

Maryland C 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 infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities and the methodology used to calculate the timely provision of Part C services (from the projected date of the service from parental consent to the actual initiation date of the service as documented on the IFSP). OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.8%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised the methodology used to calculate the actual target data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) were corrected in a timely manner.</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 requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program 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 initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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>

Maryland C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.</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 are 91.2%. The State's FFY 2007 data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 89.6%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 89.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																												
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs 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</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</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 progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 630 1446 1456"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 630 1077 813">07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1077 630 1199 813">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1199 630 1323 813">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1323 630 1446 813">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 813 1077 886">a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1077 813 1199 886">1.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 813 1323 886">1.48</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 813 1446 886">1.04</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 886 1077 1027">b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1077 886 1199 1027">10.52</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 886 1323 1027">19.24</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 886 1446 1027">15.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1027 1077 1133">c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1077 1027 1199 1133">5.45</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 1027 1323 1133">22.39</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 1027 1446 1133">4.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1133 1077 1239">d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1077 1133 1199 1239">14.08</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 1133 1323 1239">40.98</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 1133 1446 1239">19.06</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1239 1077 1349">e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1077 1239 1199 1349">68.54</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 1239 1323 1349">15.91</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 1239 1446 1349">59.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1349 1077 1456">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1077 1349 1199 1456">99.99%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 1349 1323 1456">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 1349 1446 1456">100.01%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	1.4	1.48	1.04	b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	10.52	19.24	15.85	c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	5.45	22.39	4.53	d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	14.08	40.98	19.06	e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	68.54	15.91	59.53	Total (approx. 100%)	99.99%	100.00%	100.01%	<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 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	1.4	1.48	1.04																											
b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	10.52	19.24	15.85																											
c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	5.45	22.39	4.53																											
d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	14.08	40.98	19.06																											
e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	68.54	15.91	59.53																											
Total (approx. 100%)	99.99%	100.00%	100.01%																											

Maryland C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights;</p> <p>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and</p> <p>C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 313 1480 708"> <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. Know their rights. (%)</td> <td align="center">76</td> <td align="center">78</td> <td align="center">74</td> <td align="center">2.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)</td> <td align="center">74</td> <td align="center">75</td> <td align="center">72</td> <td align="center">1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)</td> <td align="center">81</td> <td align="center">86</td> <td align="center">82</td> <td align="center">5.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>These data represent progress for Indicators 4A, 4B and 4C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met all of its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 a description of the State's efforts to ensure that its FFY 2007 data are based on a response group that is representative of the State's population. The State included a description of the State's efforts. The State reported that the data for FFY 2007 for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population and the State has revised its improvement strategies to address this issue.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. Know their rights. (%)	76	78	74	2.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	74	75	72	1.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	81	86	82	5.00%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its survey response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State has taken to address this issue.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. Know their rights. (%)	76	78	74	2.00%																		
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	74	75	72	1.00%																		
C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	81	86	82	5.00%																		
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</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 1.25%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 1.34%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 1.50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				

Maryland C 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 infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</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 3.05%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 3.03%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 2.88%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.</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 94.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 93%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 22 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) were 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 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program 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 conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate</p>

Maryland C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</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 99.1%. The State’s FFY 2006 data were 99%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) were corrected in a timely manner.</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 requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program 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 developed an IFSP with transition steps and services, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community</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 99.9%. The State’s FFY 2006 data were 99.7%.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) were corrected in a timely manner.</p>

Maryland C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</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 requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program 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 provided notification to the LEA, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</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 95%. The State’s FFY 2006 data were 94.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 16 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) were corrected in a timely manner.</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 requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under</p>

Maryland C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program 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 conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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>9. 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 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 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 53 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A) and 34 CFR §303.501.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, 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 EIS program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements,</p>

Maryland C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p>
<p>10. 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 reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not receive any signed written requests for due process hearings during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>This indicator does not apply to the State because the State has not adopted the Part B due process procedures to resolve Part C due process hearing requests.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due</p>

Maryland C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations are held.	February 1, 2010.
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</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 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>