MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

David, Congratulations!

February 15, 2017

Dr. David Cox
Superintendent
Allegany County Public Schools
P. O. Box 1724
Cumberland, MD 21502

Dear Dr. Cox:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Allegany County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Allegany County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Allegany County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Sonya Sell
Debra Metheny
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Allegany County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	95.80%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.24%	93.20%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	73.10%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and continuing or proposed promising practices to be implemented to demonstrate continued progress.	66.70%	NA
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	56.90%		Baseline data.	57.14%	50.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	52.17%		Baseline data.	58.11%	59.27%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	63.79%		Baseline data.	62.71%	54.55%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	54.41%		Baseline data.	55.41%	53.70%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	60.66%		Baseline data.	61.54%	59.38%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	47.83%		Baseline data.	52.70%	62.96%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	95.5%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.60%	93.90%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.10%	94.00%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.10%	95.00%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04	1.52%	2.56%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	2.89%	3.75%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.53%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	4.04%	4.27%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	94.29%	Not Met	The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Congratulations!

Dr. George Arlotto
Superintendent
Anne Arundel County Public Schools
2644 Riva Road
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Dr. Arlotto:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Anne Arundel County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Anne Arundel County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Anne Arundel County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Bobbi Pedrick
Wes Campbell
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:
(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Anne Arundel County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	94.60%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.92%	95.70%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.0%	98.80%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	80.95%		Baseline data.	79.73%	85.80%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	64.56%		Baseline data.	61.40%	64.03%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	84.68%		Baseline data.	88.01%	90.57%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	62.54%		Baseline data.	64.53%	65.44%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	88.87%		Baseline data.	88.31%	92.34%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	51.76%		Baseline data.	56.33%	60.77%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	97.5%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.30%	96.30%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	96.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.00%	95.50%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	97.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.40%	95.70%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.60%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.38%	1.46%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	4.25%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	4.21%	3.86%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	98.76%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.15%	99.50%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.71%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.27%	99.43%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday	100%	97.27%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator.	97.87%	100%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
	COMAR 13A.13.01.09				The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.		
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Dr. Gregory Wm. Branch
Health Officer and Director, Dept. of Health & Human Services
Baltimore County
6401 York Road, 3rd Floor
Baltimore, MD 21212

Dear Dr. Branch:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Baltimore County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Baltimore County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Baltimore County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williams
Paula Boykin
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline FFY 2013 SFY 2014	Target FFY 2014 SFY 2015	Target FFY 2015 SFY 2016	Target FFY 2016 SFY 2017	Target FFY 2017 SFY 2018	Target FFY 2018 SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Baltimore County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	99.30%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.45%	99.20%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	99.50%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.90%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	56.61%		Baseline data.	58.05%	52.19%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	50.94%		Baseline data.	59.57%	60.59%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	63.99%		Baseline data.	66.28%	65.09%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	49.06%		Baseline data.	58.30%	60.03%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	63.64%		Baseline data.	63.96%	61.38%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	47.50%		Baseline data.	56.40%	57.49%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	99.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.40%	92.70%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	99.1%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.00%	92.50%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	99.4%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.30%	92.70%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04	1.52%	1.63%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.51%	1.69%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.62%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.67%	3.61%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13.A.13.01.07	100%	96.74%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	97.33%	96.34%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	95.94%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07 Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	98.08%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	99.79%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	99.60%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09 Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	98.94%	97.98%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13.09(F)(2)(b)(4)	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

Dan, Congratulations!

February 15, 2017

Dr. Daniel D. Curry
Superintendent
Calvert County Public Schools
1305 Dares Beach Road
Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678

Dear Dr. Curry:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Calvert County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Calvert County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Calvert County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Christina Harris
Sheila Myers
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Calvert County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.53%	95.50%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	89.30%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	89.30%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	47.54%		Baseline data.	63.27%	66.67%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	69.63%		Baseline data.	73.39%	75.76%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	45.33%		Baseline data.	67.24%	69.64%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	63.70%		Baseline data.	67.89%	70.00%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	59.13%		Baseline data.	69.77%	80.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	53.33%		Baseline data.	57.80%	62.63%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	97.5%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.20%	89.70%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	97.4%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.10%	88.90%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	96.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.20%	86.50%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	2.08%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	2.65%	2.50%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of		3.10%	4.71%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share	4.66%	4.47%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
	the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04				promising practices.		
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.27%	Not Met	The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07 Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	97.78%	98.00%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13.09(F)(2)(b)(4)	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Congratulations!

Dr. Patricia W. Saelens
Interim Superintendent
Caroline County Public schools
204 Franklin Street
Denton, MD 21629

Dear Dr. Saelens:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Caroline County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Caroline County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Caroline County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Elizabeth Anthony
Robin Fox
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Caroline County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	88.24%		Baseline data.	93.75%	40.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	78.26%		Baseline data.	90.32%	73.91%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	80.95%		Baseline data.	86.96%	69.23%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	39.13%		Baseline data.	80.65%	78.26%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	91.30%		Baseline data.	90.32%	80.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	30.43%		Baseline data.	64.52%	43.48%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	96.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	88.00%	89.7%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	96.3%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	88.50%	92.60%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		900%	96.3%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	88.00%	91.70%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	3.66%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.16%	1.79%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3		3.10%	2.87%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed	3.26%	2.10%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
	COMAR 13A.13.02.04				promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.		
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Mr. Stephen H. Guthrie
Superintendent
Carroll County Public Schools
125 North Court Street
Westminster, MD 21157

Congratulations!

