

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 72.85%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 75.61%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 85.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 5.78%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 4.95%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 3.54%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 38%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 38%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 38%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.7% for reading and 98.7% for math. The State's FFY 2006 data were 98.9% for reading and 98.8% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>[Results Indicator]</p> <p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and the FFY 2006 actual target data for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="611 399 1478 849"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>62.5%</td> <td>63.33%</td> <td>62.27%</td> <td>54.97%</td> <td>60.27%</td> <td>71.31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>67.3%</td> <td>72.23%</td> <td>76.90%</td> <td>62.63%</td> <td>66.85%</td> <td>71.14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>52.97%</td> <td>67.51%</td> <td>71.36%</td> <td>51.59%</td> <td>52.52%</td> <td>64.76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>47.15%</td> <td>51.24%</td> <td>73.00%</td> <td>40.46%</td> <td>44.51%</td> <td>58.72%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>36.88%</td> <td>49.48%</td> <td>71.50%</td> <td>30.58%</td> <td>35.23%</td> <td>56.98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>35.22%</td> <td>38.81%</td> <td>68.91%</td> <td>27.22%</td> <td>29.51%</td> <td>55.82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>36.45%</td> <td>45.91%</td> <td>59.00%</td> <td>37.33%</td> <td>49.95%</td> <td>38.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	62.5%	63.33%	62.27%	54.97%	60.27%	71.31%	4	67.3%	72.23%	76.90%	62.63%	66.85%	71.14%	5	52.97%	67.51%	71.36%	51.59%	52.52%	64.76%	6	47.15%	51.24%	73.00%	40.46%	44.51%	58.72%	7	36.88%	49.48%	71.50%	30.58%	35.23%	56.98%	8	35.22%	38.81%	68.91%	27.22%	29.51%	55.82%	HS	36.45%	45.91%	59.00%	37.33%	49.95%	38.6%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	62.5%	63.33%	62.27%	54.97%	60.27%	71.31%																																																											
4	67.3%	72.23%	76.90%	62.63%	66.85%	71.14%																																																											
5	52.97%	67.51%	71.36%	51.59%	52.52%	64.76%																																																											
6	47.15%	51.24%	73.00%	40.46%	44.51%	58.72%																																																											
7	36.88%	49.48%	71.50%	30.58%	35.23%	56.98%																																																											
8	35.22%	38.81%	68.91%	27.22%	29.51%	55.82%																																																											
HS	36.45%	45.91%	59.00%	37.33%	49.95%	38.6%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 12.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 20.83%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 16.67%.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local school systems to revise), the local school systems' policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the local school systems identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that there were no findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2006.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p> <p>In addition, the State must again describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation</p>																																																															

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).																				
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="611 850 1524 1328"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">61.64</td> <td align="center">62.35</td> <td align="center">60.61</td> <td align="center">0.71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">16.21</td> <td align="center">15.82</td> <td align="center">16.36</td> <td align="center">0.39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">7.90</td> <td align="center">7.80</td> <td align="center">7.17</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5A and for 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	61.64	62.35	60.61	0.71%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.21	15.82	16.36	0.39%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	7.90	7.80	7.17	0.10%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	61.64	62.35	60.61	0.71%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.21	15.82	16.36	0.39%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	7.90	7.80	7.17	0.10%																		

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="611 581 1524 1300"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="611 581 1087 753">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1087 581 1241 753">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1241 581 1383 753">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1383 581 1524 753">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="611 753 1087 824">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1087 753 1241 824">13.07</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1241 753 1383 824">15.24</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1383 753 1524 824">14.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="611 824 1087 959">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1087 824 1241 959">6.03</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1241 824 1383 959">13.90</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1383 824 1524 959">9.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="611 959 1087 1062">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1087 959 1241 1062">5.03</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1241 959 1383 1062">13.07</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1383 959 1524 1062">4.02</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="611 1062 1087 1164">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1087 1062 1241 1164">32.50</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1241 1062 1383 1164">36.68</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1383 1062 1524 1164">32.83</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="611 1164 1087 1266">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1087 1164 1241 1266">43.38</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1241 1164 1383 1266">21.11</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1383 1164 1524 1266">39.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="611 1266 1087 1300">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1087 1266 1241 1300">100.01%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1241 1266 1383 1300">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1383 1266 1524 1300">100.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	13.07	15.24	14.24	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	6.03	13.90	9.38	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	5.03	13.07	4.02	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32.50	36.68	32.83	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	43.38	21.11	39.53	Total (approx. 100%)	100.01%	100.00%	100.00%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	13.07	15.24	14.24																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	6.03	13.90	9.38																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	5.03	13.07	4.02																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32.50	36.68	32.83																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	43.38	21.11	39.53																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.01%	100.00%	100.00%																											
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts</p>																												

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 56% for parents of school aged children and 68% for parents of preschool children. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 45% for parents of school aged children and 58% for parents of preschool children.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 29% for parents of school aged children and 34% for parents of preschool children.</p>	<p>to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of local school systems determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of local school systems determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89.02%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 83%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>§300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.42%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate that the FFY 2005 noncompliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that the FFY 2005 noncompliance was corrected.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner and that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA, inclusive of the LEA with the remaining noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 94%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 18 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that one of the two remaining findings subsequently was corrected by the date of submission of the FFY 2007 APR. For the remaining finding, the State provided intensive onsite technical assistance to the local school system's staff on transition planning.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		<p>FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and the LEA with the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2006: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each individual case of noncompliance, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>																
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="611 1052 1530 1442"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006</th> <th>FFY 2007</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are competitively employed.</td> <td>44.6</td> <td>53</td> <td>8.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>10</td> <td>6.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td>24.7</td> <td>14</td> <td>-10.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006	FFY 2007	Progress	Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	44.6	53	8.40%	Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	4.0	10	6.00%	Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	24.7	14	-10.70%	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	Progress															
Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	44.6	53	8.40%															
Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	4.0	10	6.00%															
Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	24.7	14	-10.70%															

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.46%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 84.05%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate that the remaining FFY 2005 noncompliance for Indicator 15 was corrected. The State reported that of the seven findings that remained uncorrected by the time of the FFY 2006 APR, two have been corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that one of the two local school systems is under a court-ordered consent decree and the State provided intensive oversight, verification and ongoing monitoring in both local school systems cited for noncompliance. In addition, with both local school systems with remaining noncompliance, the State directed the use of grant funds toward correction of noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY2006, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>under those indicators.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 65%. The State reported that 61 of 94 resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator were 72%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 64-75%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73%. The State</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR,</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>reported that 132 of 182 mediation sessions resulted in mediation agreements. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator were 72%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75-85%.</p>	<p>due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.7%. These recalculated data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>