

Maryland Part C FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table

Part C SPP/APR Indicators

1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [Results Indicator]
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. [Results Indicator]
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. [Compliance Indicator]
8. Percent of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday; [Compliance Indicator]
8. Percent of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and [Compliance Indicator]
8. Percent of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. [Compliance Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
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). [Results Indicator]
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]
14. State-reported data (IDEA Section 618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]

Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions
(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)

Timely Resolution of State Complaints: 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.

Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Maryland Part C FFY 2011 SPP/APR Results Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET
2. Infants and Toddlers Served in Natural Environments	96.3%	97.1%	≥ 91.5% ¹
3. Early Childhood Outcomes Data	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	93.0%	94.9%	≥ 79.5%
A. Know their rights;			
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and	93.0%	94.7%	≥ 77.5%
C. Help their children develop and learn.	94.0%	95.2%	≥ 87.5%
5. Infants and Toddlers Served Birth to One	1.59%	1.48%	≥ 1.50%
6. Infants and Toddlers Served Birth to Three	3.54%	3.39%	≥ 2.95%
12. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	None	None	None
13. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	None	None	None

¹ As used in this table, the symbol “≥” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be greater than or equal to the established target.

3. Percent of Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes

Summary Statement 1²	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2011 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	76.0%	70.1%	≥ 80.6%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	80.8%	74.1%	≥ 85.8%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	81.6%	72.9%	≥ 87.0%
Summary Statement 2³	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2011 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	68.8%	65.3%	≥ 73.8%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	64.1%	60.5%	≥ 69.9%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	70.9%	63.5%	≥ 75.4%

² **Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

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

Maryland Part C FFY 2011 Results Data Summary Notes

<p>INDICATOR 2: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Consistent with IDEA section 635(c), the State included data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR regarding children who were three years or older and received services under that section, pursuant to the policy adopted by the State in FFY 2009.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 3: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Consistent with IDEA section 635(c), the State included data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR regarding children who were three years or older and received services under that section, pursuant to the policy adopted by the State in FFY 2009.</p> <p>REQUIRED ACTION</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 4A, B, C: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Consistent with IDEA section 635(c), the State included data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR regarding children who were three years or older and received services under that section, pursuant to the policy adopted by the State in FFY 2009.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 5: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 6: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 12: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2011. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>Consistent with IDEA section 635(c), the State included data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR regarding children who were three years or older and received services under that section, pursuant to the policy adopted by the State in FFY 2009.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 13: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2011. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p> <p>Consistent with IDEA section 635(c), the State included data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR regarding children who were three years or older and received services under that section, pursuant to the policy adopted by the State in FFY 2009.</p>

Maryland Part C FFY 2011 SPP/APR Compliance Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010
1. Timely provision of early intervention services	96.7%	97.7%	100%	The State reported that all 17 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
7. 45-day timeline for evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP meeting	98.2%	98.7%	100%	The State reported that all 14 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
8.A. IFSPs with transition steps and services	99.8%	100%	100%	The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
8.B. Notification to LEA and SEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	100%	100%	100%	The State reported that it identified no findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2010.
8.C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	99.4%	99.1%	100%	The State reported that all 18 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
9. Timely correction	100%	99.8%	100%	The State reported that 534 of 535 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner and that the one remaining finding was subsequently corrected by February 15, 2013.
14. Timely and accurate data	100%	96.4%	100%	

Maryland Part C FFY 2011 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports

REQUIREMENT	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA
Timely resolution of complaints	100% (based on two complaints)	100% (based on one complaint)
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	The State reported that it did not have any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period that were adjudicated.	100% (based on one due process hearing)

Maryland Part C FFY 2011 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 1: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

Consistent with IDEA section 635(c), the State included data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR regarding children who were three years or older and received services under that section, pursuant to the policy adopted by the State in FFY 2009.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.⁴ In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 7: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 8A: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

INDICATOR 8B: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

⁴ OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

INDICATOR 8C: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 9: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

Consistent with IDEA section 635(c), the State included data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR regarding children who were three years or older and received services under that section, pursuant to the policy adopted by the State in FFY 2009.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, and 8C in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2011 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 did report on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and did not report on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

INDICATOR 14: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

OTHER ISSUES:

State Complaints and Due Process Hearings: Related to the extended option under IDEA section 635(c), the State reported that, "No families with children in the Extended Option filed a state complaint or requested a due process hearing and/or mediation during the reporting period."