Dear Mr. Guthrie:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Carroll County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Carroll County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Carroll County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Nicholas Shockney
Inez Marvel
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:
(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) / State Fiscal Year (SFY) / Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
Substantial Compliance = 95%			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Carroll County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	Local Results	Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	97.20%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.94%	99.00%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.70%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	57.55%		Baseline data.	62.26%	67.62%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	64.42%		Baseline data.	63.80%	68.29%
3B	Birth – 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	54.78%		Baseline data.	64.49%	63.39%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	60.98%		Baseline data.	65.43%	66.06%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	61.90%		Baseline data.	63.77%	72.26%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	54.88%		Baseline data.	53.09%	58.79%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	98.7%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.40%	94.40%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	97.4%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.50%	91.80%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	97.4&%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	91.30%	93.50%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	2.96%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	2.98%	3.44%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	4.48%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.85%	4.05%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	99.49%	99.52%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.52%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07 Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.10%	98.74%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

D'Ette, Congratulations!

Dr. D'Ette W. Devine
Superintendent
Cecil County Public Schools
201 Booth Street
Elkton, MD 21921

Dear Dr. Devine:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Cecil County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Cecil Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Cecil County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Karen Boulden
Sarah J. Farr
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) / State Fiscal Year (SFY) / Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Cecil County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	98.4%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	23.21%		Baseline data.	72.50%	52.50%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	60.34%		Baseline data.	84.54%	70.59%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	29.85%		Baseline data.	70.45%	52.38%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	56.03%		Baseline data.	81.44%	69.41%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	46.43%		Baseline data.	78.08%	70.77%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	48.28%		Baseline data.	71.13%	61.18%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	98.6%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.90%	98.90%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	97.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.90%	97.60%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	98.6%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.80%	98.80%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one		1.52%	0.75%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	0.86%	1.03%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3	3.10%	3.77%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.38%	3.05%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices. COMAR 13A.13.01.07	98.91%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	98.04%	99.13%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	98.70%	Not Met	The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	98.15%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Dr. Kimberly Hill
Superintendent
Charles County Public Schools
P. O. Box 2770
LaPlata, MD 20646

Congratulations!

Dear Dr. Hill:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Charles County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Charles County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Charles County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Karen A. Williamson
Arden Sotomayor
Katie Ryan
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

March 9, 2016, Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Charles County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.42%	99.50%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	62.07%		Baseline data.	57.69%	60.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	56.00%		Baseline data.	56.67%	58.43%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	59.00%		Baseline data.	62.07%	62.90%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	42.86%		Baseline data.	56.00%	50.00%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	68.10%		Baseline data.	60.45%	58.27%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	38.89%		Baseline data.	50.00%	48.80%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	90.6%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.90%	95.20%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	96.8%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	91.90%	95.20%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	100.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.90%	95.00%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.01%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	0.82%	1.21%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	2.84%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	3.03%	3.31%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.07%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.18%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

Henry, Congratulations!

February 15, 2017

Dr. Henry V. Wagner, Jr.
Superintendent
Dorchester County Board of Education
700 Glasgow Street
Cambridge, MD 21613

Dear Dr. Wagner:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Dorchester County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Dorchester County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Dorchester County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Angela McPeake Gebert
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline FFY 2013 SFY 2014	Target FFY 2014 SFY 2015	Target FFY 2015 SFY 2016	Target FFY 2016 SFY 2017	Target FFY 2017 SFY 2018	Target FFY 2018 SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Dorchester County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	71.88%		Baseline data.	100%	57.14%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	70.45%		Baseline data.	100%	56.52%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	69.70%		Baseline data.	100%	58.33%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	68.18%		Baseline data.	100%	65.22%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	75.00%		Baseline data.	100%	61.90%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	61.36%		Baseline data.	100%	52.17%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	94.7%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.20%	100%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	100.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.30%	100%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 144		90.00%	100.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.10%	100%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	3.50%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.52%	1.71%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator / Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	2.79%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	2.75%	2.90%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	89.36%	96.67%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	91.67%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	94.12%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	83.33%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Dr. Barbara Brookmyer
Health Officer
Frederick County
350 Montevue Lane
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Dr. Brookmyer:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Frederick County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Frederick County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Frederick County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Monica Grant
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Frederick County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	98.60%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.62%	99.60%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	57.41%		Baseline data.	56.38%	51.72%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	66.50%		Baseline data.	72.95%	61.95%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	61.36%		Baseline data.	65.32%	53.15%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	61.84%		Baseline data.	68.60%	54.15%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	62.57%		Baseline data.	70.12%	56.32%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	50.97%		Baseline data.	60.39%	47.32%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.80%	95.80%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	98.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.50%	95.40%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	98.4%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.00%	92.50%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.55%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.79%	1.61%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.39%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.06%	2.94%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	99.40%	99.66%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.40%	Not Met	The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	99.70%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	99.26%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	96.95%	98.13%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Mrs. Barbara L. Baker
Interim Superintendent
Garrett County Board of Education
40 South Second Street
Oakland, MD 21550

Dear Mrs. Baker:
The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Garrett County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Garrett County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Garrett County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Deneice Crites
Heather Raybold
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

March 9, 2016, Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Garrett County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	Local Results	Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	 FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	80.00%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	76.92%		Baseline data.	84.62%	100%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	86.96%		Baseline data.	85.00%	94.29%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	86.67%		Baseline data.	81.82%	100%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	82.61%		Baseline data.	85.00%	94.29%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	81.25%		Baseline data.	81.82%	100%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	73.91%		Baseline data.	85.00%	91.43%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	92.70%	100%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	92.70%	100%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.10%	100%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.02%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	2.46%	3.56%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	2.60%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	3.37%	3.97%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	80.00%	Not Met	The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	80.00%	Not Met	The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Barbara, Congratulations

