	3092	67.11	3330	61.05	-6.06	0.0119	-5.0713	<.0001	Yes	0
SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	3581	72.47	3844	65.11	-7.36	0.0107	-6.8689	<.0001	Yes	0
SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	4392	76.28	4575	71.8	-4.48	0.0092	-4.8463	<.0001	Yes	0
SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	4934	65.91	5037	59	-6.91	0.0097	-7.1437	<.0001	Yes	0
SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	4931	62.95	5038	53.65	-9.3	0.0098	-9.4595	<.0001	Yes	0
SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	4934	56.69	5037	48.94	-7.75	0.01	-7.7744	<.0001	Yes	0

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2	0
--	----------

Your State's Performance Change Score	N/A
--	------------