

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> <p>* States will either be reporting 09-10 data or 10-11 data. Data may lag one year in this indicator.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 72.33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 70.05%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85.5%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> <p>* States will either be reporting 09-10 data or 10-11 data. Data may lag one year in this indicator.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 4.46%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 4.41%. The state did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 3.54%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 24%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.1% for reading and 99.1%</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>for math. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99.23% for reading and 99.17% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math. The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>																																																																
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 581 1583 1260"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">66.72%</td> <td align="center">68%</td> <td align="center">78.18%</td> <td align="center">63.44%</td> <td align="center">62.7%</td> <td align="center">80.87%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">68.12%</td> <td align="center">71.5%</td> <td align="center">84.6%</td> <td align="center">68.63%</td> <td align="center">67%</td> <td align="center">80.76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">5</td> <td align="center">71.12%</td> <td align="center">70.3%</td> <td align="center">80.91%</td> <td align="center">57.95%</td> <td align="center">57.6%</td> <td align="center">76.51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">6</td> <td align="center">61.41%</td> <td align="center">59.4%</td> <td align="center">82%</td> <td align="center">50.78%</td> <td align="center">54.1%</td> <td align="center">72.48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">7</td> <td align="center">52.84%</td> <td align="center">57.3%</td> <td align="center">81%</td> <td align="center">45.59%</td> <td align="center">48.7%</td> <td align="center">71.32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">8</td> <td align="center">53.90%</td> <td align="center">55.1%</td> <td align="center">79.27%</td> <td align="center">34.89%</td> <td align="center">34.9%</td> <td align="center">70.55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">HS</td> <td align="center">46.69%</td> <td align="center">49.8%</td> <td align="center">72.67%</td> <td align="center">45.69%</td> <td align="center">48.6%</td> <td align="center">64.89%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets. The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	66.72%	68%	78.18%	63.44%	62.7%	80.87%	4	68.12%	71.5%	84.6%	68.63%	67%	80.76%	5	71.12%	70.3%	80.91%	57.95%	57.6%	76.51%	6	61.41%	59.4%	82%	50.78%	54.1%	72.48%	7	52.84%	57.3%	81%	45.59%	48.7%	71.32%	8	53.90%	55.1%	79.27%	34.89%	34.9%	70.55%	HS	46.69%	49.8%	72.67%	45.69%	48.6%	64.89%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	66.72%	68%	78.18%	63.44%	62.7%	80.87%																																																											
4	68.12%	71.5%	84.6%	68.63%	67%	80.76%																																																											
5	71.12%	70.3%	80.91%	57.95%	57.6%	76.51%																																																											
6	61.41%	59.4%	82%	50.78%	54.1%	72.48%																																																											
7	52.84%	57.3%	81%	45.59%	48.7%	71.32%																																																											
8	53.90%	55.1%	79.27%	34.89%	34.9%	70.55%																																																											
HS	46.69%	49.8%	72.67%	45.69%	48.6%	64.89%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 16.7%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 16.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating</p>																																																															

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>target of 8.3%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that four districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 of 24 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities suspended greater than 10 days.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>For the district identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2009 whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was not corrected. The State reported that this LEA is under a Settlement Agreement pursuant to action in the U.S. District Court. The State reported on the actions it took to address this noncompliance.</p>	<p>improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, as well as the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 4.1%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 4.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that four districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State also reported that one district was identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and does not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that 19 of 24 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities in any race/ethnicity category suspended for greater than 10 days.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected district to revise), the district’s 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the district identified with significant discrepancy in FFY 2010.</p> <p>For the district identified with significant discrepancy in FFY 2009 whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>The State did not, until FFY 2011, determine whether districts with a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, based on FFY 2009 data, had policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, and therefore did not make findings of noncompliance until FFY 2011. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator for</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>to 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was not corrected.</p> <p>The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. The State reported that this one finding is within a LEA that is under a Settlement Agreement pursuant to action in the U.S. District Court.</p>	<p>districts with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2009 discipline data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that these districts as well as the district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2009 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
5. Percent of children with IEPs	The State's reported data for this indicator are:	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">64.8</td> <td align="center">66.14</td> <td align="center">62.11</td> <td align="center">1.34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">14.55</td> <td align="center">14.04</td> <td align="center">15.61</td> <td align="center">0.51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">7.33</td> <td align="center">7.12</td> <td align="center">6.42</td> <td align="center">0.21%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.</p>						<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64.8	66.14	62.11	1.34%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.55	14.04	15.61	0.51%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	7.33	7.12	6.42	0.21%	<p>and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																						
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64.8	66.14	62.11	1.34%																						
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.55	14.04	15.61	0.51%																						
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	7.33	7.12	6.42	0.21%																						
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>					<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A:</td> <td align="center">64.4</td> <td align="center">68.9</td> <td align="center">66.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A:	64.4	68.9	66.3	<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 2011 APR.</p>												
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A:	64.4	68.9	66.3																							

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)				The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.3	69.5	66.6	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	60.6	63.9	61.7	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.9	67.5	71.5	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	52.7	55.2	57.3	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	62.1	63.6	64.2	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 40% for parents of school-aged children and 49% for parents of preschool children. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 37% for parents of school-aged children and 43% for parents of preschool children. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 34% for parents of school-aged children and 38% for parents of preschool children.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts 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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that two of 24 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that 11 of 24 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.71%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95.46%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 26 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100%</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance in the FFY 2011 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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.17%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99.73%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 95.27%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 86.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 251 of 253 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining two findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and the one finding identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance)</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>																				
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1081 1583 1516"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">49.4</td> <td align="center">29.36</td> <td align="center">50</td> <td align="center">-20.04%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">72.61</td> <td align="center">50.17</td> <td align="center">73</td> <td align="center">-22.44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher</td> <td align="center">81.42</td> <td align="center">62.73</td> <td align="center">82</td> <td align="center">-18.69%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	49.4	29.36	50	-20.04%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	72.61	50.17	73	-22.44%	C. % Enrolled in higher	81.42	62.73	82	-18.69%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	49.4	29.36	50	-20.04%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	72.61	50.17	73	-22.44%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher	81.42	62.73	82	-18.69%																		

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</p>					
<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>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.51%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 99.57%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 706 of 724 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 17 of 18 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that three of six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, FFY 2007, and FFY 2006 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>All four remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, FFY 2008, and FFY 2006 are in a LEA that is under a Settlement Agreement approved by the U.S. District Court of Maryland.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to ensure the timely correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008 and FFY 2006. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining two findings identified in FFY 2006. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Maryland Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<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 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 64.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 70.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 64-75%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 77.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 74.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 75-85%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95.45%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, 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). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>