Mrs. Barbara P. Canavan
Superintendent
Harford County Public Schools
102 South Hickory Avenue
Bel Air, MD 21014

Dear Mrs. Canavan:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Harford County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Harford Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Harford County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Susan Austin
Nicol Elliott
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Harford County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	99.70%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		99.30%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	54.67%		Baseline data.	64.33%	67.99%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	48.78%		Baseline data.	56.65%	55.66%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	63.56%		Baseline data.	71.19%	73.06%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	49.83%		Baseline data.	58.51%	53.52%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	61.18%		Baseline data.	67.17%	70.79%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	48.08%		Baseline data.	55.85%	51.99%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	97.7%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.40%	92.70%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	95.5%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.80%	92.30%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	97.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.30%	91.90%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.54%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.27%	1.25%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04		3.10%	3.45%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.80%	4.46%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	96.51%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	95.00%	90.00%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	96.90%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	96.86%	98.30%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	99.40%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator.	98.88%	100%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
	COMAR 13A.13.01.09				The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.		
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

Congratulations!

February 15, 2017

Dr. Renee A. Foose
Superintendent
Howard County Public Schools
10910 Route 108
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Dear Dr. Foose:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Howard County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Howard County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Howard County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments

c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Branch Chiefs
Nancy FitzGerald
Jennifer Harwood

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

March 9, 2016, Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Howard County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	99.40%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	97.80%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.40%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	61.80%		Baseline data.	62.23%	51.28%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	56.30%		Baseline data.	57.95%	59.92%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	65.45%		Baseline data.	68.48%	61.67%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	52.36%		Baseline data.	66.78%	60.31%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	69.83%		Baseline data.	68.38%	66.09%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	45.67%		Baseline data.	47.70%	49.24%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	98.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	93.90%	96.00%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	98.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.20%	93.90%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	98.8%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.30%	94.50%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.29%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	1.01%	1.13%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.26%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.24%	3.00%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.78%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.40%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.34%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.78%	99.47%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	98.95%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR	99.49%	100%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
					13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.		
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Karen, Congratulations, Part C too

Dr. Karen M. Couch
Superintendent
Kent County Public Schools
5608 Boundary Avenue
Rock Hall, MD 21661

Dear Dr. Couch:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Kent County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Kent County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Kent County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Wendy Keen
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) / State Fiscal Year (SFY) / Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

March 9, 2016, Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Kent County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	< 5 children		Baseline data.	< 5 children	66.67%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	100%		Baseline data.	< 5 children	66.67%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	< 5 children		Baseline data.	< 5 children	0.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	100%		Baseline data.	< 5 children	50.00%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	100%		Baseline data.	< 5 children	66.67%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	100%		Baseline data.	< 5 children	83.33%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	88.5%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	88.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	88.5%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	100%	N/A
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	2.78%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	0.56%	2.27%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	4.50%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.46%	1.31%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	82.61%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Ms. Uma S. Ahluwalia, Director
Montgomery County Department of Health
and Human Services
401 Hungerford Drive, 5th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Ms. Ahluwalia:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each local Infants and Toddler's Program performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Montgomery County Infants and Toddler's Program (ITP). Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Montgomery County Infants and Toddler's Program ITP has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP)

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Montgomery County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Jack R. Smith
Phillip Lynch
Natasha Ramberg
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline FFY 2013 SFY 2014	Target FFY 2014 SFY 2015	Target FFY 2015 SFY 2016	Target FFY 2016 SFY 2017	Target FFY 2017 SFY 2018	Target FFY 2018 SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

3/25/15bmm

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Montgomery County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	94.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.43%	95.90%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	97.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.20%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	45.01%		Baseline data.	58.32%	59.84%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	61.27%		Baseline data.	70.14%	72.12%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	58.31%		Baseline data.	70.93%	74.74%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	57.14%		Baseline data.	65.88%	69.66%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	64.67%		Baseline data.	74.24%	74.42%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	52.36%		Baseline data.	60.87%	62.69%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	98.3%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.90%	95.20%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs		83.40%	96.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	93.30%	95.70%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	98.3%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	93.90%	97.00%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.79%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.88%	2.24%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	4.18%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	4.23%	4.38%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.84%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.11%	98.75%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.95%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.90%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates	99.31%	100%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
					compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.		
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Mrs. Pamela Brown-Creekmur
Health Officer
Prince George's County
1701 McCormick Drive, Suite 200
Largo, MD 20774

Dear Mrs. Brown-Creekmur:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Prince George's County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Prince George's Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Prince George's County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MF/AM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Trinell Bowman
Alyson Felder
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Prince George's County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	97.70%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.19%	99.60%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	98.40%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	99.60%
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	64.09%		Baseline data.	72.71%	71.69%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	48.03%		Baseline data.	61.41%	61.28%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	58.90%		Baseline data.	68.12%	69.21%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	41.80%		Baseline data.	57.00%	59.41%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	78.50%		Baseline data.	84.92%	81.73%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	41.37%		Baseline data.	53.61%	54.69%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	98.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.30%	94.10%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	96.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.00%	95.00%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442	90.00%	98.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.70%	95.10%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04	1.52%	1.43%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	1.20%	1.29%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.02%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	2.92%	2.73%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	99.31%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.64%	95.89%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
	COMAR 13A.13.01.09						
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Mr. Gregory J. Pilewski
Interim Superintendent
Queen Anne's County Board of Education
202 Chesterfield Avenue
Centreville, MD 21617

Dear Mr. Pilewski:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Queen Ann's County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Queen Anne's County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Queen Anne's County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/AM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Diane McGowan
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

March 9, 2016, Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Queen Anne's County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	52.94%		Baseline data.	30.00%	30.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	75.56%		Baseline data.	82.50%	76.74%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	75.00%		Baseline data.	53.85%	53.85%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	84.44%		Baseline data.	85.00%	76.74%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	76.47%		Baseline data.	50.00%	77.78%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	66.67%		Baseline data.	62.50%	72.09%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.00%	86.80%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.00%	88.90%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.70%	89.70%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	2.68%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	2.64%	1.45%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	4.36%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.46%	3.46%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Scott, Congratulations, I Part C too !

Mr. James Scott Smith
Superintendent
St. Mary's County Public Schools
23160 Moakley Street, Suite 109
Leonardtown, MD 20650

Dear Mr. Smith:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the St. Mary's County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the St. Mary's County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the St. Mary's County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Cindy Kilcoyne
Susie Fowler
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

John, Congratulations!

February 15, 2017

Dr. John B. Gaddis
Superintendent
Somerset County Public Schools
7982-A- Tawes Campus Drive
Westover, MD 21871

Dear Dr. Gaddis:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Somerset County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Somerset County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Somerset County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Cheryl A. O'Neal
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Somerset County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	40.00%		Baseline data.	0.00%	50.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	60.00%		Baseline data.	40.00%	20.00%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	50.00%		Baseline data.	16.67%	25.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	60.00%		Baseline data.	40.00%	20.00%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	0.00%		Baseline data.	14.29%	50.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	50.00%		Baseline data.	40.00%	20.00%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	<5 children	N/A	Sample size does not meet the criteria to report for this indicator.	100%	NA
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	<5 children	N/A	Sample size does not meet the criteria to report for this indicator.	100%	NA
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	<5 children	N/A	Sample size does not meet the criteria to report for this indicator.	100%	NA
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.57%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.11%	1.15%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	1.86%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	1.90%	2.08%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	92.31%	Not Met	The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	88.89%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates compliance. No required action. Please share promising practices.	86.67%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	87.50%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	75.00%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Mr. Louis Taylor
Interim Superintendent
Worcester County Board of Education
6270 Worcester Highway
Newark, MD 21841

Dear Mr. Taylor:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Worcester County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Worcester County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

Local Infants and Toddlers Programs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Worcester County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Rae Record
Kathy Simon
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline FFY 2013 SFY 2014	Target FFY 2014 SFY 2015	Target FFY 2015 SFY 2016	Target FFY 2016 SFY 2017	Target FFY 2017 SFY 2018	Target FFY 2018 SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Talbot County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	56.52%		Baseline data.	77.27%	52.38%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	62.50%		Baseline data.	81.82%	56.25%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	63.64%		Baseline data.	82.61%	59.09%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	67.50%		Baseline data.	86.36%	53.13%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	65.52%		Baseline data.	87.10%	76.92%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	67.50%		Baseline data.	79.55%	56.25%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	<5 children	N/A	Sample size does not meet the criteria to report for this indicator.	93.30%	100%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	<5 children	N/A	Sample size does not meet the criteria to report for this indicator.	96.40%	100%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	<5 children	N/A	Sample size does not meet the criteria to report for this indicator.	100%	100%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	3.25%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.89%	3.19%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	4.64%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	4.28%	4.19%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	97.06%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	93.65%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	94.12%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Clayton, Congratulations!

Dr. Clayton M. Wilcox
Superintendent
Washington County Board of Education
10435 Downsville Pike
Hagerstown, MD 21740

Dear Dr. Wilcox:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Washington County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Washington County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Washington County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Mariam Robins

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

March 9, 2016, Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Washington County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	98.80%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.15%	98.90%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	38.04%		Baseline data.	56.52%	77.42%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	55.33%		Baseline data.	72.06%	79.69%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	33.93%		Baseline data.	58.02%	73.91%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	40.00%		Baseline data.	66.18%	75.00%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	63.24%		Baseline data.	68.97%	80.53%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	48.67%		Baseline data.	51.47%	58.69%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	97.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	94.00%	93.50%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	99.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	93.80%	93.10%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	97.9%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	93.50%	91.90%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04	1.52%	2.00%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	1.97%	1.68%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.30%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.09%	3.43%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	98.03%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrated noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	99.03%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Dr. Donna C. Hanlin
Superintendent
Wicomico County Board of Education
P. O. Box 1538
Salisbury, MD 21802

Dear Dr. Hanlin:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Wicomico County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Wicomico County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Wicomico County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments

c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Bonnie L. Walston
Patricia Adkins
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting 4A. Family Survey – Know their rights 4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs 4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn 5. Child Find 0-1 6. Child Find 0-3	1. Timely Services 7. 45 Day Timeline 8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes 8B. Transition – Notification to LSS 8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria						
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	**FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)**	**FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)**	**FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)**	**FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)**	**FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)**	**FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)**
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) / State Fiscal Year (SFY) / Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Wicomico County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015 State Target	FFY 2015 Local Results	FFY 2015 Target Met	Action Required	Previous Results FFY 2014	Previous Results FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	37.50%		Baseline data.	54.55%	65.52%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	59.00%		Baseline data.	70.42%	70.53%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	44.64%		Baseline data.	64.52%	70.77%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	56.00%		Baseline data.	74.65%	58.95%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	53.97%		Baseline data.	78.72%	71.01%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	57.00%		Baseline data.	71.83%	61.05%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	99.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.40%	96.50%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	98.3%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.40%	98.60%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	98.3%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.40%	98.60%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04	1.52%	0.92%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	1.59%	1.49%
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.21%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	2.99%	2.92%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Mr. Louis Taylor
Interim Superintendent
Worcester County Board of Education
6270 Worcester Highway
Newark, MD 21841

Dear Mr. Taylor:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each LITP performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Worcester County Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Worcester County Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Meets Requirements."

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

Local Infants and Toddlers Programs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Worcester County Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MEF/BMM/cc
Attachments
c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Rae Record
Kathy Simon
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Worcester County Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	53.85%		Baseline data.	80.00%	87.50%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	68.09%		Baseline data.	80.00%	65.22%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	48.00%		Baseline data.	85.71%	78.95%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	65.96%		Baseline data.	76.67%	52.17%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	52.50%		Baseline data.	70.83%	70.00%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	55.32%		Baseline data.	53.33%	65.22%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	96.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	97.40%	95.80%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs		83.40%	92.0%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	89.70%	91.30%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	100%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	91.70%	100%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	2.28%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	2.43%	1.04%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	3.68%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	3.07%	2.23%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	98.41%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrated noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	100%	100%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13A.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

February 15, 2017

Dr. Leana Wen
Health Commissioner
Baltimore City
1001 E. Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

Dear Dr. Wen:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) is required to make determinations annually on the performance of each local Infants and Toddlers Program using one of the following four determination categories: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention" [34 CFR §§303.700 and 300.703]. The MSDE, DSE/EIS uses a results-based rubric for specific indicators to evaluate each local Infants and Toddler Program performance in meeting the State's targets for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 (2015-2016). Attached please find the FFY 2015 Determination Overview that identifies the Part C Indicators used to assign a local determination, the FFY 2015 Local Determination Scoring Criteria, and the Graduated Results-Driven Accountability Plan. The attached FFY 2015 Annual Data Table on SPP/APR Part C Indicators provides a three-year data analysis and required actions for the Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program. Based on the FFY 2015 data, as well as information obtained through monitoring and complaint investigations, the Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program has achieved the determination status of "Needs Assistance, Year Five."

For the last four (4) consecutive years, the Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program has been assigned a determination status of "Needs Assistance." Historically, this represents inconsistent performance and a challenge to sustain targets met. This ongoing need for assistance requires that the Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program and the DSE/EIS to jointly develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive action plan that identifies targeted assistance, support, and resources. The Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program staff will be required to meet with the DSE/EIS personnel to identify the necessary actions, technical assistance, and through a jointly developed plan assist the Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program to "Meet Requirements." Dr. Brian Morrison, Program Director, Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, will be contacting Gloria Valentine, Director of Early Intervention Services, Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program to identify a date and time for this meeting.

In correspondence sent to your attention on March 20, 2014, you were informed that beginning with the FFY 2013 local determinations, the DSE/EIS would implement a six-year graduated results-driven accountability plan. As part of this plan, all Part C results indicators are used in the determination process. The results indicators include:

- Indicator 2: Provision of Services in the Natural Environment;
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes[1];
- Indicator 4: Family Outcomes;
- Indicator 5: Child Find Birth to One; and
- Indicator 6: Child Find Birth to Three.

[1] The MSDE, DSE/EIS did not include Indicator 3: Child Outcomes in the FFY 2015 Part C Determinations because of the change in methodology that resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for FFY 2015.

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the DSE/EIS has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. Please see the *Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations* document. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by LITP Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The attached baselines for local determinations of Maryland's LITPs will not be included in the Maryland's Annual Performance Report

(APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). For Federal reporting, the OSEP requested that Maryland report child outcomes data for children birth to three years separately from child outcomes data for children older than three so that comparisons could be made with other states that are not serving children through an IFSP after age three.

The shift to a more balanced accountability approach does not relieve the DSE/EIS from ensuring compliance, correction of identified noncompliance, and the receipt of timely and accurate data. As a result of the accountability shift to an increased emphasis on results, an LITP's determination status may be impacted in the future.

LITPs are strongly encouraged to work closely with their Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to perform an analysis of local data and infrastructure. The analysis should guide the development of strategies for data-informed decision-making, increased parent partnerships, strategic collaboration, and the use of evidence-based practices to improve the results for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities and their families. As we continue this shift in focus to results-driven accountability, the MSDE, DSE/EIS will provide State and local professional learning opportunities.

Thank you for your hard work and commitment to excellence, equity, and efficiency. The MSDE is committed to supporting the efforts of the Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program to improve results for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call me at 410-767-0238.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Division of Special Education/
Early Intervention Services

MF/AM/cc

Attachments

c: Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Gloria R. Valentine
Branch Chiefs

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

FFY 2015 Determination Overview
Part C & Part B
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is focused on state accountability on Part C and Part B Indicators defined in the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) State Performance Plans. Annually, the OSEP evaluates each state's performance on these Indicators, and, as a result, assigns each state to one of four levels of determination: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) anticipates receiving its current federal determination status for Part C and Part B in June 2017.

The IDEA also requires states to evaluate each state's Local Lead Agency (LLA) for the IDEA Part C early intervention services, and each Local School System (LSS) for the IDEA Part B special education performance on the Part C and Part B Indicators. As a result of that evaluation, each state is to assign each LLA and LSS to one of four levels of determination status: "Meets Requirements," "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," or "Needs Substantial Intervention." In making determinations, the OSEP requires that states consider:

- Performance on Results and Compliance Indicators;
- Whether data submitted by public agencies are valid, reliable (accurate), and timely;
- Uncorrected noncompliance from other sources;
- Any audit findings; and
- Other information.

The MSDE, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, uses a results-based rubric on specific indicators to rate each LLA's and LSS's performance in meeting the State's targets as defined by the State Performance Plan for Part C and Part B. Each LLA's and LSS's determination status and results will be posted, as required, on the *MSDE Public Website of State Performance Plan Results* at http://mdideareport.org no later than June 1, 2017.

The following Part C indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
2. Primary Service Setting	1. Timely Services
4A. Family Survey – Know their rights	7. 45 Day Timeline
4B. Family Survey – Effectively communicate their children's needs	8A. Transition – Transition Outcomes
4C. Family Survey – Help their children develop and learn	8B. Transition – Notification to LSS
5. Child Find 0-1	8C. Transition – Timely Planning Meeting
6. Child Find 0-3	
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**

Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The following Part B indicators are included in assigning determinations:

Results	Compliance
1. Students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma 2. Students with IEPs dropping out 5A. LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; 5B LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and 5C LRE for Students Ages 6-21 – In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 4A Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy in Single or Multiple Suspensions/Expulsions > than 10 days. 8A Preschool Parent Survey; or 8B School Age Parent Survey. 14 Post-School Outcomes	4B. Suspension/Expulsion – Significant Discrepancy Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 9. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity 10. Disproportionate Representation Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity and Disability 11. Initial Evaluation Timeline 12. Part C to B Transition 13. Secondary Transition
Correction of Noncompliance	**Data and Submission of Reports**
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	Timely and Accurate

The MSDE supports each LLA's and LSS's effort to improve performance and identify and correct noncompliance with federal and State requirements. Programmatic technical assistance and monitoring may include, but is not limited to, teleconference calls, targeted technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, targeted funds for improvement, and onsite visits. While it is the MSDE's preference to work collaboratively with each LLA and LSS to improve performance, other enforcement options may be necessary for sustained poor performance and/or ongoing noncompliance.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if Maryland determines, for two consecutive years, a public agency needs assistance under §300.603(b)(1)(ii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Advise the public agency of available sources of technical assistance that may help to address the identified areas in which the public agency needs assistance;
(2) Direct the use of federal funds, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a)(2), on the area or areas in which the public agency needs assistance; and/or
(3) Identify the public agency as a high-risk grantee and impose special conditions on the public agency application for federal funds under the IDEA.

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(b), if Maryland determines, for three or more consecutive years, that a public agency needs intervention under §300.603(b)(1)(iii) in implementing the requirements of the IDEA, the MSDE must implement enforcement actions. The MSDE may:

(1) Take any of the actions described in 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a);
(2) Take one or more of the following actions:
   (i) Requires the public agency to prepare a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the MSDE determines that the public agency should be able to correct the problem within one year.
   (ii) Require the public agency to enter into a compliance agreement under section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §1221 *et seq.* (GEPA), if the MSDE has reason to believe that the public agency cannot correct the problem within one year.
   (iii) For each year of the determination, withholds not less than 20 percent and not more than 50 percent of the State's funds under Section 611(e) of the IDEA, until the MSDE determines the public agency has sufficiently addressed the areas in which the public agency needs intervention.
   (iv) Seeks to recover funds under Section 452 of the GEPA.
   (v) Withholds, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under Part B of the IDEA.

In addition to the enforcement actions described above, if the MSDE determines a LLA or LSS needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of a public agency's eligibility under the IDEA, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.604(c), the MSDE may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Recover Funds under section 452 of the GEPA; or
(2) Withhold, in whole or in part, any further payments to the public agency under the IDEA.

Prior to withholding any funds under the IDEA, the MSDE provides reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the public agency involved, pursuant to the procedures in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.180 through 300.183.

Framework for Assistance and Intervention

Needs Assistance

The process for the provision of assistance is dependent upon the degree of need within each LSS or LLA. The types of assistance must be individualized to address the root causes of the problem(s) for each indicator(s) in order to meet the specific identified needs. The MSDE will identify:

- What needs to change;
- How frequently and in what manner the local school system reports on progress; and
- The MSDE contact for support, information, documentation, and follow-up.

In collaboration with the MSDE, LSSs/LLAs will identify the type, amount, and frequency of assistance needed to address the specific needs. A wide variety of assistance is available. The MSDE is available to consult with LSSs/LLAs by telephone, fax, email, mail, or in-person. To

enable a LSS to improve performance and meet compliance available assistance may include, but is not limited to the MSDE assisting a LSS/LLA to:

- Clarify/examine/develop/revise policies and procedures;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system administration and system of general supervision;
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise system of self-monitoring;
- Provide training/professional development;
- Access the advice of experts to address the area(s) of need, including explicit plans for addressing the area for concern within a specified period of time;
- Identify and implement professional development, instructional strategies, and methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based research;
- Designate and use distinguished superintendents, principals, special education administrators, special education teachers, and other teachers to provide advice, assistance, and support;
- Devise additional approaches to providing assistance, such as collaborating with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance supported under IDEA, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance;
- Provide access to additional tools and resources;
- Share sample forms, procedures, processes;
- Provide information on where additional information, resources, support, and other organizations for support may be located;
- Examine/revise data collection;
- Improve collaboration/coordination with internal and external colleagues;
- Provide local director networking opportunities;
- Develop specialized programs/services;
- Examine options for increasing/reallocating personnel
- Clarify/examine/develop/revise fiscal management procedures and documentation
- Use evaluative measures to validate progress and correction of previous noncompliance
- Provide access to discretionary funds.

Needs Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Intervention" indicates a need for assistance in either performance and/or compliance areas within the LSS/LLA General Supervision process. Using the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) "*Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B*," MSDE will direct the LSS/LLA to examine, clarify, and develop an effective system of general supervision to address results and compliance. This may require more frequent MSDE oversight and direct onsite follow-up.

In collaboration with the LSS/LLA, the MSDE may determine a local school system needs additional assistance beyond that listed above in the determination category of "Needs Assistance." Additional supports and required actions may include but are not limited to:

- Mandatory review of the local school system's system of general supervision to include:
    - Local Self-Assessment of Performance and Compliance;
    - Policies, procedures, and effective practices, including the local school system's required documentation of implementation;

- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Directed Targeted Assistance and Professional Development.

- Identification and prioritization of corrective actions based upon the analysis of their system of general supervision, needs and resources;
- Development and implementation of required Corrective Action Plans with required timelines for submission, provision of evidence and data to demonstrate progress and correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year;
- MSDE prescribing the use of discretionary funds;
- Identification of a local school system as a high risk grantee if a local school system is in the category of Needs Intervention for 2 years;
- Required quarterly reporting on status of correction of noncompliance

Needs Substantial Intervention

The determination category of "Needs Substantial Intervention" indicates a need for significant assistance and support in multiple results and compliance indicators. In addition to the available assistance listed above, to address "Needs Intervention," additional supports and required actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Reduce or eliminate the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Discretionary funds;
- Redirect or target the use of funds allocated under IDEA Part B Passthrough funds;
- Withhold or reduce Part B Passthrough funds pending completion of the corrective actions;
- Withhold or reduce State funds for special education services pending the completion of corrective actions;
- Assign MSDE staff on-site to assist in the completion of the corrective actions; and
- Assign a monitor to oversee the local school system's special education programs, with the responsibility for the costs of monitoring to be determined by the Department.

Prior to reducing or withholding funds, all requirements regarding proper notice by MSDE to the local school system shall be met, consistent with 20 U.S.C. §1413(c) and (d).

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Early Childhood Results (IFSP)	LITP met State targets for at least four results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least five results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	Change in methodology resulted in a new baseline for Indicator 3. LITP met State targets for at least three results indicators/ subindicators (4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least six results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)	LITP met State targets for at least seven results indicators/ subindicators (3aSS1, 3aSS2, 3bSS1, 3bSS2, 3cSS1, 3cSS2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, & 6)
	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*	LITP met State target for Natural Environment (Indicator 2) birth to 3 & three through 4* **Or each IFSP includes a justification based on each child's needs. Programs with 3 or fewer children in non-NE settings may be excluded.*
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators/subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)	LITP demonstrated full compliance (100%) in at least two compliance indicators/ subindicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, & 8c)
	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification	LITP corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance, including fiscal noncompliance, within one year of notification
	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner	LITP submitted all data in a timely and accurate manner

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program, *Birth-4*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Local Infants Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • One of Two Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • Zero of Two Results Indicator bands; and • One of Five Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention • LITP demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification; • LITP demonstrated failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to infants and toddlers and their families and oversight; or • LITP informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Graduation (1)		LSS meets or exceeds 4- year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)	LSS meets or exceeds the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (1)
Dropout (2)		LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS was not significantly above the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)	LSS meets or exceeds the Annual 9-12 Dropout target (2)
Assessment (3A)		*PARCC Administered	AMO Waived by U.S. Department of Education		LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)	LSS meets the State Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Reading or Math Proficiency (Indicator 3A)
Assessment (3B)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate	LSS meets or exceeds the participation rate
Assessment (3C)		*PARCC Administered			LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard	LSS meets or exceeds the proficiency rate against the achievement standard
Suspension Expulsion (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)	LSS does not demonstrate a significant discrepancy in single or multiple rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days (4A)
School Age LRE (5)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)	LSS met or exceeded the State target for three LRE Indicators (5A- regular class 80% or >, 5B- regular class < 40%, and 5C- separate, residential or homebound/hospital)
Preschool LRE (6)				LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility	LSS meets or exceeds the State target for Preschool LRE Indicator 6A- majority of time in regular early childhood program and 6B-separate class, school or residential facility
Preschool Outcomes (7)					LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)	LSS met or exceeded the State targets for three of six early childhood outcome indicators (Social Emotional 7A1-increased rate, 7A2- within age expectation; Knowledge and Skills 7B1-increased rate, 7B2- within age expectation; Appropriate Behaviors 7C1- increased rate, or 7C2-within age expectation)

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Special Education and Support Services for Students with Disabilities, *3-21*

Local Determination Scoring Criteria

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) State Fiscal Year (SFY) Determination Year	FFY 2013 SFY 2013-2014 2015 (March)	FFY 2014 SFY 2014-2015 2016 (March)	FFY 2015 SFY 2015-2016 2017 (March)	FFY 2016 SFY 2016-2017 2018 (March)	FFY 2017 SFY 2017-2018 2019 (March)	FFY 2018 SFY 2018-2019 2020 (March)
Parent Involvement (8)	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	Change in methodology resulted in the establishment of a new baseline for Preschool (8A) and School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator	LSS met or exceeded State target for Preschool (8A) or School-age (8B) Parent Involvement Indicator
Post School Outcomes (14C)			LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	LSS met or exceeded the State target for students enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment
Compliance Full Compliance = 100% Substantial Compliance = 95%	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance higher for at least five of six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated substantial compliance or higher for six compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
			LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	LSS demonstrated 85% compliance for all compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification	LSS corrected all previously identified findings of noncompliance; including fiscal noncompliance within one year of notification
	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data	LSS submitted timely and accurate data
Local Determination Criteria	***Meets Requirements*** • Two of Three Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Three of Five Results Indicator bands; and • Two of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Three of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Five of Six Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Meets Requirements*** • Seven of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • Four of Four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Assistance • One of Three Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Five Results Indicator bands; and • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Two of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Four of Six Results Indicator bands; and • One of Four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Assistance*** • Five of Nine Results Indicator bands; and • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Intervention • ≤One of Three Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Five Results Indicator bands; or • One of Three Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ One of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Three of Six Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands	***Needs Intervention*** • ≤ Four of Nine Results Indicator bands; or • One of four Compliance Indicator bands
	Needs Substantial Intervention 1. LSS demonstrated continued failure to correct all previously identified noncompliance and completion of corrective actions for two or more years from date of identification 2. LSS failure to substantially comply has affected the core requirements, such as delivery of services to students with disabilities or to provide effective general supervision and oversight; *or* 3. LSS informed the State that it is unwilling to comply with the core requirements					

Indicator numbers correspond to State Performance Plan (SPP). See SPP for details.

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Part C Child Outcomes Baselines and Targets for Local Determinations
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013-2018
State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2019

As part of the results-driven accountability system, the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services' (DSE/EIS) has developed one set of baselines and targets that are inclusive of children who receive services from birth to three, as well as children who receive services through an Extended IFSP. The decision to examine child outcomes as one group independent of age was unanimously supported by local Infants and Toddlers Program (LITP) Directors and Preschool Coordinators through a stakeholder discussion held during the April 29, 2014 Professional Learning Institute. The percentage increases in targets above are consistent with the DSE/EIS Strategic Plan: *Moving Maryland Forward* and with the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1, 2015. Baseline and Target Data for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 are as follows:

Child Outcome Indicator	Summary Statement*	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
		FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
		SFY 2014	SFY 2015	SFY 2016	SFY 2017	SFY 2018	SFY 2019
Positive Social Emotional Skills	1	64.23%	64.23%	65.23%	66.23%	67.23%	68.23%
	2	65.12%	65.12%	65.62%	66.12%	66.62%	67.12%
Acquisition and Use of Knowledge & Skills	1	69.08%	69.08%	70.08%	71.08%	72.08%	73.08%
	2	61.42%	61.42%	61.92%	62.42%	62.92%	63.42%
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Their Needs	1	72.98%	72.98%	73.98%	74.98%	75.98%	76.98%
	2	56.92%	56.92%	57.42%	57.92%	58.42%	58.92%

*Summary Statement #1 – Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Summary Statement #2 – The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program.

Local Part C Determinations

Early Childhood

Number of Performance Indicators Required to Meet Requirements (of 11 Total Indicators) *Natural Environments, Child Find, Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes*				
FFY <State Fiscal Year> (Determination Year)	4 of 11	5 of 11	6 of 11	7 of 11
2013 <2013-2014> (2015)				
2014 <2014-2015> (2016)				
2015 <2015-2016> (2017)				
2016 <2016-2017> (2018)				
2017 <2017-2018> (2019)				
2018 <2018-2019> (2020)				

Baltimore City Infants and Toddlers Program
Annual Data on Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) Priority Indicators
for the Period July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report								
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator			FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
			State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
2	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	97.10%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	98.14%	97.10%
2 Ext IFSP	Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive services in natural environments COMAR 13A.13.01.07		93.00%	99.10%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	99.00%	N/A
3A	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of social – emotional skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	68.94%	58.37%		Baseline data.	59.89%	53.02%
		2. Exits within age expectations	65.90%	58.64%		Baseline data.	67.12%	60.17%
3B	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of knowledge and skills COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	73.17%	47.01%		Baseline data.	53.59%	44.41%
		2. Exits within age expectations	62.34%	42.86%		Baseline data.	44.07%	35.33%
3C	Birth - 4 Outcomes: Use of appropriate behaviors COMAR 13A.13.01.08	1. Exits with substantial growth	77.03%	48.96%		Baseline data.	62.07%	55.59%
		2. Exits within age expectations	57.16%	40.07%		Baseline data.	49.49%	42.17%
4A	Families who report EIS helped them know their rights 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		85.00%	95.6%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	95.50%	96.60%
4B	Families who report EIS helped them communicate their child's needs 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		83.40%	97.4%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.10%	96.50%
4C	Families who report EIS helped them help their children develop and learn 20 U.S.C. 1416a(3)(A) and 1442		90.00%	98.2%	Met	Target met, no required action. Please share promising practices.	96.00%	96.30%
5	Children birth to one served as a percentage of the population birth to one COMAR 13A.13.02.04		1.52%	1.38%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	1.12%	1.60%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
6	Children birth to three served as a percentage of the population birth to 3 COMAR 13A.13.02.04	3.10%	2.76%	Not Met	Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising implementation practices to demonstrate continued progress.	2.72%	3.22%
1	Timely Delivery of IFSP Services COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	94.25%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	94.35%	91.87%
7	Percentage of toddlers for whom the evaluation and the initial IFSP was within 45 days from the date of referral COMAR 13A.13.01.07	100%	83.63%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance within one year for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.07. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	96.07%	98.86%
8A	Percentage of toddlers exiting Part C for whom an IFSP was developed at least 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%
8B	Percentage of toddlers for whom the LEA was notified of potential Part B eligibility at least 90 days prior to the third birthday 13A.13.01.09	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%

Part C Annual SPP Performance Report							
SPP/APR Indicators Results Indicator Compliance Indicator		FFY 2015			Action Required	Previous Results	
		State Target	Local Results	Target Met		FFY 2014	FFY 2013
8C	Percentage of children for whom the transition conference was held 90 days, and not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday COMAR 13A.13.01.09	100%	99.68%	Not Met	Subsequent data demonstrated correction of the FFY 14-15 noncompliance for this indicator. The FFY 15-16 data demonstrates noncompliance with COMAR 13A.13.01.09. Submit an Improvement Plan within 30 days; identify the root causes and proposed promising practices. Correction of the noncompliance must be demonstrated and verified within one year.	98.69%	99.63%
	Correction of Noncompliance COMAR 13a.13.02.04	100%	100%	Met	Compliant. No required action. Please share promising practices.	100%	100%